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ABSTRACT

Concepts of marginality have found popular use in the field of adult education. Unfortunately indiscriminate usage of the term marginality has left too much latitude for misapplication, misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Clark was first to use the term, marginality, to denote a particular concept in the field. In his doctoral organizational case study, "Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity," University of California--Los Angeles, 1956, Clark identified a transition by the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System from a state of existence wherein traditional educational values prevailed to a state wherein the adult education schools had assumed a service orientation subservient to community demands.

Clark's initial concept of marginality was developed to denote the final status of the Branch resulting from this transition. His subsequent uses of the term departed from denoting the status of an adult education subunit in relation to other subunits within a common parental educational school system to include other organizational and non-organizational applications.

Clark was inconsistent in applying the term marginality and strayed from its application in his doctoral case-study-in-depth to describe the status of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System. He also used marginality to denote the
status of various other adult education subunits, including that of adult education administrative agencies, classes, departments, enterprises, schools, school programs, programs in general, a bureau, and professional administrators' society. Additionally, concepts of marginality were used by Clark in his dissertation to describe the low status of adult education administrators, functions, activities, programs, and a subunit organizational position.

This thesis links Clark's initial concept to dictionary definitions, discusses problems in assessing and validating marginality within organizational contexts, establishes a typology for classification of usages within the literature, and pursues concept clarification and differentiation. Definitions are stated for (1) values marginality, (2) practice marginality, (3) autonomous extra-organizational marginality, (4) autonomous organizational marginality, (5) intra-organizational marginality, (6) human system marginality, (7) administrator system marginality, (8) client system marginality, (9) organizational system marginality, (10) organizational micro-system marginality, (11) organizational macro-system marginality, (12) organizational multiple subunit micro-system marginality, (13) organizational multiple subunit macro-system marginality, and (14) for the generic label applicable to organizational system marginality concepts--inter-system marginality.

Suggestions for future research are also presented.
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Authors in adult education frequently use the term marginality, citing Burton R. Clark and his popular writings which reported his seminal doctoral study of adult education in California. Clark used the term to denote the status of various adult schools within the Los Angeles and California school systems and felt the concept of marginality might also have application within other systems. He wrote convincingly enough to persuade others of the conceptual value of marginality in adult education. Although other authors apparently deal with quite different concepts, they use the term marginality as a common label. These concepts vary and are applied in a variety of contexts. Frequently they are in conflict with one another—still they are termed marginality, and attributed to a common source.

---

What are the plausible explanations for variance in concepts termed marginality and for the attribution to Clark of such diverse concepts? People may carelessly read Clark and thus misapply the term marginality. Authors may cite Clark, but assign to the term marginality, meanings which may be more compatible to their purposes; they may fail to specify differences between Clark's usages of the term and their own contextual usages. Another possibility might be that Clark's writing may not have been precise, thus yielding multiple, and possibly even operationally contradictory, definitions of the concept. In such case, those who use various concepts of marginality would cite Clark and would find contextual instances of Clark's usages which are compatible with their applications. Since the possibilities are not mutually exclusive, one might find examples within each category. Regardless of cause, the term marginality has been used in the field of adult education with great latitude. This has led to imprecision and a lack of uniformity of understanding both of the concepts of marginality and of their applications.

The term marginality has been used in the adult education literature, in graduate schools, and at professional conferences, by a variety of individuals and in a number of ways. Had the term received less usage, it would be less significant to study, but it is precisely because of the popularity of the term that it is important to develop precise definitions, thus enabling consistent use of the term in the field of adult education. Why, after years of popular use of
the term might it now be important to identify the concepts of marginality applied in the field and endeavor to define them? It is apparent through the frequent use of the term in the literature that adult education practitioners, educationists and authors alike, find utility in its use.

Darkenwald and Merriam suggest that the "creation of a body of knowledge in adult education through systematic and disciplined inquiry has lagged behind the development of graduate training programs." However, footnoting Clark's monograph published in 1968 at Berkeley by the University of California Press, which publication ensured from his previously cited doctoral study, they cited "Adult Education in Transition, a sophisticated study of the organizational dynamics of public school adult education agencies by the sociologist Burton Clark," as one of the exceptions:

Clark's analysis of the causes and effects of institutional marginality is still of value in understanding administrative roles and organizational processes in adult education, especially in school and college settings.

Furthermore, Darkenwald and Merriam refer to Clark's study as one of two examples of how research focused on adult education, even though conducted by individuals outside of the field of

---


5 Ibid., p. 231.
adult education, adds to the field's knowledge base. They repeatedly acknowledged the importance of the Clark study. Brunner, Wilder, Kirchner, and Newberry noted the extent to which Clark's 1956 monograph,\(^6\) gave attention to administrative concerns and the degree to which these had application "to other school systems and some other agencies."\(^7\) They labeled Chapter IV of his monograph, dealing with implications and policy, as "a most valuable, not to say brilliant, contribution of value beyond the area of public school adult education."\(^8\) Although Clark's monograph has been included in different series, has been individually printed as well as being published as a book, its content and page numbering appear to have remained constant with the exception of changing introductions and tables of contents. This 1956 document will, hereafter, be referred to as the monograph.

Because of the frequent use of the term marginality, and its apparent importance in the field of adult education, it is desirable that the concepts of marginality which are labeled


\(^7\)Edward de Schweinitz Brunner, David S. Wilder, Corinne Kirchner and John S. Newberry, Jr., An Overview of Adult Education Research (Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1959), p. 120.

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 122.
with this common term be defined so as to allow individuals to visualize the states being denoted by the concepts and to enable them to arrive at a common understanding of status for the adult education element. A uniform definition is essential if the concept is to become a useful research tool. Once a concept is well defined—clear, identifying that denoted by the concept and excluding that which is not a part thereof—it becomes possible to refine companion and "subsidiary concepts" necessary for model and theory building. The precise defining of terms is a necessary first step in theory building within a field of study and for integrating theory and models across boundaries of disciplines and fields of study. Anything less than clearly defined terms and concepts:

would interfere with the construction of adequate theory and the development of systematic research through which the body of knowledge accumulates logically with internal consistency. Consequently, the discovery of valid solutions to practical problems encountered in the field would be retarded.\(^9\)

Because of the popular usages of the term marginality it tends to be one of the fundamental terms around which new concepts are formulated. The concept of marginality is integral to several concepts developed by Clark. He described his concept of marginality as one of three historical conditions

---


\(^10\)Ibid., p. 27.
which "largely exist as 'givens' for the decisions made in the administration of adult education departments of school systems," the other two being "the pressures of the enrollment economy, and the potential effect of the stated ends of the program." 

Concepts of marginality need to be well defined and must be operationalized for maximum utility. Clark defined his concept of "organizational marginality" to some extent and announced his intention to identify not only indices, sources, bases, and a contributing factor to marginality, but also some symptoms and evidences for determination of whether an adult education subunit is in a state of marginality. Confusion concerning multiple concepts of marginality concerns their level of application within organizations or within society.

For purposes of clarity in defining concepts of marginality, it is essential to distinguish between adult education units and subunits. An adult education unit is

---

12 Ibid., p. 36.
14 Ibid., p. 25.
15 Ibid.
17 Ibid., p. 27.
19 Ibid.
defined as an independent and formally constituted organizational element wherein the primary objective and function is the education of adults. An adult education subunit is not a subdivision of an adult education unit but, rather an adult education element organizationally subordinate to a parental organization or larger or more powerful organization whose primary objective and function is not adult education. The term unit within this thesis, with the exception of its use in direct quotations or accompanied by qualifying statements, will be restricted to the designation of legal or formally incorporated elements. Subunits will be used to refer to subordinate parts of legally or formally incorporated elements.

Repeated references have been made to multiple concepts of marginality which are most frequently denoted by Clark and others through use of the single term, marginality. While it is important at this point to identify examples of different uses of marginality by Clark, in-depth analysis and critique of each would not be appropriate. Clark's uses of the term marginality will be individually quoted in context in Chapter II and subsequently analyzed and critiqued.

Clark used the term to denote the status of the Adult Education Branch (which may be thought of as an adult education subunit) among other subunits within a parental organization (the Los Angeles School System) wherein the primary objective and function is not the education of adults. Clark also

\[20\] Ibid., pp. 3-4.
applied this concept to the Bureau of Adult Education of the California Department of Education,\textsuperscript{21} and to the California Association of Adult Education Administrators.\textsuperscript{22}

Variations of the concept of marginality were used by Clark to describe the status of adult education subunits, considered collectively, both within immediate parental organizations and within larger organizational systems which encompass such immediate parental organizations.

Clark also considered the status of various groupings of adult education subunits collectively. Groupings were by organizational unit types, such as classes and schools. Among subunits whose status was considered on such a collective basis by Clark in his Dissertation were adult education: administrative agencies,\textsuperscript{23} classes,\textsuperscript{24} departments,\textsuperscript{25} enterprises,\textsuperscript{26} schools,\textsuperscript{27} school programs,\textsuperscript{28} and programs.\textsuperscript{29} He appears to specifically identify the parental organizations and comparative subunits infrequently in his application of concepts

\begin{enumerate}
\item[Ibid., p. 29.]
\item[Ibid.]
\item[Ibid, p. 30.]
\item[Ibid, p. 26.]
\item[Ibid, pp. 14, 24, 27.]
\item[Ibid., p. 172.]
\item[Ibid., pp. 70, 172, 203.]
\item[Ibid., p. 70.]
\item[Ibid., pp. 14, 24-30, 35-6, 70, 172.]
\end{enumerate}
of marginality. This thesis will examine the frequency and consistency with which Clark applied his concepts of marginality to various adult education elements, and identified comparative elements and parental organizations and contexts.

Quite distinct from Clark's organizational marginality concept by which the status of adult education subunits is described, Clark used additional concepts of marginality in his Dissertation to denote the status of adult education administrators,\textsuperscript{30} functions,\textsuperscript{31} activities,\textsuperscript{32} and a subunit organizational position.\textsuperscript{33}

Clark appears to merge concepts of status and acceptance as they relate to his concepts of marginality. Clark's use of these two terms, acceptance and status, will be identified, discussed, analyzed, and critiqued as he uses them to define various concepts of marginality.

The term marginality has been used in the literature to denote concepts which are distinct from Clark's initial concept. These concepts have been referred to as "concepts of marginality" in this thesis because of similarities with Clark's concept of organizational marginality. These similarities occur in definition and in contextual application. Few guidelines for application of Clark's initial concept of marginality were given.

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{31}Ibid, p. 172.
\textsuperscript{32}Ibid, pp. 26-7, 70.
\textsuperscript{33}Ibid, p. 36.
outside the boundaries of his case study. Other authors using the term marginality, and citing Clark, seem unconcerned by the ambiguity that results from having a multiplicity of concepts of marginality. Distinctly different concepts of marginality have been created by these authors in their attempts to apply Clark's concept to novel situations. The review of literature in the field of adult education is necessary for identification of these distinct concepts of marginality.

Since adequate definitions for the several concepts of marginality appear to be non-existent, definitions will be proposed.

Once concepts of marginality are defined it may be possible to identify applications of some concepts of marginality. Such an identification process is considered to be an initial test of validity.

Outside of Clark's initial writings, which will be identified in Chapter II, the term appears to have been applied by Clark and authors within adult education with minimal additional definitional development. None of the concepts of marginality appears to have been well defined. No reports of measurement of any state of marginality have appeared in the adult education literature. Virtually no guidelines are available for assessing marginality or its effects. His uses of the term marginality in both his Dissertation and Monograph will be quoted in context, analyzed and critiqued in an effort to understand his use of them.

This thesis was commenced under the assumption that
concepts of marginality lacked definition and development in the field of adult education. There appeared to be inconsistency in application of concepts of marginality. The importance of developing precise definitions of concepts, such as those for marginality, was further assumed.

To clarify Clark's development of his concepts of marginality, each will be traced through quotation of each of his uses of the term marginality in their contexts from both his Dissertation and Monograph, through classification of uses and their contexts, and through analysis and critique, thereof.

If the field of adult education is to enjoy conceptual clarity and success in theory and model building, which in turn may lead to the integration of theory and practice, the building blocks must be precise. Terms and concepts must be specific if common understanding in the field is to exist. Terms and concepts need definition so as to allow individuals to visualize commonly denoted phenomena or meaning and thus enable mutual understanding of that which is being studied. For maximum utility, terms and concepts should be defined through the use of conventional language, avoiding the jargon of the field which might tend to make the terms subject or field specific, rather than allowing for more universal understanding and their potential integration and use across fields of study. Turner, addressing the structure of sociological theory, insists:

a body of theory rests on the premise that scientists will do their best to define concepts unambiguously. Not to do so, or to give up because the task is difficult, is to invite conceptual chaos and thereby to preclude the accumulation of theoretical
knowledge.  

Clark's concept of organizational marginality coincides with several definitions for marginality found in a standard dictionary. Clark's concepts of marginality will be compared to the more popular standardized definitions of marginality to determine the degree of agreement. An individual outside of the field of adult education can gain a basic understanding of Clark's concept of organizational marginality without the need of jargon specific to the field of adult education. This thesis will link Clark's initial concept of marginality to dictionary definitions.

A second challenge made by Turner is that of increasing a concept's usefulness by making it relevant to observable situations and occurrences:

After all, the utility of an abstract concept can only be demonstrated when the concept is brought to bear on some specific empirical problem encountered by investigators: otherwise, concepts remain detached from the very processes they are supposed to help investigators understand.  

Thus, Turner maintains, concepts when abstract should be accompanied by "operational definitions," which are series or sets of procedural instructions telling individuals how to identify phenomena in the real world. One objective of this

---

35 Ibid., p. 4.
36 Ibid.
thesis is to ascertain the degree to which concepts of marginality have been defined, instrumented, and applied in adult education.

In summary, an effort will be made to identify distinct concepts of marginality used in adult education by Clark and by other authors. Until the apparent confusion concerning the meanings of marginality is resolved, it will be impossible to identify and measure the effects of the different types of marginality. Until a single concept is identified which can be labeled with the term marginality and individuals in the field of adult education restrict their usage of the term to the concept so denoted, or until the term marginality is modified by accompanying descriptors, enabling individuals to differentiate among concepts of marginality, it will continue to be impossible to determine whether users of the term are talking about the same thing.

The purposes of this thesis are to review the origin of the term marginality; present definitions perceived as being useful in determining the meaning of the term within the adult education literature; identify, analyze, and critique each use of the term contained in what are identified as the primary documents pertaining to its use in adult education; discuss the theoretical consistency of Clark's use of the term; and define these concepts precisely.

This exercise is an historical and theoretical clarification of the concepts which are currently termed, marginality. It will be accomplished through a literature
review, classification of the usages of the term marginality in the literature, and development of definitions for each distinct concept of marginality.

Methodology

Several research methodologies are employed in this research. Primarily a concept analysis, this thesis begins with an examination of The Marginality of Adult Education, a seventeen page essay published two years after the completion of Clark's Dissertation. Reviewed next is the widely circulated 220-page monograph, published under the same title as Clark's Dissertation, based on Clark's "doctoral dissertation completed in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles," and referred to elsewhere in this thesis as the Monograph.

Several research questions were formulated for purposes of guiding the literature search. Was Clark first to use the term marginality to denote a concept pertinent to the field of adult education? Was Clark's concept of marginality applied in adult education similar to the ways it is applied outside of the field? Did Clark apply his concept of marginality consistently in adult education? How extensively was Clark referenced in adult education in association with his use of the term marginality. To what extent do Clark's concept(s) of


38 Idem, Monograph, Acknowledgments.
marginality lend themselves to application and measurement within adult education. What are the documents which are pertinent to the above questions and for setting the scope of this thesis?

Acknowledging that some of the preceding questions may be beyond the scope of this thesis, a more thorough search and review of the literature was considered to be the next step. In many regards, the literature search was opportunistic, focusing first on that literature readily available in this author's personal library, at the University of British Columbia, and on that assessible through computer searches available at the University.

Portions of the literature search were systematic in that the major periodicals of professional associations of adult education in the United States were searched article by article for purposes of identifying uses of the term and concepts of marginality, related subjects, and for reference to Burton R. Clark, whose writings were felt to be primary to analysis of the term and concepts of marginality in adult education.

Use of the term and concepts of marginality by authors in adult education, other than Clark, were reviewed to determine the degree of their conformity to Clark's usages and for purposes of testing Clark's concepts of marginality outside of the context of his study. This exercise was perceived useful in identification of various concepts of marginality and in their refinement.

Searches were made of course syllabi or offerings within
the Department of Administrative, Adult and Higher Education at
the University of British Columbia; listings under Burton R.
Clark contained in the University of British Columbia Library
and the Coolie Verner Adult Education Reading Room; both
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) computer data
banks [Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE) and
Resources in Education (RIE)]; periodicals of the Adult
Education Association of the United States of America (AEA-USA)
beginning with the 1953 issues, the year in which Clark
completed his doctoral research data collection and a year prior
to acceptance of his Dissertation, and continuing until they
were discontinued in 1982 (Adult Education: A Journal of
Research and Theory and Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years);
periodicals of the American Association for Adult and Continuing
Education (AAACE) from their inception in 1982 through the July
1985 issue (Adult Education Quarterly: A Journal of Research and
Theory and Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and
of Adult Education. Additionally, more than one hundred books
concerning organizational development, change, psychology,
planning, concepts, theories, behavior, personal psychology,
policy, and design which were shelved at the Coolie Verner
Memorial Reading Room in the Adult Education Research Center at
the University of British Columbia (UBC), the UBC general stacks
and this author's personal library were scanned for examples of
applied concepts of marginality or use of the term in other
disciplines. In the course of graduate study, publications of
departmental faculty members and student papers were reviewed for the purpose of identifying concepts of marginality. Fellow graduate students brought additional references to this author's attention.

All of Clark's writings listed in the Bibliography, wherein the term or concepts of marginality are used, other than his Dissertation, were read. Initially, the focus of the examination was on relationships and whether the term marginality was used consistently.

Once a concept of marginality had been identified, the work was scanned for further use of concepts of marginality. Whether the actual term, marginality, was used within these contexts or not, if a concept of marginality was used as evidenced by sufficient contextual indicators, then the passage was initially reviewed.

References from each newly identified article wherein the term marginality had been used, were then examined for additional relevant works. Works or passages were reviewed if any of Clark's writings were referenced or included in the bibliography, or if key words were listed in subject indices, including marginality, marginal, margin, organizational, acceptance, central, retrenchment, organizational growth cycles, stage development, or other terms which appear to be related to status.

Leading to the establishment of definitions, dictionary definitions will be analyzed for the terms margin, marginal, and marginality. The dictionary definitions will be identified.
according to their congruence or appropriateness for each of the identified concepts of marginality. This process is required to ground the newly defined concepts in common English terms.

Two major "strategies" used by linguists and logicians, abstraction and homonymy, have been considered in an effort to determine whether the concepts of marginality used in the field of adult education by Clark and others are in fact one very general and abstract concept of marginality—the abstraction view; or whether different and independent concepts of marginality exist—the homonymy view. A strong homonymy view would insist that the various concepts of marginality used in adult education are distinct and independent with no similarities other than the term which is used to designate them. Because a purpose of this thesis is to lay the foundation for operationalizing concepts of marginality and because it is felt that distinct definitions are necessary to this end, a weak homonymy view is felt to be appropriate for this thesis. Thus, terms and concepts of marginality will be examined for purposes of identifying uniqueness. It is not assumed that concepts of marginality used within the field of adult education are mutually exclusive.

Definitions for the various concepts of marginality that may be identified will be used to establish a Typology for the Classification of Concepts of Marginality. Use of the proposed

typology may serve as one strategy for analysis of uses by other authors of concepts of marginality within the adult education literature, which analysis is considered to be beyond the scope of this thesis.

Once developed, the Typology for Classification of Concepts of Marginality may be tested by classifying concepts of marginality from the adult education literature. This testing will allow the evaluation of adequacy for each definition of marginality.

The purpose of the proposed typology is to serve as a foundation for the analysis of Clark's usage of the term and concepts of marginality. Numeration is felt to be an insignificant method of analysis for purposes of this thesis. Nevertheless, once Clark's usage of the term marginality is identified in his Dissertation and Monograph, and once the differing designation for concepts of marginality appearing in these two documents are nominally listed, frequencies will be reported in this thesis. The numerous labels used by Clark to distinguish among concepts of marginality will be discussed and analyzed. The identification of distinct concepts of marginality from the literature through application of proposed definitions and classification of the concepts, using the Typology for Classification of Concepts of Marginality, will be feasible processes for validating the proposed definitions and typology. The proposed definitions and typology may be further validated by their ability to facilitate critical analysis of term and concept usage by other authors of adult education
Several questions have been identified in this introductory chapter. Many of these questions will serve as topics in chapters to follow. Should the concept of organizational marginality be credited to Clark? What were the labels Clark used to designate his concept(s) of marginality? To what extent was he consistent in term usage? Can definitions be written to distinguish among concepts of marginality? Should this conceptual analysis be approached using an abstraction or a homonymy strategy? These questions, among others previously stated will for the basis for this conceptual analysis.

Thesis Format

Clark, through the research methodology described in this Chapter was identified as first to use the term, marginality, to denote a concept in the field of adult education. Questions concerning application of the term and concepts of marginality to the field of adult education have been stated. Research goals for this thesis have been stated.

Chapter II identifies Clark's writings utilizing the term marginality and explores his purposes for applying concepts of marginality in his doctoral study. His focus on organizations as well as the sociological perspective of the study are explicated. Dictionary definitions of the term are reviewed and constitute a basis, along with the aforementioned reviews of his work, for analyzing Clark's use of the term in the two primary documents.

Chapter III is dedicated to presentation and discussion of
uses of the term marginality from Clark's *Dissertation*. Each context, wherein the term is used, is quoted in sufficient length to facilitate identification of critical conceptual elements.

Chapter IV includes a premise for categorizing concepts of marginality. Each category and subcategory is defined and illustrated in charted form. Contextual data from Clark's seventeen uses of the term marginality are charted, discussed, and analyzed. General observations which do not lend themselves to categorization follow.

Chapter V repeats the process of Chapter III, this time for Clark's uses of the term marginality from the *Monograph*. Each use of the term is quoted in context.

Chapter VI is the presentation of the categorical data from Clark's uses of the term marginality in his *Monograph*. General observations not lending themselves to categorization follow.

Categorical data tabled from Clark's uses of the term marginality in his *Dissertation* and *Monograph* are compared and contrasted in Chapter VII. Ancillary observations not lending themselves to categorization are thematically labeled and discussed. Most theme presentations involve data from Clark's two primary documents concerning his study. The thematic presentations will make distinctions which are necessary for defining specific concepts of marginality.

Chapter VIII is dedicated to the proposal of succinct definitions and labels for each of the basic concepts of marginality and their subcategories. Additionally, a generic
label is proposed for denoting the marginality of adult education subunits which are considered to be part of more than one educational system. The definitions constitute a typology which is tabled.

The final chapter includes the presentation of summary statements, findings and conclusions. It addresses the limitations of the study and contains recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

CLARK'S WRITINGS CONCERNING MARGINALITY
AND DEFINITIONS PERTINENT FOR THEIR ANALYSIS

The principal purpose of this chapter is the identification and analysis of Clark's writings pertinent to usages of the term marginality. A second purpose of this chapter is the presentation of background of Clark's doctoral study wherein the term marginality appears to have first been used. This exercise is intended to provide the reader with sufficient background to facilitate understanding of the several uses of the term marginality as they are discussed in subsequent chapters. These ends will be accomplished through exploring Clark's purposes for applying concepts of marginality in his doctoral study and by discussing his focus on organizations from the sociological perspective.

The third major section of this chapter focuses on dictionary definitions of the term marginality and of its root, the term margin. These definitions are viewed as a basis for understanding Clark's usages of the term marginality and are seen as forming a common definitional base for understanding the
applications of concepts of marginality in specific settings.

As evidenced through a review of the books, periodicals, reports, proceedings, and unpublished materials listed in the Bibliography of this thesis, in addition to the examination of other publications as outlined in the Methodology subsection of Chapter I, Burton R. Clark was first to use the term marginality in discussing the status of adult education subunits.\(^4\)

**Clark's Articles Concerning Marginality**

Clark appears to have used the term marginality repeatedly in his doctoral study. Each will be identified and discussed.

Clark first used the term marginality in his *Dissertation*, an organizational case study of "adult education schools and departments"\(^1\) within the Los Angeles Public School System during the early 1950s. The document was completed in 1954 at the University of California, Los Angeles. While his doctoral study may be considered to be a sociological case study, it "directly concerns the development of adult education in the public school system of California."\(^2\) Clark originally intended to limit his "purview to just the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System in order to have a case study in the institutionalizing of adult education," however, he addressed,

\(^4\)Clark, *Dissertation*.

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 1.
studied and generalized "state-wide conditions."\textsuperscript{3} The study has since received attention among adult educators, attributable to Clark's focus on adult education organizations, his articles and reports published in journals associated with the field, and to the extensive citation of the study by authors of other adult education literature. Because Clark first used the term marginality within his Dissertation the document is the primary source in the study of the concepts of marginality in adult education. Outside of references made in this thesis to the document, no other direct references to Clark's Dissertation were identified through this study.

Clark's article, referred to elsewhere in this thesis as the Monograph, was published with an index in 1956 by the University of California Press in the University of California Publications in Sociology and Social Institutions series\textsuperscript{4} under the identical title as his Dissertation. Since 1956, this Monograph with its index has been reprinted four times, three times in book form by the University of California Press, the third reprinting being in 1968.\textsuperscript{5} The book maintained page numbering matching that of the article's initial printing and commencing with page number 43. This consistent page numbering may be helpful to readers of this thesis in that specific pages

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{5}Idem, Monograph, 1968.
in footnoted references to the Monograph are applicable to all reprintings which are enumerated in the bibliography of this thesis. Additionally, a publisher's page, acknowledgments, and table of contents were added to reprints of the Monograph. Clark acknowledged in the Monograph that:

This study is based on a doctoral dissertation completed in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.\footnote{Ibid., Acknowledgments.}

Even though he acknowledged that the article was based on his doctoral dissertation, Clark did not include a formal reference to the Dissertation in the bibliography of his Monograph.

The absence of direct citations of Clark's Dissertation in the adult education literature may be attributed in part to the fact that dissertations per se are seldom widely read and to Clark's never having formally referenced his Dissertation in any of his other writings in which he used the term marginality. Rather, he cited passages and references from his Monograph which was "conducted under a 1952-53 fellowship granted to Clark by the Social Science Research Council."\footnote{Idem, Adult Education in Transition, 1968, Acknowledgments.} Clark's 1956 article, referred to elsewhere in this thesis as the Monograph, is the prominent document concerning the term and concepts of marginality and receives major attention and analysis in this thesis.
Clark's *The Marginality of Adult Education* was published in 1958. Whereas his *Monograph* was based on his *Dissertation* which primarily concerned the transition of the adult schools within the Los Angeles Public School System, this 1958 article focused on the term marginality, the concept denoted by the term, and its application to and implications for the field of adult education. The article was published with an accompanying 3-page "Postscript" by Harry L. Miller, Assistant Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. Miller critiqued Clark's attempted application of the term and concept of marginality to the field of adult education.

Clark's article, "Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Values: A Case Study" was published in 1956 in the *American Sociological Review*. The article firstly identified "some of the conditions of weakness in social values, and secondly, [sought] to present a case study of one type of value modification." Clark's concept of marginality as it affects value modification was discussed.

In 1964, Clark's *Monograph* which had appeared in the *American Sociological Review* was reprinted in part under a

---


49 Ibid, pp. 16-18.


51 Ibid., pp. 327-28.
shortened title in Amitai Etzioni's sociological reader.\textsuperscript{52}

In 1980, Clark's Monograph was reprinted in book form for the fourth time, this latest time by Arno Press of New York.

In summary, Clark's Monograph has been distributed by at least three publishers, issued in at least two editions, and has a record of at least six printings.\textsuperscript{53} Sustained demand for the article and book may account for the popularity of the term marginality; which Clark emphasized in these publications.

It was expected that the term marginality discussed extensively in the references already noted would appear in other works by Clark. Clark's writings\textsuperscript{54} which followed his Dissertation addressed organizational relationships within junior colleges and society to which his initial concept of marginality might have been applied. Clark's Monograph\textsuperscript{55} was cited in these books and several concepts from Clark's Dissertation were discussed, but only two books contained


\textsuperscript{53}See Reference Bibliography for listing of publishers and printing dates.


\textsuperscript{55}Idem, Monograph.
applications of a concept of marginality. The first use of marginality found in these writings was in connection with possible trends for organizations. "Organizational marginality" was cited as an example of a condition with predictable consequences:  

Clark's second use of a concept of marginality outside of his articles, which were previously referenced, was in 1983.

Clark's only usages of the term marginality which have been identified in this study, with the exception of the two preceding quotations, occur within his Dissertation, in the Monograph based on his Dissertation, and in the three additionally cited articles published in periodicals and based on both the Dissertation and the Monograph. The Dissertation and Monograph include Clark's most pertinent usages of the term marginality. Both Clark's Dissertation and Monograph will be reviewed to identify his uses of the term. Each use within his Dissertation and Monograph will be cited and discussed for purposes of identifying contexts of use and what might be considered to be Clark's assigned meanings to the terms.

---


58 See Clark, "Organizational Adaptation"; "The Marginality of Adult Education"; and "Adult Education in Transition".
Observations from the quotations will be tabled, compared, discussed, analyzed, and critiqued.

Clark's Purpose of Concept Development

A brief description of Clark's study was given in the introductory chapter. A fuller introduction will now be presented to supply adequate background concerning the doctoral study to enable the reader to understand Clark's logic in applying one or more concepts of marginality in his study, and to prepare the reader for analyses of Clark's uses of the term marginality.

Clark's concept or concepts of marginality appear to have been developed in the field of adult education in a traditional way. Through his organizational case study, Clark felt he had identified a transition by the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System from a state of existence wherein traditional educational values were upheld to a state wherein a service orientation to community demands had been assumed. His concept of marginality was developed to represent the status of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System or of its twenty-four adult schools, one of three contributing factors to the transition which he reported to have observed: "marginal status, open-ended purpose, and a set of operating pressures."

Whereas public school education has tended to be prescriptive, Clark felt programs within the adult education schools in California had grown to be "highly adaptive to the

59 Clark, Monograph, p. 142.
expressed interests of students and community groups, and the schools are in close relationship to their clientele." Clark noted evidence for determining differences between "traditional modes" and an organizational element which had assumed a service character:

We shall find strong evidence of the service character of the schools in the way that classes are initiated and maintained, with students in effect making the final decisions. The service orientation is reflected also in the bases for hiring and firing teachers, in the duties of the administrative role, and in the content of administrative doctrines. Clark announced that he had observed a transition by the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System from a state of existence wherein traditional educational values prevailed to a state wherein the adult schools had assumed a service orientation subservient to community demands. In an empirical sense, Clark did not observe such a transition, but rather the state of existence of the adult schools in 1953, which schools professed service orientations and were seen by Clark as subservient to community demands. Through historical records, earlier states of existence of the adult schools were described using such variables as budget, enrollment, physical facilities, and administrative profiles. Clark observed these states from his historical data, not first hand. Transitions of the adult schools from one state of existence to another were

---

60 Ibid., p. 45.
61 Ibid.
hypothesized rather than observed. What Clark identified as referred to as "sources,"62 "indices,"63 "effects,"64 "symptoms,"65 "bases,"66 "evidences,"67 and as a "contributing factor,"68 a "condition,"69 and a "hypothetical index"70 of marginality were hypothesized in the study but were not observed and empirically measured.

Clark's statement that "We shall find strong evidence of the service character of the schools"71 is misleading in that Clark had observed the final status of the adult schools, which state of existence he denoted as marginality. His doctoral study included identifying, through historical research, previous states of existence occurring between 1887 and 195372 and hypothesizing indices, sources, bases, symptoms, evidences and effects of the status without direct observation or empirical measurement of actual states of existence other than the final status of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System and its twenty-four adult education schools. Clark used his case-study-in-depth to hypothesize indices, sources, bases, symptoms, evidences and effects of marginality, but he did not include a scientifically controlled test or measurement to substantiate his hypothesized results.


71Ibid.

72Ibid., p. 7.
Clark sought to account "for the reason for the emergence of this service character." He turned to conditions under which the adult schools had operated. Marginality was one of three factors which he identified as being of "basic importance" in accounting for the emergence of a service character. Clark enumerated the three factors:

first, the marginal position of adult education within the public school system and the effect this status has upon the adult school; second, the nature of the purposes of adult education since the 1920's [sic] and its influence on the adaptive behavior of organizational leadership; and third, a specific set of operating pressures that stem from state legislation and problems of student clientele. The service institution identified in this study may be seen as a resultant of the conjunction of these conditions.

The marginal "position", "status", condition, or state of existence of "adult education within the public school system" is what Clark termed marginality.

Clark, while not rigorously defining his concept of marginality, wrote of what he termed "Sources and Indices of Marginality," and reintroduced as "bases and symptoms," without distinguishing among them. Clark appears to have used

---

73Ibid.
74Ibid.
75Ibid.
76Ibid.
77Idem., Dissertation, p. 25.
these labels, among others, to denote his hypothesized variables of marginality. Clark's variables are perfunctorily introduced to the reader, presently, but will be reiterated in context, and discussed, analyzed, and critiqued in detail later in the chapter.

He contrasted the precarious state of adult programs to well-established, well-accepted primary departments within the school system, the budget support and general organizational position of each, their "formal or 'constitutional' status," and the status of adult education program administrators to that of other administrators. The "general absence of separate plant facilities and other fixed capital" for adult schools versus facilities and fixed capital possessed by comparative elements within a common system, and voluntary attendance to adult schools versus the compulsory attendance requirements of elementary and secondary schools were cited as contrasts, supposedly affecting the status of the adult education element in relation to that of comparative elements.

Additionally named by Clark as indices of marginality were the severity of the "pressure of economy-minded interest

---

79 Ibid., pp. 25-6.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid., p. 27.
83 Ibid., p. 27-8.
84 Ibid., p. 25-6.
groups,"85 the "felt need, expressed by adult administrators, of having to 'sell' the program to the public and especially to other educators,"86 the "relatively low degree of acceptance"87 by groups internal and external to the parental system to which the adult education element belongs, and "insecurity"88 of the adult education element, an enrollment economy wherein continuation of courses is dependent upon attendance,89 and ambiguous goals.90

It appears that Clark, in developing his concept of marginality, may not have taken the logical first step—the thorough defining of the concept. Instead he appears to have enumerated the symptoms of the condition,91 explained its effects92 and remedies93 while bypassing the rigorous defining of the term. If this is the case, it becomes important to be alert to Clark's precision in making distinctions among sources, indices, effects, symptoms, bases, evidences, contributing factors, conditions, and hypothetical indices of marginality as each of Clark's uses of the term marginality is quoted in

85Ibid., p. 28.
86Ibid., p. 29; 87Ibid., p. 30.
88Ibid.
89Ibid., pp. 31-6.
91Clark, Monograph, p. 58.
92Ibid., p. 148.
93Ibid., p. 150.
context, discussed, and analyzed. These terms appear to be key elements for defining and testing concepts which have been denoted by Clark as marginality, understanding his usage of the term, and improving conceptual clarity in future applications of the term and concepts of marginality.

A Study of Organizations

Preliminary to the analysis of Clark's usages of the term marginality, it appears important for the reader to approach the subject from Clark's perspective.

Clark's study is one of "organizations, their values and practices." Clark, in explaining the sociological perspective of his study and the importance of organizations in the process of social norms and values modification, noted that:

Where values are implemented by organizations, then attention is directed by this concern to organizational process. This has reference to both the processes that shape goals of organizations and those modifying the patterns of behavior that are means to those goals. In this study, "adult education" is considered the general value that is undergoing implementation by adult education schools and departments. These organizations are seen as the instruments of implementation. It is clear that adult education subunits of various size and scope must be built and maintained in order to realize the education of adults. It is equally clear, however, that such organizations are not simply passive tools. They affect the ultimate value being put into effect, and its meaning for program and behavior. Our concern is with the how of such changes—the conditions and processes of changes in norms and values. In our case study, these are the norms and values of public school adult education organizations.  

---

94 Clark, Dissertation, p. 37.
95 Ibid., pp. 1-2.
For future analysis, it is important to note that Clark has identified "adult education" as "the general value that is undergoing implementation by adult education schools and departments."\(^9\) When the term adult education appears in Clark's writings, some confusion may result as to when the "general value"\(^9\) of adult education is being identified and when "adult education"\(^9\) is being used to denote an organizational element such as an adult education program, activity, class, school, division, branch, department, center, division or school system, or an amalgam of these listed elements. While Clark does recognize a difference between adult education, which he considers to be "the general value that is undergoing implementation by adult education schools and departments,"\(^9\) and the organizational elements which are "instruments of implementation,"\(^1\) he does not appear to maintain the distinction in his Dissertation and Monograph. As Clark introduces his concept of marginality this important distinction between the "general value"\(^1\) and the organizational unit or subunit makes possible the distinction between the marginality of adult education, and marginality in adult education, the

\(^9\)Ibid., p. 1.
\(^9\)Ibid.
\(^9\)Ibid.
\(^9\)Ibid.
\(^1\)Ibid.
\(^1\)Ibid.
former suggesting the field or value is marginal in relation to other fields or values within society and the latter suggesting the less than full status of an adult education organizational unit in relation to other units or subunits within society or within the larger organization. These distinctions become important when the concepts of marginality are applied, and hence are important in our analysis.

In this thesis an adult education unit is defined as an independent and formally constituted organizational element whose primary objective and function is the education of adults. An adult education subunit is not a subdivision of an adult education unit, but rather an organizational adult education element which is organizationally subordinate to a parental organization or physically larger or more powerful organizational element whose primary objectives and function is not the education of adults. As has been stated previously, use of the terms unit and subunit within this thesis, with the exception of quotations and qualified statements, will be restricted to designation of legal or formally incorporated elements in whole and in part. In the two preceding quotations, Clark appears to use the terms unit\textsuperscript{102} and subunit\textsuperscript{103} interchangeably. Because his study focuses on the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System and its twenty-four adult schools, which are organizationally

\textsuperscript{102}Ibid., pp. 3-4.

\textsuperscript{103}Ibid., pp. 1-2.
subordinate to parental organizations wherein the primary objectives and functions are directed to the education of children rather than adults, it may be surmised through applying the proposed definitions that Clark was studying the marginality of adult education subunits rather than the marginality of adult education units.

In analyzing Clark's usages of the term marginality, it is helpful to keep in mind the development of Clark's Dissertation and its focus on various levels of adult education organization. Clark was interested in a sociological case study of the evolution of an "institution." 1 We had originally intended to limit our purview to just the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System in order to have a case study in the institutionalizing of adult education. But it became apparent after several months of research that we had to become familiar with certain state-wide conditions in order to understand the development of local school units. Attention was then partly shifted to the level of state legislative and executive action; at the same time, the Los Angeles department was maintained as a case-study-in-depth. The former gave us the general conditions in the state of California under which adult education programs have been built; the latter provides us with detailed information on how these conditions are likely to work themselves out within local school systems.

1 The concept of institution is discussed in Chapter VI. Our use of the term is similar to that of Robert M. MacIver. See R. M. MacIver and Charles H. Page, Society, (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1949, pp. 15-17.104

In this same quotation Clark referred to "the Los Angeles department" as being maintained as a case-study-in-depth. While

104Ibid, pp. 3-4.
it is assumed that reference was to the same organizational element, certainty is negated through use of the word department rather than Branch. In his diagram of the formal organizational structure of the Los Angeles School System 1952-53, which is reproduced in this thesis as Table 1, Clark identified three formal administrative units of adult education: the Division of Extension and Higher Education, the Adult Education Branch and the Adult Schools. In Table 2 of this thesis, Clark's diagram of the formal hierarchical administrative structure for

---

105 Ibid., p. 44.

106 Ibid., p. 49.
Clark notes the existence of twenty-four organizationally distinct adult schools which were "located on senior high school grounds" throughout Los Angeles, but which were administratively distinct. He also notes the administrative divisions of Academic Education, Homemaking, Americanization and Citizenship, and the Americanization Center over which there were full-time administrators. He acknowledges further administrative

---


108 Ibid.
divisions such as parent education which is supervised by part-time administrators.

Clark's organizational charts acknowledged the occurrence of adult education "functions"\footnote{Ibid., p. 47.} at various administrative levels and within the various organizational subunits:

Within the Division [Division of Extension and Higher Education], adult education is now an important concern of both main branches—the junior college structure and the Adult Education Branch, The focus of the next several chapters is upon the latter, which we have termed the "adult school organization".\footnote{Ibid., pp. 47-8.} The relationship of the junior colleges to the adult schools is considered in Chapter V.

\footnote{Different levels of one concrete organization may be treated as "an organization". For a large urban school system, it seems useful to consider the entire school system as an "organizational complex"; such a school system is composed of a large number of subunits which in themselves constitute "organizations".\footnote{Ibid., p. 3-4.}}

Where the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System was identified initially by Clark to be the focus of his Dissertation, he considered "state-wide conditions in order to understand the development of local school units"\footnote{Ibid., p. 47-8.} and then in Chapter V considered the "relationship of the junior colleges to the adult schools."\footnote{Ibid., p. 47-8.} Discussion of these various adult education administrative subunits was quite acceptable until
Clark introduces his initial concept of marginality. Identification of the pertinent adult education function, unit or subunit then became problematic for the establishment of status. Clark announces that his case study is of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System and the "institutionalizing of adult education"\textsuperscript{113} conducted therein. When the term marginality is applied to the "adult education value,"\textsuperscript{114} to adult education units, and to adult education subunits\textsuperscript{115} at various organizational levels without positive identification of the element, it becomes difficult to identify the level or levels to which Clark intended to apply his concepts of marginality. Within his \textit{Dissertation} Clark writes not only of the marginality of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, but also of the adult education administrative and organizational elements diagrammed in Tables 1 and 2. Chapter II of Clark's \textit{Dissertation} was dedicated to discussing "PRESSURES ON A MARGINAL PROGRAM."\textsuperscript{116} He referred to marginality as a "'given' for the decisions made in the administration of adult education departments of school systems,"\textsuperscript{117} but did not clarify whether he considered marginality to be a constant in all administrative and

\textsuperscript{113}Ibid., pp. 15-7.
\textsuperscript{114}Ibid., pp. 1-2.
\textsuperscript{115}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{116}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{117}Ibid.
organizational elements which he had identified through his organizational diagrams.\textsuperscript{118}

When Clark refers to administrators' "sustained effort to reduce the marginality of adult education within the public-school framework"\textsuperscript{119} it is not clear whether he is referring to the general value of adult education, an administrative or organizational element matching one of those he identified in his organizational charts of the Los Angeles School System, or whether reference is to yet a different organizational element or non-organizational function or element occurring within the public-school framework. Only assumptions can be made without positive identification of the element said to be experiencing marginality. The title itself of Clark's Dissertation, "Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity" adds to the confusion as to whether Clark intends to address the general value of adult education or to focus on a specific organizational unit, whether institutional insecurity rests with the adult education general value, organizational unit, or is independent of them, or what the causal relationships might be which are said to result in institutional insecurity.

Clark refers to several additional distinct as well as indistinct organizational and non-organizational elements within his Dissertation: "adult education in California;"\textsuperscript{120} "part-time instruction...for young people who had dropped out of

\textsuperscript{118}Reproduced as Tables 1 and 2 in this thesis subsection.

\textsuperscript{119}Clark, Dissertation, p. 24.
school;"¹²¹ "public affairs forums;"¹²² a "community-program" for "community agencies;"¹²³ "public adult education organizations;"¹²⁴ "the adult school;"¹²⁵ "adult schools;"¹²⁶ "The adult schools of California;"¹²⁷ "evening school;"¹²⁸ "evening school classes;"¹²⁹ "evening schools;"¹³⁰ "evening high school;"¹³¹ "evening school activity;"¹³² "evening program;"¹³³ "legitimate evening program;"¹³⁴ "night schools;"¹³⁵ "a night program of elementary and high school subjects;"¹³⁶ adult education "programs of local school districts;"¹³⁷ "immigrant education;"¹³⁸ "centers of liberal education;"¹³⁹ "liberal education classes;"¹⁴⁰ "adult education agencies...at local, state and national levels," which common identification became known after 1926 as the "adult education movement;"¹⁴¹ "driver education classes;"¹⁴² "investment courses;"¹⁴³ and "student groups, clubs, and organizations."¹⁴⁴ Community colleges and adult schools in Los Angeles were identified by Clark to be "competing adult education organizations"¹⁴⁵

Clark's Monograph identified or qualified still other adult education elements including: "public adult schools;"¹⁴⁶ "courses;"¹⁴⁷ "evening school functions;"¹⁴⁸ "continuation
school;"149 and "remedial academic education."150 The term, marginality, was applied by Clark to many of the enumerated adult education elements. In Chapter III of this thesis each application of the term marginality appearing in Clark's Dissertation and Monograph will be quoted at length and an attempt will be made to identify the element or elements to which the term is applied.

While it is true that Clark announces his case-study-in-depth to be the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, his application of concepts of marginality in both his Dissertation and Monograph to numerous organizational and non-organizational elements appears to erase the contextual limits originally imposed by the announcement of his case study. Therefore, while the assumption is made that Clark's primary focus is either the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System or its twenty-four adult education schools, the possibility of application of concepts of marginality by Clark outside his announced contextual limits will not be ignored.

Dictionary Definitions As a Basis For Understanding Clark's Concepts of Marginality

Dictionary definitions of the term marginality, its root word and adjective, may be used to understand Clark's uses of the term marginality. Dictionary definitions may also prove useful in developing concepts of marginality in the field. They provide a common definitional base for understanding

146Monograph, p. 47; 147Ibid.; 148Ibid.; 149Ibid., p. 49; 150Ibid.
applications of the term of marginality within a specific setting—the field of adult education.

As with many terms in the English language, and as borne out by a quick scan of most any unabridged dictionary, the term marginality is used to denote multiple concepts. Granted, concepts denoted by the use of a single term are most often related, are at times generalizations from a more central concept, and may be so closely related that some individuals would consider them to be one and the same. Nevertheless, the standard concepts denoted by the term are distinct enough to require differential treatment and application as evidenced by the multiple definitions assigned to the term within numerous dictionaries.¹⁵¹

A Typology for Classification of Concepts of Marginality will be proposed within this thesis wherein discriminating definitions for concepts of marginality will be given. These definitions, if specific, may facilitate discussion of commonalities among the distinct concepts which will have been identified from the literature of the field. The tendency in this thesis toward homonymy and hence away from abstraction is accounted for by a desire to ground the concepts within the adult education experience and to maintain conceptual clarity.

Clark did not indicate an intention to assign any standard definitions to his use of the term. Nevertheless, examination of these dictionary definitions may serve as a basis for

¹⁵¹Specific dictionary definitions and references to follow.
understanding his concept or concepts of marginality. To facilitate and enhance understanding of Clark's use of the term, dictionary definitions will now be reviewed for purposes of strengthening common interpretation of these concepts.

Clark appears to use the term marginality alone as well as with modifiers. Concepts of marginality are also denoted by Clark through use of the adjective, marginal, paired with nouns—which nouns are considered to be designations of the field of adult education or segments of it.

Dictionary definitions of the root word will first be examined, followed by those for the adjective marginal and the term marginality.

**Margin**

The word margin has been identified by Webster as a noun and has been used within various disciplines to denote concepts of natural history, psychology, botany, zoology, dentistry, stock-brokering, agriculture, economics, commerce, life-insurance, joinery, building, politics, and pathology. The word seems to be most frequently used to denote "the part of a page or sheet outside the main body of printed or written

---


matter." While this definition may be generalized to Clark's organizational case study, other definitions seem to parallel and aid understanding of Clark's concepts of marginality.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines margin as:

That part of a surface which lies immediately within its boundary, esp. when in some way marked off or distinguished from the rest of the surface....

This physical science definition includes the margin within the element and suggests that the word margin is especially applicable when it is possible to distinguish the margin from the central portions of the element.

The second definition for margin could be said to be an economic/value definition:

A condition which closely approximates to the limit below or beyond which something ceases to be possible or desirable.

This definition could be helpful in conceptualizing the position or state of condition of adult education elements. Economic feasibility of adult education subunits and programs is discussed and is in part evaluated within Clark's organizational case study. Some adult education schools might be described in economic terms to be existing within such a margin, below which it would not be feasible, based on financial considerations, for the element to continue. The perceived status of adult education subunits and programs may be different for groups...

154Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1979 ed., s.v. "margin".


156Ibid.
internal to the system from its perceived status for groups external to the system. The assessment and affording of status requires a value judgment and may be determined according to the evaluator's values system, by expressed or unstated values existent internal or external to the system, or by a combination, thereof. Such value judgments may be based on comparison of adult education elements to other elements selected by the evaluator.

Webster suggests that the margin extends beyond "the extreme edge of something" to include "the area lying parallel to and immediately adjoining the edge esp. [especially] when in some way distinguished from the remaining area lying farther in: the outside limit and adjoining surface of something."¹⁵⁷ This definition appears to have been struck in the physical sciences. To generalize application of this concept of margin to an organizational case study such as Clark's may present some difficulties. The adult schools of the Los Angeles School System are considered to exist within the formal organizational structure. Clark, in his case study, appears to have confined his observations to internal components of a system, although acceptance by groups internal to the organization, as well as by external groups were felt by Clark to influence states of existence experienced by adult education subunits. If one

¹⁵⁷Webster's New World Dictionary, rev. and expanded ed. (1973), s.v. "margin".

¹⁵⁸Clark, Dissertation, p. 172.
speaks of adult education functions,\(^{158}\) interactions, or activities,\(^{159}\) they may occur internal or external to an organization and thus may be considered to be concepts different from Clark's initial concept of organizational marginality as applied within an organizational context.

While certain organizational patterns occur frequently within the adult education field, no single pattern seems predominant. Core subunits within some educational organizations, such as within many high schools, appear homogeneous when contrasted with their adult education subunits. It might be observed that a distinctive margin exists. Yet in other educational organizations, such as some community colleges, adult education subunits are integrated within the organization so completely that distinctions are more difficult to observe and tend to conform more closely to the core subunits than do the adult education subunits written of in the first example.

An additional general definition by Webster is that of the margin acting as a buffer:

An amount (of space, time, money, material, etc.) allowed or available in addition to what is estimated to be strictly necessary for a certain purpose, and serving as a provision for unforeseen contingencies, or admitting of being applied to other purposes.\(^{160}\)

Using this definition, one might view the field of adult education as a buffer between an institution and society. If

\(^{159}\)Ibid., pp. 52, 116, 145.

\(^{160}\)Webster, 1966, s.v. "margin".
one concentrates on program development, this definition may be applicable. In times of retrenchment, particularly in periods of declining enrollment among traditional or college age students and increasing enrollments of returning and mature students, the adult education subunit may provide a protective margin or buffer for the total institution or may act to stabilize total enrollment levels for the institution. Adult students may be introduced to degree programs through adult education programs. In this light, the adult education subunit fulfills a student recruitment role. Faculty lay-offs may be averted through re-assignment of faculty to adult education programs. Physical facilities left idle because of declining traditional enrollments may be utilized through increasing the number of adult education programs. Additional adult education program sponsorship may qualify the educational institution for increased grants or state subsidies, as was the case in Clark's case study, or may provide direct income from tuition and fees. Adult education subunits may provide institutions with a margin or buffer for increased flexibility in coping with fluctuations, whether they be in enrollment, staffing or funding.

An additional definition based on economics exists for the term margin. Webster provided the following definitions:

(2): the limit below which economic activity cannot be continued under normal conditions; the particular condition (as with regard to the increment of return for labor or for interest on an investment) that limits the existence or continuance of an economic process other things being unchanged <a • of production> <the • of consumption> 5 a: the difference that exists between net sales and the cost of merchandise sold and that is taken as that from which expenses must be met or profit derived or from which
other obligations must be met or other advantages derived—called also gross margin.\textsuperscript{161}

This economic definition might well be applicable anywhere there is economic activity, costs, and sales, including adult education programs. The gross margin might be calculated strictly on the basis of income derived from tuitions and fees minus institutional expenses. Alternatively, educational training, its benefit within society and increased productivity for which it may account might become part of the evaluative formula for determining the gross margin. Gross margin within the adult education subunit would not be a direct index of marginality. Rather the index would be the gross margin of the adult education subunit in relation to the gross margin found in other subunits of the parental organization.

\textit{A Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary}\textsuperscript{162} gives the term "profit margin" as one acceptable definition of the root. It defines a profit margin as the excess between income and expenses and suggests that the profit margin can be increased by scaling down usages, interpreted to mean usages resulting in expenses beyond resultant income.

Another potentially useful definition of margin is one used within brokerage. The brokerage definition of margin is closely linked with common definitions for "margin of safety" where:

\begin{quote}
 an allowance [is] made for safety, spec. a number equal to the factor of safety (*FACTOR sb. \ 8) minus
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{161}Ibid., 1966, s.v. "margin".

\textsuperscript{162}Supplement, 1976, s. v. "margin."
Webster supplies the following brokerage definition:

b: the excess market value of collateral over the face of a loan

(1): cash or collateral which is deposited with a broker to secure him from loss on a contract made on behalf of his principal and which may also constitute a partial payment of the purchase price

(2): a customer's equity if his account is terminated at prevailing market prices

These brokerage definitions of margin are potentially helpful because of the possibility of viewing adult education as providing a margin of safety for the parental organization. An adult education subunit may be allowed to develop in association with a parental organization or may even have been established with the intention for it to serve as a buffer to the larger educational system, to government and to society. Typically in times of surplus and growth, adult education is the recipient of excess funds which are used to pilot programs. As stability is sustained, functions of the adult education subunit may gradually be transferred to other more central subunits of the organization and funding to the adult education subunits may be proportionately reduced. In times of retrenchment, an adult education subunit may receive the first and most drastic cuts in funding, staff and programming. Adult education tends to protect the core of the parental organization from the ravages of the legislature and public in times of financial crises and thus may to some degree be equated with the broker's margin—a margin which may be sacrificed without jeopardizing the safety,

Ibid.

Webster, 1966, s. v. "margin."
integrity and stability of the central subunits.

Clark not only used the root of the term marginality to denote his concept or concepts of marginality within his doctoral study but also the adjective, marginal, paired with various nouns to denote the concept or concepts of marginality.

Marginal

The word marginal is identified within all dictionaries cited within this thesis as an adjective, "a word used to limit or qualify a noun or other substantive". When used as a qualifier, the attributes of existence within the margin or in situations defined by definitions of margin discussed within this thesis, are considered to be the delimiters or quantifiers and qualifiers of the noun. When Clark referred to a "marginal program;" "marginal school program;" or "marginal activity;" the term marginal is used as an adjective to describe the existence of the program, school program, or activity within the margin, regardless of which definition of margin is accepted and applied. When the adjective, marginal,

---

165 Webster, 1973, s. v. "marginal."

166 Clark, Dissertation, p. 14; Monograph, pp. 57, 58, 75.

167 Idem, Monograph, pp. 118, 140.

168 Ibid., pp. 52, 116, 145.

169 Idem, Dissertation, p. 36; Monograph, pp. 62, 123, 142, 148, 149.

170 Idem, Dissertation, pp. 27, 172, 203; Monograph, pp. 45, 57, 58, 96, 150.
is used to describe "status,"169 "position,"170 or "existence,"171 it designates less than full status, non-central position, or tentative or precarious states of existence being experienced by the adult education element—traits which are resultant from existence within the margin. The positive identification and description of the adult education element or attribute, be it the general value, an independent adult education unit, or an adult education subunit, is still an essential contextual factor for understanding concepts of status.

Marginality

Both Webster172 and the Oxford English Dictionary define marginality as "The quality or state of being marginal." Because it appears that Clark and other authors writing in the field of adult education have used the terms margin, marginal and marginality to denote various states of existence, it has become important that distinctions assigned to the three terms, if any, be made if the three terms are to be used with consistency within adult education. While the words margin and marginal may be used in description of conditions of, or indices of marginality, only the term marginality, together with appropriate descriptors, parsimoniously denotes the various concepts of marginality in adult education. The nature of the quality or state of being marginal is dependent upon the

171Ibid., p. 142.

172Webster, 1966, s. v. "marginality."
definition of margin associated with application of a concept of marginality in a given instance. That definition might duplicate or enlarge upon any of the previously cited dictionary definitions, or may be assigned new meanings by Clark and other authors.

The preceding definitions of margin, marginal, and marginality, may be helpful in identifying Clark's usage of the term marginality. Through matching these various concepts associated with the root word to Clark's usage of the term marginality within his doctoral study, one might determine whether he used the term to denote a single concept or multiple concepts of marginality. If multiple concepts of marginality exist within the adult education literature, the definitions may prove helpful for distinguishing among them and for examining the theoretical implications of such distinctions.

The identification in this chapter of Clark's writings, the review of Clark's doctoral study and its sociological and organizational underpinnings, and the review of dictionary definitions pertinent to applications of the term marginality, constitute a perspective from which to approach the analysis of Clark's uses of the term marginality within his Dissertation and Monograph. All three are vital tools for such an evaluative process. The nature of the state of being marginal is dependent upon the definition of margin associated with application of a concept of marginality in a given instance. That definition might duplicate or enlarge upon any of the previously cited dictionary definitions, or may be assigned new meanings by Clark
and other authors.
CHAPTER III

DIRECT LABELING OF CONCEPTS OF MARGINALITY IN CLARK'S DISSERTATION

This chapter is dedicated to the presentation of uses of the term marginality from Clark's Dissertation, the primary document of this study. Each use of the term will be quoted at sufficient length to ensure that adequate text will be presented to facilitate identification of critical conceptual elements. While each use will be discussed upon presentation, the analysis of the usages individually and collectively will be reserved for Chapter IV.

Clark used the term marginality seventeen times in his Dissertation. While Clark also used other terms to label concepts of marginality, the seventeen uses of the term itself will serve as the basis for this analysis. The initial analysis sets the foundation for analysis of further use of the term in Clark's published writings. Likewise, this examination may serve as a basis for analyzing concepts of marginality which have been labeled with alternate terms.

Clark's use of marginality in his Dissertation is
apparently the initial application of the concepts to the field of adult education. Clark's Dissertation has received limited reading, as indicated by the absence of even a single direct reference to the document in any of the publications examined in the writing of this thesis. Nevertheless it is the primary source for the term and concepts of marginality. Clark's 1956 article, given the same title as his Dissertation, and identified elsewhere in this thesis as the Monograph, is the popular published version of his study.

While it might be deemed helpful to group term uses from Clark's writings according to noted distinctions or variations in concepts they denote, the presentation of quoted term use will be sequential for purposes of more fully following the cognitive development of the term by Burton R. Clark. Each use of the term will be numbered and each citation discussed to show its meaning within a specific context. A summary and analysis of the uses will follow in the next chapter. Data gathered from individual uses of the term within the Dissertation will be tabled in summary form and will be critiqued as such. Because not all observed data from this analysis of uses lends itself to tabling, such data and discussion and critique, thereof, will follow by order of Clark's use in the thesis sub-section labeled, Item Analysis and Critique.

This analysis focuses on the use of the term marginality within Clark's Dissertation. Other thesis sub-sections follow in which the uses of the term marginality in the Monograph will be cited in sufficient length to permit the identification of
the specific meanings in context. Utilizing distinctions already made through reference to dictionaries, use of each term will be separately traced according to its sequential use by Clark. Uses of the term marginality within Clark's Dissertation will be identified as D1 through D17. Corresponding numbering will identify these quotations of use in the tabled analyses (Table 3). Term uses will frequently be referred to by their alpha-numeric labels.

It is important with each use of the term marginality to determine the adult education and the comparative elements or attributes being referred to. Contexts of application will be noted for their potential use in distinguishing distinct concepts of marginality and for development of definitions.

**Use of the Term Marginality Within Clark's Dissertation**

Clark first used the term marginality in the second chapter entitled "PRESSURES ON A MARGINAL PROGRAM".\(^{173}\) He identified marginality as an historical condition that shaped service-type organizations during the development of adult education in the public school system of California.\(^{174}\) His "significant conditions,"\(^{175}\) Clark explained, were "reconstructed from the experience of participants, and from the historical record as it is contained in organizational files, public documents, and


\(^{174}\)Ibid.

\(^{175}\)Ibid.
previous studies." Clark explained his rationale for labeling marginality as a condition in the following quotation:

\[(D1)\]

The elements discussed below are defined as conditions because they largely exist as "givens" for the decisions made in the administration of adult education departments of school systems. They are important in defining the environment of decision-making within which program administrators operate. Over the long-run it is possible for the administrators to effect changes in these conditions; e.g., their sustained effort to reduce the marginality of adult education within the public-school framework. But in the here-and-now of decision-making, these historical elements are conditions of decision and action, rather than means or ends readily changed by leadership.\(^1\)

\(^1\)This point is emphasized here since we are treating the formal goals of public-school adult education as a condition of local decision-making. Compare the view of Chester I. Barnard on purpose as part of the objective environment within which new decisions are made. Chester I. Barnard, The Function of the Executive, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 194-95.\(^1\)

Clark, in this first use of the term marginality speaks of marginality as a rather stable condition and environment in which adult education departments of school systems are administered. In the introduction to his Dissertation, Clark noted that his "study of organizations, their values and their practices" directly concerned "the development of adult education in the public school system of California." He further identified his "case-study-in-depth" to be the "Adult

\(^{176}\)Ibid.

\(^{177}\)Ibid., pp. 24-25.

\(^{178}\)Ibid., p. 4.
Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System."\textsuperscript{179} In quotation D1, Clark applied the term marginality to "adult education within the public-school framework,"\textsuperscript{180} without restrictions to a specific case study, organizational element or structure, or geographic location. Adult education, as noted earlier by Clark, could be understood to include the "general value"\textsuperscript{181} as well as implementations of this "general value" through organizational elements. One of the "historical elements" or "conditions of decision and action"\textsuperscript{182} discussed by Clark is marginality. The first sentence of quotation D1 may be understood to acknowledge the existence of states of marginality outside of "adult education departments of school systems," but it also notes that marginality and the other conditions "largely exist as 'givens' for the decisions made in the administration of adult education departments of school systems."\textsuperscript{183}

Clark's second application of the term, marginality, appears in a Dissertation subheadings:

(D2)

Sources and Indices of Marginality

In broad terms the primary mission of a public school system in the United States is the education of the young. Within both school ranks and the general population, the rank order of acceptance of different

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{179}Ibid. p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{180}Ibid., p. 24.
\item \textsuperscript{181}Ibid., p. 1.
\item \textsuperscript{182}Ibid., pp. 24-5.
\item \textsuperscript{183}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
school programs and legitimate concerns of public supported education tends to follow the age progression. Historically, public responsibility for elementary education was established first, followed by the legitimation of high school and junior college levels. Junior college education is particularly well established in California where there is a state system of approximately seventy junior colleges. Providing secondary education of thirteenth and fourteenth year, these colleges are linked to the grade-sequence structure of the school system.


Within a seven-page subsection Clark identifies sources and indices of marginality and begins to develop his initial concept of marginality. Unfortunately, he did not organize the subsection in a way which distinguished sources of marginality from indices of the status. Rather he intermingled what he identified as sources, indices, bases, symptoms and evidences of marginality. He identified his context as the "public school system in the United States" and addressed the acceptance of publicly supported educational school programs by those within school ranks and the general population. He failed to indicate whether "age progression" is an index or a source of marginality. He identified three levels of education which have been institutionalized and legitimized: elementary education,

\[^{188}\text{Ibid., p. 25.}\]
\[^{185}\text{Ibid., pp. 25-6.}\]
\[^{186}\text{Ibid., p. 25.}\]
\[^{187}\text{Ibid.}\]
high school, and junior college.

In Clark's third use of the term he applied his concept within an organizational context and claims difficulty in assessing and validating of the status.

(D3)

In contrast to the position of elementary, high school, and junior college educational levels, adult education is, of course, not part of the primary education ladder, and its clientele exists almost completely outside of the compulsory-attendance age groups.\(^3\) It exists as a separate, peripheral activity. When an adult program is established within a school system, its personnel finds itself within a family of well-established, well-accepted programs. Considered on its educational acceptability alone, the adult activity initially exists in a somewhat precarious state. It must compete with the primary departments for budget support and for general organizational position. This has been historically the status of adult education and to a considerable degree seems an appropriate characterization today. It is difficult to assess such a factor as organizational marginality, since the question of validation involves acceptance by different groups within and without the school system, and acceptance on various grounds.

\(^3\)School attendance is compulsory until the age of sixteen in California. If a person drops out of school after that age but has not graduated from high school, he must attend a continuation school for four hours a week until eighteen. Continuation schools are not now considered a part of adult education.\(^{188}\)

Clark's use of the terms "organizational marginality"\(^{189}\) appears to stress the organizational context within which he applies the term. It is the only use of the descriptor in the Dissertation. There is no direct application of a concept of

\(^{188}\)Ibid., pp. 25-26.

\(^{189}\)Ibid.
marginality in quotation D3 to Clark's case study. In referring to "adult education", Clark could mean either the "general value," the field, or an organizational unit. His reference to an "adult program" could have been understood to allow most any context if he had not specifically referred to its establishment in a school system wherein its educational acceptability in relation to that of more well-established and well-accepted programs tended to determine its "somewhat precarious state." Clark appears to be equating this "somewhat precarious state" with the state of existence he terms marginality.

Within quotation D3, Clark identifies three adult education elements: an adult level of education, adult education, and "a separate peripheral activity." An "adult activity" in the context of a school system could be a designation of any single adult activity, a single adult educational activity, a program, class, curriculum, school, branch, department, division or a multiple of any of the preceding examples. Several comparative elements were identified by Clark in quotation D3: elementary, high school, and junior college educational levels; well-
established, well-accepted programs; and primary departments, assumed to be the primary subunits within a common parental organization. In Clark's reference to "primary departments," there is no indication of whether these comparative departments exist or must exist on a school, branch, division or system level.

It is difficult from the preceding quotation to assess how Clark defines marginality or why it was that adult education experienced it. Clark made no distinction as to whether the characteristics of marginality he listed are indices or the source of the state of marginality. An index of marginality used to identify the status of an element experiencing marginality is not equivalent to a factor which contributes to establishment of states of marginality.

Clark refers to adult education as being "in a somewhat precarious state" of existence. He further refers to "the status of adult education" which suggests a rank ordering of adult education in relation to other elements. Equating marginality with a state of existence is congruent with labeling it as a status, for status denotes both existence and ranking.

Again, as in Clark's first use of the term (D1), there is confusion in quotation D3 concerning identification of both the adult education element and its comparative element. Reference

\[196\text{Ibid.}\]
\[197\text{Ibid., p. 26.}\]
\[198\text{Ibid.}\]
to adult education could allow the interpretation that assessment and validation of marginality is difficult in all adult education contexts, both organizational and non-organizational, in which marginality exists.

Adult education elements specifically mentioned by Clark in this quotation in addition to his general designation of "adult education" are "a separate, peripheral activity," "an adult program...within a school system," and an "adult activity."

Although the "Continuation schools" mentioned by Clark were not officially recognized at the time of Clark's writings as part of adult education in California, such schools might be considered to be part of adult education at a different time in California or might be considered part of adult education elsewhere. Clark observed that the continuation schools were not at the time considered to be part of adult education, that is they were not being recognized as part of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System. Clark, in noting that the adult education "clientele exists almost completely [sic] outside of the compulsory-attendance age group," made reference to the continuation schools. His footnoted example might be for purposes of showing that because attendance is mandatory until the age of eighteen for those not having

\[199\] Ibid.
\[200\] Ibid.
\[201\] Ibid., p. 25.
\[202\] Ibid., pp. 25-6.
graduated from high school, that not considering continuing schools as part of adult education supports his statement that adult education clientele exist almost completely outside of the compulsory-attendance age group. The second possibility is that Clark felt continuing schools are adult education and he was footnoting what he felt was an anomaly. Given the context in Clark's Dissertation, it is not possible to determine with certainty education how Clark would classify occurring in continuing schools.

Clark identified a number of potential comparative elements in quotation D3, including the "elementary, high school, and junior college educational levels" of the school system, the "school system" itself which could be considered as a whole, "a family of well-established, well-accepted programs," and "primary departments" within an organization. Clark did not restrict his concept of marginality to any one of those mentioned. When Clark wrote of "primary departments" and "a family of well-established, well-accepted programs," he did not indicate the organizational level within the school system to which comparison of the adult education element was or should be made.

Furthermore, several potential comparative elements were identified by Clark in his diagram of the Organizational

---

203 Ibid.
204 Ibid., p. 29.
205 Presented earlier in this thesis as Table 1.
Potential comparative units identified for the adult schools included the elementary schools; secondary schools including both junior and senior high schools; and junior colleges. Marginality of individual adult schools may be assessed at times while at other times it may be assessed for adult schools aggregated. Potential comparative units to the Adult Education Branch identified by Clark included the five elementary districts within the Division of Elementary Education, the Junior High Central Office and the Senior High Central Office within the Division of Secondary Education, and the Junior College Central Office within the Division of Extension and Higher Education. At the level of operating divisions, the potential comparative organizational subunits for the Division of Extension and Higher Education are the Division of Elementary Education and the Division of Secondary Education. All three operating divisions are administered by two boards and a commission through a common superintendent and administrators of both business and educational services divisions who are organizationally accountable to the superintendent. From Clark's organizational chart it is inferred that administrative decisions of the Retirement Board and the Personnel Commission are funnelled through the Board of Education for purposes of approval before being given to the superintendent as mandates.

206 Ibid.
The adult education subunits noted by Clark in his chart of the organizational structure of the Los Angeles School System have been diagrammed as equals to their comparative subunits at each administrative level. There is no indication of marginality for the adult education subunits.

Potential comparative subunits identified by Clark in his organizational structure chart have been so termed within this thesis because it is felt that Clark has provided no information within the chart to suggest differentiated status between adult education subunits and the named potential comparative subunits. Concepts of marginality identified within this thesis denote states of existence within larger systems wherein the status of the adult education element is judged to be lower than that accorded primary elements in the system. Within organizational settings the adult education and comparative elements are denoted as subunits, and elements fulfilling major objectives of an institution are termed primary subunits.

It would appear that standards within a system are frequently manifest in system structure. Models of system structure may be based on a number of variables such as administrative status, administrative power, influence, function, financing, or by mandated or legislated administrative authority which appear to be the two most common foci in organizational charting. Clark's organizational structure chart

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
which he adapted from a chart in use in the Los Angeles school system during 1952-3,\textsuperscript{208} represents the hierarchical arrangement of various organizational units. It appears to be based on a mandated line of administrative authority.

No difference in status is evident for adult education in Clark's chart of the Organizational Structure of the Los Angeles School System. This is attributable to the limited nature of organizational charting that is based on administrative lines of authority. Significant chartable differences are assumed to exist among the lines of administrative authority within a system and the scope of authority, the magnitude of authority, and the priority assigned various organizational units by virtue of their mandates, the latter often being evidenced through the magnitude and flexibility of financial support.

Upon these grounds, adult education subunits are afforded different status from other subunits. Distinctions exist between the primary objectives of an organization, and the values and functions of the organization. The marginality of an adult education subunit denotes the existence of values, goals and objectives within a parental organization which are considered to be more important than the education of adults and the existence of one or more organizational subunits dedicated to achieving those goals. Such subunits are given higher priority within the parental organization than that given to an adult education subunit.

\textsuperscript{208}Ibid.
Clark charted both operating divisions and administrative and support units which he labeled in Chart 1209 as Executive Offices, Business Services Divisions and Educational Services Divisions. A comprehensive assessment of organizational marginality might entail identification of comparative administrative offices and divisions in both the adult education subunit and other subunits in order to facilitate comparisons which might be thought to be indices of status.

Clark noted in quotation D3 that:

It is difficult to assess such a factor as organizational marginality, since the question of validation involves acceptance by different groups within and without the school system, and acceptance on various grounds.210

Unless otherwise specified, when one speaks of organizational marginality in the field of adult education, the overall or societal status of an adult education subunit is being designated. Clark, in the preceding quotation, states that validation of organizational marginality involves acceptance by groups internal and external to a school system. These various groups, according to Clark, afford acceptance based on "various grounds."211 One group may exhibit an increased acceptance of an adult education subunit if the subunit increases its academic programming. A second group may prize an emphasis on community programming and may be less

209 Ibid.
211 Ibid.
accepting of the adult education subunit if academic programming is emphasized within the subunit. This is an example of a common variable which is perceived differently by different individuals and groups. When the societal status of an adult education subunit is considered, however, such variations in perception might be considered to largely cancel one another.

When one is concerned only with the measurement of total status of an adult education subunit and is not concerned with identifying the source of marginality, then the presence of such variables may not be of concern. If, however, sources of status are of importance, perhaps for purposes of administratively manipulating various sources of marginality and measuring the effect of intervention, then manipulation of such confounding variables is of concern. The confounding ability of nonmontonic variables, both two directional and noncontinuous, must be considered when variables are measured for purposes of determining their contribution to the variance of primary concern.

In quotation D3 Clark defined marginality as a state of existence as a status. He also says that validation of status is contingent on afforded acceptance. It becomes necessary to distinguish between acceptance and afforded status. Whereas acceptance denotes approval, the affording of status implies an ability to differentiate among variables, which variables form

\[2^{12}\] Nonmontonic variables, both two directional and noncontinuous are defined and examples are given in the appendix.
the basis upon which one element is ranked above a comparative element. Marginality, or relative status, within organizational contexts of the field of adult education denotes the valuing of a comparative element above that of an adult education element. If validation of marginality or relative status of an adult education element does involve acceptance, as Clark maintains, it is a suggestion of a high correlation between acceptance and status, explained here as two distinct concepts.

In the next four quotations (D4-D7), Clark appears to equate marginality with "peripheral status," "marginal position," and "precariousness of the adult schools," all three states of existence. He does this as he lists what he perhaps somewhat casually termed "Sources and Indices of Marginality" and what he now reintroduces as "bases and symptoms of peripheral status." In the first he appears to substitute the terms "evidence of relative marginality" for what he had previously termed "Sources and Indices of Marginality" and "bases and symptoms of peripheral status." Discussion of Clark's use of the terms sources, indices, bases, symptoms and evidences will occur later in this

\[213\] Clark, Dissertation, pp. 26-7; \[214\] Ibid., p. 27.; \[215\] Ibid.
\[216\] Ibid., p. 25.
\[218\] Ibid.
\[219\] Ibid., p. 25.
thesis. In quotation D4, Clark is understood to be equating "relative marginality" with "peripheral status." In quotation D5 he identifies "the part-time nature of administrators" as his second "index" of marginality and also as "both a contributing factor to and a symptom of the marginal position of the adult education departments." Clark then continues in the next sentence to equate "the marginal position of the adult education departments" to "marginality." In this quotation Clark uses the terms index, contributing factor, and symptom synonymously. His reasoning is circular without indication as to whether he feels "the part-time nature of administrators" contributes to the status, indicates existence of the status, is the status, or results from the status of marginality. The third factor is said by Clark to contribute "to the precariousness of the adult school," understood as an equation of marginality to "the precariousness of the adult school."

Clark wrote:

(D4)

Here we may note some bases and symptoms of peripheral status.

First, some evidence of relative marginality is indicated in the formal or "constitutional" status of adult education. The state school system is made up of elementary, high school, and junior college

221 Ibid.
222 Ibid., p. 27.
223 Ibid.
224 Ibid.
districts; adult classes are attached to these units. Once voted into existence by the electorate, these districts must maintain appropriate schools. In contrast, adult education has mainly permissive legislation for its local establishment. Citizenship and literacy classes are the main exceptions. Clark appears to use the descriptor, relative, to indicate that assessment of organizational marginality is a comparative measurement. The comparison for purposes of determining formal or constitutional status of the adult education subunit is between the adult education element and other subunits within the parental organization considered to be central or primary.

Clark first writes in broad terms of the adult education element. He identifies it twice with the general designation, "adult education." He notes citizenship and literacy class as examples of adult education. It is not specified whether the concept of relative marginality is being used to describe the status of all adult education elements or a specific level district, school, or classroom. Judging from the organizational units mentioned by Clark two possible conclusions seem logical. For the establishment of status two or more items must be compared and ranked. The adult education elements specifically identified in quotation D4 are organizational subunits--school and college districts, and classes. Clark's use of the term, adult education, in the quotation could be in reference to these organizational subunits or to the "general value" of adult education identified as the focus of his Dissertation in his


226 Ibid.
Introduction. It is logical in applying a concept of marginality that comparisons for purposes of establishing status be made among categorically similar subunits within an organization—classes are ranked among classes, schools among schools, and districts among district level elements, operating districts among operating districts, and so forth. Clark identified the elementary, high school, and junior college districts as existing within the state school system. If the state school system is considered to be a parental organization, then marginality might be used to denote the status of either individual adult education subunits within the state, or of all adult education subunits considered collectively. For purposes of establishing status, comparisons might be made among either individual or aggregated adult education subunits existing within a local geographic area and corresponding elementary school, high school, and junior college districts, or on a state basis wherein the population of organizational subunits for purposes of comparisons would be expanded to the total system. Where marginality of adult education subunits is evaluated locally, such as within the confines of the Los Angeles School System, the Los Angeles School System would be considered to be the parental organization and the state school system might be considered to be a supra-parental organization.

With the comparative units identified, and with the help of Clark's chart of the Organizational Structure of the Los Angeles

\[227\] Ibid, p. 44.
School System, 1952-53, the appropriate comparisons for the purpose of establishing the status of adult education can be determined by examination of organizational levels, and is identified as the Adult Education Branch.

An alternative application of a concept of marginality is in description of the status of what Clark identified as "adult classes." Again through referring to Clark's chart of the Organizational Structure of the Los Angeles School System, 1952-53, the appropriate comparative elements are identified as classes occurring in the elementary schools, junior and senior high schools, and junior colleges of the California School System, the California School System being the supra-parental organization named by Clark in quotation D4. A concept of marginality might be used to denote the status of adult classes when compared to classes held within the elementary schools, junior and senior high schools, and junior colleges within the Los Angeles School System, which is the immediate parental organization.

Each distinct combination of an adult education subunit or of subunits to a parental organization or supra-parental organizations could be the basis for a distinct concept of marginality for purposes of designating status, and it appears that each would require the identification of different comparative elements in addition to its own operational
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definition and measurement instrument.

In summary of the discussion of Clark's preceding quotation, the level of inquiry is not specified. One could explore the organizational marginality of individual adult education classes, schools or departments within the system or collectives of these organizational subunits. Their existence could be considered relative to individual schools, districts or all parental organizations of adult education subunits statewide. Clark is maintaining that legislative disparity, such as exists in this quoted example where the parental organization has a constitutional mandate and the adult education subunit exists under permissive legislation, is a source or index, or both, of organizational marginality. Clark suggests that no such mandate exists for adult education, on the whole, with the main exceptions of citizenship and literacy classes. The comparison is that other subunits predominately exist with mandates while adult education subunits exist by virtue of permissive legislation.

The term marginality was next used by Clark in presentation of his second index, source, base, or symptom of marginality.

(D5)

Secondly, as frequently happens with a new activity within an organization, adult education began as a secondary responsibility of administrators at other school levels....the administration of adult education in the state had this character until 1931, and it was symptomatic of the program's weak position in the school system. After 1931, there were separate principals but mainly in part-time posts. These positions were any fraction of a fulltime assignment, with one-half time the most common. From that basis there has been a gradual growth of fulltime positions;
but it is only within the last five years (1947-48) that the largest department in the state, (the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System) became completely manned by fulltime administrators. The part-time nature of administration has been historically both a contributing factor to and a symptom of the marginal position of the adult education departments. This index would indicate that marginality has been reduced over the last twenty-five years.²³⁰

"The part-time nature of administration" has been identified by Clark in this quotation as historically being "both a contributing factor to and a symptom of the marginal position of the adult education departments,"²³¹ or in other words, as Clark's second index, source, base, or symptom of marginality. He identified three administrative states which represent various intensities of his identified variable of marginality: a state in which the administration of the adult education element is a "secondary responsibility of administrators" with primary responsibilities elsewhere in the system; a state in which the adult education element is administered by separate principals, but on less than full-time appointments; and a state where the adult education element has "become completely manned by fulltime administrators."²³² In description of these three states, Clark used examples from distinctly differing organizational contexts. In his first example he wrote of the administration of "adult education...at

²³⁰Ibid, p. 27.
²³¹Ibid.
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other school levels." Clark was referring to the adult schools initiated by individual host schools within the state of California. These adult schools were initially and most frequently administered on a part-time basis by the high school principals and vice-principals who had initiated them. Clark referred to other different and specific organizational levels. He noted that "adult education agencies emerged throughout the country at local, state and national levels." In the second stage of development of adult education Clark noted the emergence of separate principals in mainly part-time posts. In this case it is reasonable to assume that the adult education unit referred to by Clark is an individual adult school at a host high school.

Clark changed contexts in his illustration of this second administrative stage. He noted that although "evening school classes extended as far back as 1856 in California, and 1887 in Los Angeles," and "the first separate evening high school [was] established in Los Angeles in 1907," it wasn't until the 1947-8 academic year that the largest department in the state, (the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School
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System) became completely manned by fulltime administrators."

The organizational levels existing within the Branch referred to by Clark, and which could be pertinent in determining the level of application, include the branch level itself, overseen by the Supervisor of the Adult Education Branch, the divisional level where fulltime supervisors exist for Academic Education, Homemaking, Americanization and Citizenship and the Americanization Center; and the individual school level where principals of adult education programs oversee teachers, counselors and clerks.

Clark's third stage away from the state of marginality was one in which the adult education element had "become completely manned by fulltime administrators." His contextual example of this third state addresses the state of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System where from 1947-8 administrators hired on a fulltime basis became the rule. This Branch, referred to by Clark, was manned by the fulltime administrators. His notation on Chart 2: Organizational Structure of the Adult Education Branch, Division of Extension and Higher Education, Los Angeles School System, 1952-53, reported the existence of "several part-time supervisors (parent education, music)" among the Branch administrators who were not included in his organizational diagram. Clark summarized that

\[239\] Ibid., p. 27.
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the transition from part-time to fulltime administrative appointments within "the adult education departments" was an "index" indicating "that marginality has been reduced over the last twenty-five years."\(^2\)

Clark did not specify of which adult education departments he wrote: the support, business service, or executive officer divisions of the state system, the "operating divisions,"\(^3\) the Adult Education Branch, the supervisory divisions within the Branch, the twenty-four adult schools of the Los Angeles School System, or any combination of these organizational departments.

In quotation D5, Clark's observations of the adult education element begin on a state level. He described adult education as "a new activity within an organization" and identified the administration of that element as occurring within the "school system" or parental organization within the state.\(^4\) He noted the establishment of separate principalships of adult education occurring after 1931, but reported that most of these positions were part-time. It appears that Clark was noting the administrative separation of high schools and their adult education organizational units which Clark illustrated in his organizational charts\(^5\) of the Los Angeles School System.

\(^2\)Clark, Dissertation, p. 27.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 44.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 27.

\(^5\)See Tables 1 and 2 above; Clark, Dissertation, pp. 39-40.
Whereas most adult schools began under the immediate initiatives of local schools and school districts, Clark reported that in 1952-3 the twenty-four principals of the Los Angeles School System were hierarchically linked administratively to the Supervisor of Adult Education rather than to principals of their immediate host institutions, the twenty-four individual schools of the system.

Having numerically listed and expounded on three sources, indices, bases, or symptoms of marginality, Clark noted that there are still other indices.

(D6)

A few other indices of marginality are available. It can be noted that the pressure of economy-minded interest groups is especially severe upon adult education. And, the economy recommendations of these groups take a special programmatic or "content" bent in adult education. Where economy at the other school levels is centered about plant expansion and teachers' salaries, in adult education it is a matter of content and clientele curtailment. Major segments of the program are not accepted by these economy groups and their proscription is sought. Here is a clear index of the relative acceptability of program contents of the various educational levels by strong outside social forces. The program building efforts of the adult administrators are sharply questioned.246

In quotation D3, Clark's adult education element was identified merely as "adult education," and his comparative elements were "elementary, high school, and junior college educational levels."247 It might be inferred that at this point Clark viewed the adult education element as an educational

246Clark, Dissertation, pp. 28-29.

247Ibid., pp. 25-6.
level, if one assumes that Clark's concepts of marginality require comparison of parallel organizational units for purposes of establishing status. In D-6, Clark compares what he considers to be an index of marginality, as manifest in the adult education element, to manifestation of the variable in comparative elements. Again, Clark identified the adult education element as merely "adult education."

He identified the comparative elements in quotation D6 as "other school levels," indicating that he viewed adult education in the context of this use of the term marginality as a school level. School levels and educational levels might be considered to be synonymous insofar as school levels are reflective of educational attainment.

As in quotation D2 and D3, Clark appears to be equating "relative acceptability" with marginality in this quotation. He noted a distinction in the relative acceptability to economy-minded groups of adult education program content and the content of programs "at the other school levels." He noted that "major segments of the [adult education] program are not accepted by these economy groups and their proscription is sought." He did not identify the differences in the two types
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of program content which might account for the variation in their acceptability to the economy-minded interest groups, but he did identify actions of economy-minded interest groups in regard to the two types of programs. In adult education, economy measures focused on "content and clientele curtailment....Economy at the other school levels is centered about plant expansion and teacher's salaries," said Clark. If the assumption is made that Clark equated what he termed as "other school levels" with the "elementary, high school, and junior college educational levels" he had written earlier in quotation D3, the transition can then be made in application of his concept of marginality to conclude that higher status was assigned to these units than to the adult education element.

Clark's next use of the term marginality identifies what he maintains is the most important indicator of that state of existence:

(D7)

Perhaps the most important symptom of the present marginality of adult education units is the felt need, expressed by adult administrators, of having to "sell" the program to the public and especially to other educators. This sentiment exists very strongly within the ranks of the adult administrators in the Los Angeles department. It stands out in the discussions and reports of such state-wide groups as the California Association of Adult Education Administrators, and in the bulletins of the Bureau of Adult Education of the California State Department of
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Education. The adult administrators have not arrived at a point where they can rely upon a fundamental kind of acceptance by the general population, and especially by key figures in the educational hierarchy and in the state legislature.


Under his section heading "Sources and Indices of Marginality," and which he reintroduced as "bases and symptoms," Clark now lists what he identifies as the most important symptom of marginality. His use of the descriptor "present" in modification of his concept of marginality suggests the current nature of this state of existence.

Clark used the terms "felt need" to identify his most important symptom of "present marginality." Clark was suggesting that the stronger the perception of adult educators that there is a necessity to sell their program, the greater the marginality.

Clark in this quotation specifically mentioned three adult education elements: "the Los Angeles department," and "such state-wide groups as the California Association of Adult Administrators" and "the Bureau of Adult Education of the
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California State Department of Education." He did not specifically identify in which adult education elements his "most important symptom of the present marginality of adult education" occurred, but noted that administrators in the Los Angeles department agreed with the importance he placed on his identified symptom of "felt need" and that the symptom stood out "in the discussions and reports of such state-wide groups as the California Association of Adult Education Administrators, and in the bulletins of the Bureau of Adult Education of the California State Department of Education." It is uncertain whether Clark's symptom was of a condition existent within the two organizations or whether individuals within these organizations agreed that the felt need "expressed by adult administrators, of having to 'sell' the program to the public and especially to other educators" was the most important symptom and reports thereof stood out "in the discussion and reports of such state-wide groups" as the two named.

When Clark refers to "adult administrators" it is assumed that he is referring to administrators of adult education units and subunits rather than to all administrators. He notes that these administrators "have not arrived at a point where they can rely upon a fundamental kind of acceptance by the
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general population, and especially by key figures in the educational hierarchy and in the state legislature."\(^{265}\) The way in which administrators perceive they can achieve this acceptance is through selling their adult education programs to the groups which have been identified. Clark noted that the symptom is the felt need of adult administrators having to sell "the program to the public and especially to other educators."\(^{266}\)

In quotation D7 Clark wrote of acceptance, this time by the "general population, and especially by key figures in the educational hierarchy and in the state legislature."\(^{267}\) It appears again, as in quotations D2, D3, and D6, that Clark is equating a state of limited acceptance with a state of marginality.

In reference to quotation D7, Clark proffered the following clarification:

(D8)

We are referring here primarily to acceptance of the educational worth of the program and its proper place in the educational structure. To the extent the program's educational value is judged to be low, relative to other uses of school monies, the position and power of the adult administrators is built on insecure grounds. Marginality directly contributes to insecurity. In our interpretation of organizational development, we posit that the key to the insecurity of administrative agencies is a relatively low degree of acceptance. The long-term organizational problem of the adult administrators is, then, to achieve a

\(^{265}\)Ibid.

\(^{266}\)Ibid.

\(^{267}\)Ibid.
well-accepted position in the educational hierarchy. The importance of gaining a fully legitimized position has been recognized by many spokesmen for the field. This long-term effort for acceptance is, in its organizational meaning, a struggle for organizational security and stability. Enduring security for the administrators hinges upon the acceptance of their work as educationally valuable. Clark indicates that in the two preceding quotations (D7, D8) "We are referring...primarily to acceptance of the educational worth of the program and its proper place in the educational structure." Clark's use of the phrase "proper place" suggests a value judgment by Clark that there is an appropriate status within education for an adult education element, be the adult education element a "program," or "administrative agencies." Whether this proper place is one on par with what might be considered to be primary units, or one of superiority over comparative elements is prescribed by Clark. It is clear that Clark viewed states of marginality in a negative sense.

In quotation D8 Clark may be equating marginality with "a relatively low degree of acceptance." He noted that "marginality directly contributes to insecurity." Clark then posits that in organizational development "the key to the insecurity of administrative agencies is a relatively low degree
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of acceptance.\textsuperscript{274} If one assumes that marginality, which Clark identified as a contributor to insecurity, is what he later referred to as the key to insecurity, then marginality would be the equivalent of "a relatively low degree of acceptance."\textsuperscript{275} Clark is ambiguous as to whether he equates marginality with "a relatively low degree of acceptance" or whether he views both "a relatively low degree of acceptance" and the "low position and power of adult administrators"\textsuperscript{276} as sources or indices of status. In the event Clark views the two variables as sources of marginality, there are further questions as to whether he views the two variables as distinct sources or as related variables which together constitute a source of marginality.

Clark uses the term acceptance four times in quotation D8, but twice within the same quotation he uses the concept of status, evidently equating the two concepts. His reference to a "proper place in the education structure"\textsuperscript{277} for an adult education program suggests an assignment of status. Judging the educational value of an adult education program lower than the educational value of comparative elements is the second application of the concept of status.

Clark labeled the section in which the preceding uses of the term marginality appear as "Sources and Indices of
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Marginality,"\textsuperscript{278} and used the section to identify what he believes are sources and indices of marginality without distinguishing among sources, indices, bases, symptoms, or evidences of marginality. Clark in quotation D8 identified marginality as a contributor to insecurity.

Clark's contextual focus shifts from "programs" to "position and power of adult administrators" to "administrative agencies."\textsuperscript{279} Clark does not announce whether he is addressing the marginality and insecurity of programs, agencies, or that of administrators. He does clarify the focus to some extent when he notes that "Enduring security for the administrators hinges upon the acceptance of their work as educationally valuable."\textsuperscript{280} He appears to be suggesting that security of both adult education programs and their administrators hinges upon the acceptance by other educators of the value of the adult education curricula.

Clark's next four uses (D9-D12) of the term marginality appear in his discussion of what he terms the "enrollment economy."\textsuperscript{281} An introduction to Clark's enrollment economy concept serves as a basis for understanding his related concepts of marginality.

The level of state support of adult education programs

\textsuperscript{278}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 25-31.
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within California was determined by attendance statistics from each school district for the preceding year. Adult education subunits were, therefore, under pressure to maintain high attendance which can result in a level of state support equal to the prorated cost of providing adult courses, or to make a profit through high enrollments in low cost programs, allowing the schools to claim more reimbursement than the actual expenses they incurred through operating the adult programs. Unlike elementary and secondary education where attendance is compulsory, adults, with few exceptions, are free to enroll or withdraw at will. "This confluence of state support with the nature of the school's clientele", Clark has "termed the 'enrollment economy' of the adult schools."\textsuperscript{282} This enrollment economy, according to Clark, was an internal operating pressure of the adult schools in his case study and was of primary concern for their survival and security.

The enrollment economy reflects the pressures upon the adult schools to provide adult education courses at lower costs than the state level of reimbursement by increasing enrollments to the profit level in a system which reimburses on the basis of students' attendance hours. While instructional expenses per course remain relatively constant, revenue increases with increased course registrations. Maintenance costs for facilities are essentially constant as numbers of adult education courses increase. Maintenance cost per attendance

\textsuperscript{282}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 35.
hour decreases with increased enrollment per course while reimbursement per attendance hour remains constant, and adult education courses utilize facilities during hours different from those hours required for elementary and secondary education courses. Clark felt that the influence of the enrollment economy was a major influence on adult education within the Los Angeles School System.

As mentioned earlier, Clark's next four uses of the term marginality, all of which appear in two consecutive paragraphs, are used to enhance understanding of his enrollment economy concept. (D9, D10, D11, and D12).

The enrollment economy needs to be understood in relation to other conditions. Here the marginality of adult education within school systems is relevant, i.e., the greater the marginality, the more the pressures of the enrollment economy are likely to play an important role. Local school systems will not contribute heavily to a program they only weakly accept; and, where insecure because of marginal status, program administrators are more susceptible to the pressures of the enrollment economy. The marginality of this program, through its impact upon the security and power of the administrators, directly conditions the severity of the enrollment economy pressures.

Of no less importance in this context are the stated goals of organizational leadership. Administrative purpose plays an important role in relation to these operating pressures. In the following section, the manifest goals of adult education are analyzed. This discussion will then provide us with a configuration of three historical conditions, e.g., the marginality of organizational position, the pressures of the enrollment economy, and the potential effect of the stated ends of the

283Ibid., pp. 35-6.
In these paragraphs Clark appears to define marginality in two ways. His statement, that "local school systems will not contribute heavily to a program they only weakly accept" might be understood in the context of the preceding quotations to be a definition of marginality as weak acceptance. His use of the terms "marginal status," is understood as an equivalent of one of his concepts of marginality. Clark does not appear to distinguish among the concepts of acceptance and status and appears to use both to define his concepts of marginality.

Clark appears to be saying that marginality influences the security and the susceptibility of an adult education element to the forces of an enrollment economy. He lists "marginality of an organizational position" as one of three "historical conditions" which he says "exist as 'givens' for the decisions made in the administration of adult education departments of school systems." Clark wrote twice of these three historical conditions which he identified as organizational marginality, the pressures of the enrollment economy and the potential effect of the formal goals of adult education. He treated the three conditions as mutually exclusive. In quotation D12 he
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identified the same historical condition as "the marginality of organizational position"\textsuperscript{288} within the public school framework. One might therefore understand Clark's concept of marginality to be restricted to organizational position within public school frameworks. Clark may be further interpreted as saying that marginality is a low level of acceptance or status based on organizational position within the public school framework.

In term uses D10 and D11 the term marginality is used to emphasize the relationship between the concept and an enrollment economy. Both state that marginality controls the "severity"\textsuperscript{289} of an enrollment economy. Clark's use of the term severity rather than intensity could be understood to mean that he viewed a state of marginality as a negative or detrimental condition. Both usages address themselves to a single program.

As stated by Clark, "The marginality of this program, through its impact upon the security and power of the administrators, directly conditions the severity of the enrollment economy pressures."\textsuperscript{290}

An attempt was made to determine whether Clark applied his concept of marginality, defined as inferior status, to different adult education elements from those elements to which he applied his concept of marginality, defined as weaker acceptance. Clark does not seem to distinguish among concepts of marginality used

\textsuperscript{288}Ibid., p. 36.

\textsuperscript{289}Ibid.
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within the two paragraphs in which term uses D9 through D12 occur, despite the conceptual difference between his concept of marginality based on acceptance and his concept of marginality based on status. The nature of the adult education element also appears to be a distinguishing feature among concepts of marginality identified within the two paragraphs. While Clark claims a common context for both paragraphs, his reference to distinctly differing adult education elements may represent contextual variations in what was announced by Clark as a common context. Clark first refers to "the marginality of adult education within school systems." The multitude of elements which might be denoted as adult education appear to be restricted only by the context of school systems. If one defines marginality as "marginal status," which appears to be one of Clark's definitions of the term, then Clark has identified the adult education element as both a "program" and as "program administrators." Quotation D12 addresses the "marginality of organizational position." Within the context of these four term uses, Clark has applied marginality directly to a program, administrators, and to an organizational position.

Clark next used the term marginality to designate a context in which a number of particular operating procedures had arisen.
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His statement infers a causal relationship between the condition, identified as marginality, and the result—a set of operating procedures. In his discussion of adult school operating procedures, Clark identified two subsets: those where "rules of administrative thought and action stem from stated policies of the Board of Education," and those "operating procedures that have arisen from practice but around which there is consensus among the adult administrators [sic]."²⁹⁵

Clark identified two operating policies of the adult schools: the policy of setting "a class-size minimum for the introduction and maintenance of courses,"²⁹⁶ and the no-fee policy.²⁹⁷ Standard operating procedures identified by Clark for introduction of courses in adult schools were those of setting minimum enrollment levels for initiation of courses, and using sign up lists and group petitions.²⁹⁸

Clark also identified standard operating procedures which concern class size and duration which he perceived arose from the context of marginality: enrollment and withdrawal tend to be open-ended; homework tends not to be required; no examinations are a general rule; courses tend to be shortened or are run on a condensed schedule; classroom sessions tend to be packaged as complete or independent units in order to accommodate open-ended

²⁹⁵Ibid., p. 53.
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entrance and withdrawal; class work tends to be both independent and self-paced; revolving-membership type classes where students enter and exit at will to complete specific sets of instructional units are offered; entrance requirements are frequently non-existent, courses are combined when expedient for maintenance of minimum class size, necessitating increased individual and group instruction in lieu of classroom instruction; sensitivity to an enrollment economy where courses are initiated and cancelled according to enrollment demands is increased; courses are tailored for specific organizations; and enrollment is used as the standard for course and teacher evaluation.  

In regard to the preceding operating policies and procedures, Clark warned that:

(D13)

It should be understood that these operating procedures have arisen in the context of diffused, openended [sic] program goals and the organizational marginality of adult schools. These conditions hold, in general, for the Adult Education Branch, though it has the largest public-school program in the country. To indicate the peripheralness by budget size of this activity, the adult school program is a two to three per cent budget item. The total direct expenses of the program in 1952-1953 were $2,494,789.97 in a school budget of approximately one hundred and eighteen million.  

Among the twenty-four adult schools, direct expenditures ranged from $50,205.66 to $135,772.57.  

In size of attendance, adult education amounted to 11,176 ADA units out of a total of 366,378 for the school system, or 3.05%.  

Table 3 indicates that the size of the program, using ADA as a comparative measure, has varied from 1.79% to 3.89% of the total school system in the period 1925-26 to 1952-
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53. When we compare program size in 1952-53 with twenty-five years ago, we seen that the program has maintained about the same relative size in the school system. The adult schools have grown proportionately to the over-all increase in an expanding system.


18Controller's Report, op. cit. 300

Organizational marginality of adult schools has been noted by Clark in the preceding quotation as one of two contexts in which the operating policies and procedures arose. Clark apparently writes about the marginality of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System through paragraph D13 and denotes the Branch through use of the terms, activity, adult school program, program, 24 adult schools, adult education, and adult schools. Clark makes no distinctions in this paragraph among the terms he uses to denote the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System—he appears to use them synonymously.

Clark uses the term, peripheralness, as a synonym of marginality as he reports indices of peripheralness based on ratios of budget size. He uses "the total school system," which he refers to twice as "the school system" and once as merely the "system,"301 as his unit for comparison.

300Ibid., p. 70.
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Because of the imprecision of Clark's writing, several assumptions are made. The first is that Clark used the terms peripheralness and marginality synonymously. The Adult Education Branch noted by Clark as "the largest public-school program in the country"\textsuperscript{302} is assumed to be the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System. An assumption is also made that the "system," "school system," and "total school system"\textsuperscript{303} noted by Clark is the Los Angeles School System and that in this context of use, it constitutes the parental organization within which the comparative elements are contained.

Because Clark identified peripheralness as demonstrated by "budget size,"\textsuperscript{304} one might expect a reporting of the absolute magnitude of the variable present in the adult education subunit. Clark expressed the index as an estimated ratio between budget allocated the adult education element to that allotted to the total system. The estimated ratio was expressed as a percentage and in theory is indicative of the relative status of the adult education unit to the total system for the particular index.

Clark re-expressed this same index ratio in dollars, \$2,494,789.97:118,000,000.00. He thereby opened the door in his conceptual framework to the assessment of the marginality of
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adult schools collectively through reporting the ratio of their budgets to the total educational budget. An extension of Clark's logic would be that a ratio of the direct expenditures of an individual adult school to the direct expenditures of the total system, in this case to that of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, would be an index of the marginality of a particular adult school.

Clark's second identified variable in quotation D13 is "size of attendance." His reported unit of measurement for this alleged index of marginality was the average daily attendance (ADA) unit. Identifying the adult education unit merely as "adult education," Clark reported the ratio of ADA units both in relation to the total ADA of the school district (11,176:366,378) and as a percentage (3.05%). It is assumed that his intention was still to report the marginality of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System to the total Los Angeles School System. He further reported that the variation of this ratio, expressed as a percentage, during the years 1925-6 to 1952-3 ranged from 1.79 percent to 3.89 percent. Clark summarized the paragraph somewhat imprecisely noting that over the twenty-five year period the "adult schools have grown proportionately to the over-all increase in an expanding system." Although Clark now identifies the adult education
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element as adult schools rather than as the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, it is doubtful that he intended to make a distinction. Furthermore, because the ratio of ADA units generated by the adult education unit to the ADA units generated by the entire system remained relatively constant over the twenty-five year period, the implications of reporting this stable variable as an index of marginality is that the marginality or the adult education unit has likewise been relatively stable.

Clark's final four usages of the term marginality occur in a section of his Dissertation which he has labeled:

(D14)

The Effect of Marginality

In quotation D15, Clark seems to be expressing a value, that value being that administrative action is called for wherever insecurity is present within organizations.

(D15)

Where organizational position is insecure, then administrative thought and action needs to be oriented toward reducing that insecurity. Marginality of a "function" means that the need for adjustments contributing to security is strengthened. In this way a marginal position directly contributes to an uncontrolled evolution. There is a greater need to adapt, on other people's terms if necessary, and less likelihood that change will be controlled from within. For adult education, a marginal position in school systems increases the sensitivity of the program to vocalized public demands. The adult schools have a strong need for outside interest and support; their product is then less likely to be maintained in "internal" terms of the organizational personnel. The autonomy of the organization is reduced and decision-making is more subject to the pressure of

\[^{308}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 172-3.}\]
ad hoc demands.\textsuperscript{309}

In this quotation Clark applies his concept of marginality to school systems. He appears to be saying that the "effect" of marginality within school systems increases program "sensitivity" to "vocalized public demands."\textsuperscript{310} When he speaks of "a marginal position" directly contributing to "an uncontrolled evolution" he speaks from the position of an administrator rather than from the position of the public who may or may not have gained varying degrees of control over the program.\textsuperscript{311}

Clark's reference to the "Marginality of a 'function'"\textsuperscript{312} is his only identified application of the term to a function. This use by Clark is to be understood in an organizational context because of his references to organizational position, "position in school systems," and "adult schools."\textsuperscript{313} Clark's use of the term function is problematic. Does he mean through use of the term that "the normal characteristic action" of adult education, an organizational mandate, or a "thing that depends on and varies with something else"?\textsuperscript{314} The meaning of Clark's discussion can be interpreted in a variety of ways depending on the definition used. Since marginality contributes to

\textsuperscript{309}Ibid., p. 53.
\textsuperscript{310}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{311}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{312}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{313}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{314}Webster, 1973, s.v. "function".
insecurity and insecurity can be affected through administrative action, Clark appears to be implying that marginality can also be affected through administrative action.

It would appear that marginality was viewed by Clark to be a negative condition which must be dealt with and reduced for the sake of organizational and administrative control and well-being. Increased marginality meant increased interest group control and influence over adult education programs.

Clark's final usages of the term marginality in his Dissertation explain the effects of marginality on program justification.

(D16-D17)

Marginality also shapes the doctrines that emerge as program rationales. In the adult education context, it strengthens the need for a doctrine of service, or what might be called a doctrine of immediate needs. The doctrine of service seems in part a response to the insecurity of the adult education enterprise within public school systems. The gathering of outside support is a basic requirement for reducing insecurity, and the doctrine of service sanctions the tendency to provide service in return for support. Here marginality pushes the program toward an uncontrolled development, with its course determined by outside forces.  

Clark first made a general statement: "Marginality...shapes the doctrines that emerge as program rationales."  

Marginality, according to Clark, apparently occurs both inside and outside of the field of adult education, for his second sentence explains the effect of marginality "in the adult

315 Clark, Dissertation, p. 53.
316 Ibid.
Clark earlier stated that "Marginality directly contributes to insecurity." Clark now states that marginality "strengthens the need for a doctrine of service" and that this doctrine of service "seems in part a response to the insecurity of the adult education enterprise within public school systems." Whether Clark believes the only contribution of marginality to the doctrine of service is made through insecurity resulting from marginality or whether other effects of marginality on the doctrine of service are direct and are not resultant through creation of insecurity to which marginality contributes is not clear.

Clark's seventeenth use of the term marginality in his Dissertation addressed what he perceived were the effects of marginality from the perspective of the adult education administrator. Clark's reference toward an uncontrolled development refers to diminished administrative control and increased control of the unit by what Clark refers to as "outside forces." He previously identified some of these outside forces as being "pressures of the enrollment

---
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319 Ibid., p. 53.
320 Ibid.
321 Ibid., p. 36.
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economy," and a "felt need" for acceptance.

The term marginality appeared one additional time within Clark's Dissertation. It was included in the Table of Contents to guide readers to those sections already discussed. Since it was used to repeat the subheading already cited as use D2, no additional number was assigned.

Examination of Clark's seventeen uses of the term marginality in his Dissertation has resulted in the preceding notion of numerous distinctions among concepts of marginality. Using these distinctions as criteria for recognizing discrete concepts of marginality it is possible to summarize them in a table. Chapter IV is dedicated to this process.

^323Ibid.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE OF USES OF THE TERM MARGINALITY IN CLARK'S DISSERTATION

Each of Clark's uses of the term marginality was quoted in context from his Dissertation and discussed at length in the preceding chapter. This chapter is dedicated to presentation of a basic premise for categorizing concepts of marginality, discussion of categories and subcategories of concepts of marginality, presentation of tabled observations, discussion and analysis of the data, and the presentation of observations pertaining to the use of the term in the Dissertation which did not lend themselves to categorization. Once the basic premise for categorizing concepts of marginality is presented, the resultant Table 3 will be presented, its categories defined, and the data or lack of data within each category discussed. General observations concerning the table will follow.
The Premise for Categorizing Concepts of Marginality

The analysis of usages of the concepts in the field of adult education involves the identification of the adult education element, comparative elements, parental system or context, and a discussion of the nature of each. The basic questions are: What specific adult education element, practice, or value, is experiencing a state of marginality in relationship to what comparative elements, practices, or values? And, what is the system or organization in which marginality is experienced by the specific adult education element, practice or value? The more specific the identification of these comparative elements, practices, or values, and parental systems or contexts, the greater the potential for concrete application of the concept and operationalization and measurement of the designated status. The generation of Table 3, the Contextual and Key Element Analysis of Term Uses by Burton R. Clark in His Dissertation for the Term Marginality, has been based upon this premise.

Discussion of Categories and Subcategories of Concepts of Marginality and Presentation of Tabled Observations

The Contextual and Key Element Analysis of Burton R. Clark's Use of the Term Marginality in His Dissertation is not only a categorical summary of data gathered from Clark's use of the term within his Dissertation, but also is a conceptual scheme for identifying key elements and contexts which distinguish among various concepts of marginality. Uses of the
term marginality, with the exception of the appearance of the term in the Table of Contents, were individually quoted at length and numbered as D1 through D17. Corresponding numbering in Table 3 refers to the quotations.

As terms within Clark's writings were identified and reviewed, distinctions were noted. Such noted distinctions among term usage form the basis for the categorical definitions which follow. Categories will be defined, followed immediately by a discussion of each. Examples from Clark's writings do not exist for every category identified in the table. Some categories have been conceptually deduced as opposites to or extensions from Clark's usages. Where logical examples from the field of adult education could be identified and use of a concept of marginality within adult education seemed plausible, categories are labeled and defined, regardless of a lack of an example from Clark's writings. First the table is presented, then the categories are defined.

Marginality of the General Value of Adult Education and Learning

The first categorical label identified in Table 3 is that of the "Marginality of the General Value of Adult Education and Learning."

Clark announced that his Dissertation was a "study of organizations, their values and their practices."324 Concepts of marginality may be applied to any of these three concerns:

organizational units, values, or practices. He voiced "a concern with the organizational processes of value implementation and change" and felt that adult education organizations seemed good objects for his study.

Adult education was considered to be the "general value...undergoing implementation by adult education schools and departments." Clark explained that:

These organizations are seen as the instruments of implementation. It is clear that adult education units of various size and scope must be built and maintained in order to realize the education of adults.

When the focus is on the status of adult education beliefs or standards, singly or collectively, among learning or educational values, respectively, which values are held elsewhere in society or a portion, thereof, then the concern is of the marginality of the general value of adult education or learning. Such adult education values may be identified throughout the field of adult education. Contexts, wherein the marginality of adult learning values is considered, may constitute either part or all of what is considered to be the field of adult education, or may permeate contexts considered to be outside the field.

Although Clark announced his study to be one of

---
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organizations, their values, and their practices, and while concepts of marginality might be used to denote the status of adult education values among any number of societal values, and as assessed by any number of interest groups or individuals, no specific application of the term marginality to values was identified within his Dissertation. True, values are associated with various organizational and non-organizational units and processes. Values marginality concepts in the field of adult education pertain, however, only when the values of adult education and learning are the focus.

Marginality External to the Field of Adult Education

Concepts of marginality may be applied to organizational units, values, or practices external to the field of adult education. One may address the marginality of values external to the field of adult education and learning within a given organizational subunit in comparisons to the status afforded other subunits within a common system.

No evidence was found, as illustrated by the lack of data falling within this category in Table 3, of such applications by Clark within his Dissertation.

Marginality of the Field of Adult Education

When one addresses the marginality of the field of adult education, comparison for purpose of establishing status is made among other fields of study or practice. While Clark used the term "adult education" in association with thirteen of his seventeen applications of the term marginality within his
Dissertation, comparison was made to other fields of study or practice, and no direct applications of a concept of marginality to the field was apparent. While Clark's use of the term adult education in his Dissertation might lead to the conclusion by some readers that concepts of marginality are applied to the field of adult education, absence of comparisons to other fields of study does not support such conclusions, and the six comparisons made to subunits within a common parental system in the three instances in which comparisons are made, demonstrate Clark's application of marginality to adult education subunits and not to the entire field.

Organizational Marginality

The term organizational marginality in the field of adult education denotes a low status of an adult education subunit in comparison to other subunits within a common organizational system. Organizational denotes the formal structuring of individuals or groups. While any interaction among individuals in societal settings might be regarded as indices of the existence of an organization, for purposes of defining this category mere collaboration of individuals and roles is not considered to be sufficient for inclusion without the existence of formal objectives, bylaws, constitution, and/or incorporation, mandate, or charter.

Key elements which must be identified in application of concepts of organizational marginality include the adult education element, comparative elements, and parental organization. For assessment of states of marginality these
three elements are essential because one must be able to identify the element said to be experiencing marginality, the organizational context of the assessment, and the other subunits within the common context against which status is being assessed. Otherwise, statements of status remain ambiguous and incomplete.

No specific application of a non-organizational concept of marginality in Clark's Dissertation was identified.

In reiteration, key elements essential for both application of and interpretation of concepts of organizational marginality in the field of adult education include the adult education element, comparative elements, and parental organization. Description of each element follows, along with discussion of the data from Clark's Dissertation which have been classified within each.

Adult Education Element

The term element has been used because of the diversity of foci one might have when applying concepts of marginality in the field of adult education. Clark announced his focus to be adult education values, but his concepts of marginality most frequently were applied to adult education subunits. Clark used various labels in his Dissertation for identification of

\[329\] Stated again for clarity, an adult education subunit is not a subdivision of an adult education unit, but rather an adult education element which is organizationally subordinate to a parental organization or physically larger or more powerful organizational element whose primary objective is not the education of adults.
adult education elements, as enumerated in Table 3. He applied his concepts to individuals, processes, and locations, in addition to adult education subunits.

Terms used by Clark to label the adult education subunit vary in specificity. For example, use of the term program, the term used most frequently by Clark in his Dissertation to denote the adult education element, may denote what has been identified in this thesis as an adult education subunit, a process, or a value. Clark used the term program in association with sixteen of the seventeen uses of the term marginality identified in his Dissertation. The terms adult education, adult education department, activity, adult classes, Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, Bureau of Adult Education of the California Department of Education, California Association of Adult Education Administrators, administrative agencies, adult administrators, organizational position, adult schools, adult school program, public school program, function, organization, and adult education enterprise appear to have been used synonymously with the term program in contexts wherein Clark applied concepts of status and labeled them as marginality. The term program is rendered ambiguous, thereby, in regards to which of the enumerated adult education elements are denoted through Clark's use of the term in his Dissertation. One might question whether Clark would use the term program to denote still other elements distinct from those listed.

The second most frequently used term appearing in Clark's Dissertation as a label for adult education elements said by
Clark to be experiencing marginality, is adult education. Similarly, to instances of usage of the term program, the term, adult education, when used in association with other labels for elements said by Clark to be experiencing marginality, leaves the reader questioning which element is experiencing the condition, and whether Clark, with each use of the term marginality, intended application of his concept of marginality to individual adult education elements or multiples, thereof. Labels used either synonymously by Clark with his adult education label, or elements identified by Clark as concurrently experiencing marginality along with what he labeled adult education are: adult education departments, program, activity, adult classes, Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, Bureau of Adult Education of the California Department of Education, California Association of Adult Education Administrators, adult schools, adult school program, public school program, function, organization, and an adult education enterprise.

From a review of the two terms used most frequently by Clark in his Dissertation to designate the adult education element said to be experiencing marginality, it is impossible to conclude whether Clark intended his concepts of marginality to be applied to individuals, organizational subunits, processes, locations, or values. A cursory review of the context of application is insufficient for determination and many terms used by Clark for labeling the adult education element allow for divergent conclusions. It is reasonable to assume that when
Clark writes of the marginality of adult administrators, he is addressing the status of individuals. When he writes of the marginality of organizational position, he is addressing the status of given locations within an organization. When he writes of the marginality of a function, he is addressing the marginality of a process. And when he writes of the marginality of adult classes, the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, adult education departments, and adult schools, it is logical to assume he writes of the status of adult education subunits in relationship to other subunits within a common parental organization.

When Clark writes of the marginality of an activity, however, it may be difficult to determine whether he is addressing the status of an adult education subunit or process. Likewise, when he writes of the adult education enterprise it may be difficult to determine whether he is addressing the status of an adult education subunit, a process, or the individuals encompassed by the organizational designation. Terms used by Clark to designate adult education elements said to be experiencing marginality appear to vary in terms of the breadth and range of interpretation which may be given them. They often encompass applications to adult education subunits, individuals, processes, and locations, and permit applications to values.

The combinations of Clark's application of concepts of marginality within his Dissertation across the distinct adult education elements which have been enumerated are numerous. Because Clark's writings applying his concepts of marginality
can be characterized as being casual and non-specific, further identification of combinations of term usage and the statistical manipulation may be futile.

It does seem important when applying concepts of marginality not only to identify the unit of focus, but also to specify whether the status of such elements within a specified system or context are considered individually or collectively. Because labels for adult education elements may be considered to be designations of individual elements or multiples, thereof, depending on the range of meaning across the enumerated categories, it is not always possible to conclude the plurality of a term. In five instances in Clark's Dissertation it is felt that the label for the adult education element denotes multiple elements which, for purposes of determining status, are to be considered collectively.

Comparative Element

The status of an adult education element can be described in relation to the status of other elements within the same organization or system. Without a clear point of reference the term status or marginality is unclear.

Clark most frequently applied concepts of marginality in his Dissertation to denote the status of adult education subunits. The empirical evidence from Table 3, however, is insufficient to confirm such an observation. Examination of what is here termed comparative elements, which exist in an organization common to the adult education element, was felt to be significant for confirming identification of adult education
elements said by Clark to be experiencing marginality.

Elements identified for comparison to adult education elements for purposes of establishing status should be of a comparative nature—adult classes to other classes in a common system, adult education departments to other departments in a given system.

Clark identified comparative elements in only three of the seventeen contexts in which he used the term marginality. In each of the three contexts he identified two or more comparative elements. In consideration of each of the three contexts, the question existed as to which of the comparative elements was meant by Clark to be the reference point for determining the marginality of the adult education element. Was Clark suggesting that the terms he used to identify comparative elements were to be synonymous? None of the elements named by Clark in the three contexts were clear comparisons to adult education elements named in the corresponding contexts. In quotation D3 Clark compared primary departments to an activity, program, and adult education. While the three terms might be used to denote a specific adult education department, they might just as well be used to describe processes, goals, or individuals. In quotation D4 Clark identified adult classes and adult education as the elements of focus and their status was addressed among three educational levels in addition to well-established, well-accepted programs. If one assumes the more specific identification of adult classes to be the focus of status assessment, one is still hard pressed making comparisons
of classes to educational levels. Classes and programs as used by Clark may be understood as synonymous, but not with appreciable assurance.

It appears that Clark did not regard specifying a point of reference or comparative element when applying a concept of marginality to be particularly important. While several comparative elements were named by Clark in contexts within which he used the term marginality, multiple terms were used to identify such comparative elements. Frequently terms were used to identify comparative elements which denoted distinct elements. Hence, the status denoted by Clark's use of the term marginality could not be clearly identified.

**Parental Organization**

The Parental Organization classification has been so named in order to restrict applications of marginality to organizational contexts within the adult education field. All contexts of status assessment are confined in Clark's *Dissertation* by what may be termed parental organizations. Concepts of marginality may be applied, however, in non-organizational contexts.

It would appear that Clark most frequently used the term marginality to denote the status of adult education subunits among other subunits within a common parental organization. When one addresses the marginality of adult education it is an indication that the primary goals and function of the parental system is not the education of adults, be it an organizational or non-organizational system.
Clark identified parental organizations both specifically and generically. Most frequently he used generic terms to denote such parental organizations. In fifteen of the seventeen contexts in which he used the term marginality, Clark wrote of school systems which might be considered as parental organizations. Once Clark wrote of an assessment of marginality within the context of a local school system, and once, in the context of a total school system. Clark's labels of elementary school districts, high school districts, and junior college districts, while more specific than the school system label, are, nevertheless, considered to be generic labels because of their lack of specificity.

Specific identification of parental organizations included Clark's references to the Los Angeles School System, the California School System, and the school system in the United States. While these labels are considered to be specific, each might require detailed definition to facilitate a full understanding of contexts of status. Of thirty-one references to parental organizations occurring in association with uses of the term marginality, ten were specific and twenty-one generic. Parental organizations were identified by Clark in all but one instance. More than one parental organization was mentioned in association with eight of the sixteen uses of the term in which parental organizations were identified. Up to five distinct organizations were identified in association with an individual term usage. When multiple parental organizations are identified within the context of a single use of the term marginality, the
specificity of the term and concept of marginality is diluted.

Most significant in considering identified parental organizations is the fact that the California School System was named five times versus the three times the Los Angeles School System was named. This change of focus may be attributed to Clark's shift from his initial case study of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System to address "state-wide conditions in order to understand the development of local school units." 330

Contexts in which the term marginality was used by Clark in his Dissertation were further analyzed to determine the system breadth within which status was addressed. In quotation D3 it was determined that the assessment of status was within an immediate parental organization. In quotation D4, status was assessed at a supra-parental organization level and at a level two steps removed from the immediate parental organization.

Non-organizational Marginality

The classification, Non-organizational Marginality, denotes application of concepts of marginality within what is considered to be the field of adult education, but which occur in non-organizational contexts. Concepts of marginality used to denote the status of adult education activities, classes, courses, functions, interactions, and programs which occur outside formal organizational settings fall within this classification. In the absence of formal organizational objectives, bylaws,

330 Clark, Dissertation, p. 3.
The concepts, and/or incorporation, mandate or charter, application of concepts of marginality to the enumerated adult education elements would fall under this classification.

While Clark uses the terms activity, class, function, and program in connection with his use of the term marginality within his Dissertation, no application was specified to be outside of the organizational settings which were announced to have been the focus of his doctoral study. Nevertheless, activities, classes, courses, functions, interactions, and programs designated for adults do exist outside of organizational contexts, as previously defined in this thesis. Concepts of marginality may be applied to designate the status of each within various contexts. The Non-organizational Marginality category is proposed as a designation for such applications.

Summary of Contextual and Key Element Analysis for Clark's Use of the Term Marginality Within His Dissertation

Although Clark identified his case-study-in-depth to be of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, it was named as the adult education element in but three of Clark's seventeen applications of the term. With two of his three applications of the term marginality to the Branch, the California School System was named and is considered to be the immediate parental system. In none of the three applications were comparative elements named.

Outside of Clark's application of concepts of marginality to the Adult Education Branch, there appears to be little
logical consistency in Clark's identification of adult education elements said to be experiencing marginality, the comparative elements he identified, and his naming of parental organizations. As enumerated in examination of the various classifications, Clark overwhelmingly chose to use generic terms when applying his concepts of marginality. Application of concepts of marginality to specific adult education elements was infrequent and seldom were the adult education elements logically matched to comparative elements within specific parental organizations. Clark's use of the term marginality in his Dissertation may be described as casual rather than rigorously scientific.

Because general values of adult education may be present not only in the field of adult education, but also within organizations and social contexts which would not be classified as the field of adult education, an effort was made to determine whether Clark specifically addressed the marginality of the general value of adult education, either internal or external to the field of adult education. Clark does not appear to have applied a concept of marginality to adult education values which would be considered to be external to the system. Neither is there a direct reference in his Dissertation to marginality of general values of adult education which would be considered to be part of the field of adult education. But, because Clark equated adult education with the "general value...undergoing

33'Ibid.
implementation by adult education schools and departments," and because there are three possible applications of a concept of marginality in Clark's Dissertation to adult schools, to adult education departments, and to the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System which is designated as a department of the California State School System, an assumption that Clark was addressing the general value in the cited quotations as implemented by these schools and departments has some basis.

With even a cursory glance at Table 3, it is obvious that Clark's primary application of his concepts of marginality in his Dissertation was to organizational contexts in the field of adult education. To apply a concept of marginality, or to interpret the meaning of the marginality of an adult education subunit within an organization, several key elements must be manifest. Identification of the adult education element and its nature is of paramount importance. Within the organizational context, an adult education element may exist as an independent adult education unit wherein the primary objective and function is the education of adults, or as a subunit of an organization wherein the primary purpose and function is other than the

---

332 Adult schools are specifically named as adult education elements in quotations D13, D14, and D15.

333 Adult education departments are specifically named as adult education elements in quotation D1 and D5.

334 The Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System is specifically named as an adult education element in quotation D5, D7, and D13.
education of adults. No application of concepts of marginality to independent adult education units, or subunits, thereof, was identified within Clark's Dissertation.

Clark apparently used the terms program and adult education in his discussions of marginality—in a generic sense. In most instances, it was extremely difficult to identify the particular adult education organizational subunit said to be experiencing marginality. An example is his generic use of the term department.

Clark noted that:

What we sought to determine in our analysis were the ways in which adult education departments are shaped by pressures to which they have been subject in their recent development.\(^{335}\)

Clark appears to have used the terms adult education departments in a generic sense denoting thereby various organizational adult education elements which he discussed. Even in specifying the focus of his study, Clark used generic and non-specific terms. He described his doctoral work as:

a sociological case study of the evolution of an "institution".\(^1\) We had originally intended to limit our purview to just the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System in order to have a case study in the institutionalizing of adult education. But it became apparent after several months of research that we had to become familiar with certain state-wide conditions in order to understand the development of local school units. Attention was then partly shifted to the level of state legislative and executive action; at the same time, the Los Angeles department was maintained as a case-study-in-depth. The former gave us the general conditions in the state of California under which adult education programs have been built; the latter provides us with detailed

\(^{335}\)Clark, Dissertation, p. 3.
information on how these conditions are likely to work themselves out within local school systems.

'The concept of institution is discussed in Chapter VI. Our use of the term is similar to that of Robert M. MacIver. See R. M. MacIver and Charles H. Page, Society, (New York:Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1949), pp. 15-17.\textsuperscript{336}

Because Clark specified the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System as his case-study-in-depth, it was anticipated that the Branch would be the organizational unit of focus when Clark discussed his concepts of marginality within his Dissertation. A second potential focus identified from Clark's Organizational Structure of the Los Angeles School System, 1952-53,\textsuperscript{337} was the adult schools within the Adult Education Branch. Therefore, as each use of the term marginality contained in Clark's Dissertation was quoted, attention was given to determine if each application were to the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, to one of the adult schools, to the schools as an aggregate, or whether application was to still other adult education elements.

Contrary to the preceding assumptions, Clark, when using the term marginality within his Dissertation, made explicit references to the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System three times.\textsuperscript{338}

\textsuperscript{336}Ibid., pp. 3-4.

\textsuperscript{337}See Table 1.

\textsuperscript{338}Clark, Dissertation, pp. 27, 29, 70; quoted earlier in this thesis as term uses D5, D7, and D13.
In reference D5 Clark noted a reduction in marginality "over the last twenty-five years" and noted several elements to which his observation might apply, including "adult education," "a new activity within an organization," "the program's weak position in the school system," "principals" which are assumed to be principals of adult schools, and "adult education departments." It is, therefore, difficult to determine which of these adult educational elements were being identified by Clark as experiencing marginality or whether he considered some or all to be experiencing it. In reference D7 Clark referred to sources or indices of marginality occurring within the "Los Angeles department." None of the organizational units identified by Clark in his organizational charts of the Los Angeles School System and the Adult Education Branch were labeled specifically as departments. It has been assumed that Clark used the term department (D1, D5, and D7) in a generic sense and that his reference was to his stated case-study-in-depth which he specified as the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System.

An intention by Clark to apply his concept to adult schools is a second possibility. Clark, in quotation D15, wrote of the "Marginality of a 'function'" and continued his explanation noting that "The adult schools have a strong need for outside interest and support." Because Clark, in conjunction with the same use of the term, wrote of "a marginal position in school systems," increased "sensitivity of the program to vocalized public demands," in addition to the "marginality of a
'function,'" it is difficult to note with assurance which specific adult education element Clark felt was experiencing marginality. Because direct references to "adult schools" is made in association with term uses D13, D14, and D15, term use D14, which is a topic heading, was similarly classified. None other than these associations of term use with "adult schools" were identified within Clark's Dissertation, although Clark's reference to principals in term use D4 might be understood as an application of marginality to adult schools.

A third assumption was made concerning the application of the term marginality within Clark's study. Because he reported the Organizational Structure of the Los Angeles School System, 1952-53 and diagrammed the Organizational Structure of the Adult Education Branch, Division of Extension and Higher Education, Los Angeles School System, 1952-53, it was anticipated that he might address one of the various organizational elements identified within these organizational charts: the Division of Extension and Higher Education, the Adult Education Branch, administrative divisions within the Branch, or the twenty-four adult schools within the Los Angeles School System. As previously noted, Clark did apply his concept of marginality in the context of the adult schools three times (D13, D14, and D15) and in the context of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System three times (D5, D7, and D15).

---
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Additionally, Clark wrote within an organizational context of adult classes (D4), administrative agencies (D8), the Bureau of Adult Education of the California State Department of Education (D7), and the California Association of Adult Education Administrators (D7). Most frequently he used the non-specific designations for the adult education element of program (D1-D3, D5-D17), adult school program (D13), activity (D3, D5, and D13), adult education enterprise (D16, D17), organization (D14, D15), organizational position (D12), public school program (D13), and function (D14-D15), which terms might be understood to include any or all of the adult education organizational units specifically named by Clark.

A further analysis of Clark's Dissertation was conducted for the purpose of determining whether he applied his concept of marginality to an individual adult education organizational unit, such as an independent adult school; to a subunit, such as one of the adult schools of the Los Angeles School System; or whether his application was to an aggregate of adult education units or subunits, such as an application of the concept to denote the status of the twenty-four adult schools of the Los Angeles School System, aggregated. In all but five instances the contextual information was inadequate for such determinations to be made. Inadequacies in data occurred either through omission of data or through identification of multiple adult education units, subunits, and comparative units named in association with a single concept of marginality. In instances where multiple elements were identified, it often became
impossible to say with certainty what was experiencing marginality, and in comparison to which elements and based on which criteria.

In Clark's five applications of marginality to multiple adult education subunits he described the status of adult classes (D4), adult education departments (D5), a combination of various and quite different adult education units (D7), and administrative agencies (D8). Clark identified the general value of adult education,\(^{341}\) the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System,\(^{342}\) and the California School System\(^{343}\) to be specific foci. While it can be assumed that Clark's application of his concepts of marginality were within these contexts, direct references to them are infrequent in passages of his Dissertation in which he applies the term marginality.

A search was made to determine comparative elements associated with Clark's application of the term marginality. Clark used his concepts of marginality most frequently to denote the marginality of either an adult education subunit or of adult education subunits in relation to other subunits within a parental organization. Such a comparison requires the identification of both the parental organization and the other subunits within the parental organization. In Clark's case

\(^{341}\)Ibid., p. 1.

\(^{342}\)Ibid., pp. 27, 29, 70.

\(^{343}\)Ibid., pp. 3-4.
study, the parental organization for the twenty-four adult schools might be considered to be their individual host secondary schools, the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, the Division of Extension and Higher Education, the Los Angeles School System, the California State School System, or the United States Department of Education. Clark's Dissertation was reviewed to determine if parental organizations and comparative elements were clearly indicated in applications of his concept of marginality. The comparative elements were conceptualized as existing within an immediate parental organization when host secondary schools were considered to be the pertinent parental organization or within a supra-parental organization when the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System or any of the other named organizational levels were designated as the parental organization. Because Clark noted that the adult schools were organizationally "responsible directly to the Associate Superintendent in charge of the Division (Howard A. Compion)" of Extension and Higher Education, there could be some debate concerning the designation of an immediate parental organization where adult education parental and affiliate organizations are discrete and are not hierarchically ordered.

A number of organizational elements were named in Clark's Dissertation in contexts where concepts of marginality were applied. None was specifically identified by Clark as a

---

344 Ibid., pp. 44, 48-9.
parental organization; nevertheless, each use listed in Table 3 as parental organizations is considered as such because of its relationship to adult education elements which were said by Clark to be experiencing marginality. Some parental organizations were positively identified, others were denoted with generic labels. Specifically named parental organizations were the Los Angeles School System, the California State School System, and the school system of the United States. Generic labels given the parental organizations by Clark were: school system, used in fifteen of the seventeen cited references in which Clark used the term marginality; total school system, used once; local school system, used twice as an ambiguous designation of either local school districts or of the Los Angeles School System; elementary school district, used once; high school districts, used once; and junior college districts, used once.

In certain contexts other than those contexts that are believed to be in the cited references in which the term marginality was used, several elements categorized as adult education subunits in Table 3 might be categorized as parental organizations. An activity, administrative agencies, a function, an organization, a program, and a public school program would be considered to be parental organization when

---

345 Ibid., pp. 27, 29, 70.
346 Ibid., pp. 25, 26, 27, 27, 29.
347 Ibid., p. 25.
they encompass adult education subunits. When the primary objectives and functions of such parental organizations are other than the education of adults, adult education subunits within them would be said to be experiencing marginality. Clark applied his concept of marginality in the Los Angeles context three times, to the California context five times, and to the United States context once.

In applying concepts of marginality, Clark wrote of "the general value" of adult education, a function, activity, program, interaction, course and classes, all of which may occur in contexts external to formally constituted organizations. Nowhere, however, did he discuss application of his concept of marginality to such external contexts, or identify the occurrence of marginality in such a context.

Clark referred to the marginality of adult education without any qualifying adjectives in thirteen of his seventeen uses of the term. Because Clark repeatedly made reference to school systems when applying his concept, it is doubtful that he intended applications outside the context of school systems. His three direct applications of his concept of marginality to the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, his application of concepts of marginality to the Bureau of Adult Education of the California Department of Education, and to the California Association of Adult Education.

\[^{348}\text{Ibid.},\ pp. 27, 29, 70.\]
\[^{349}\text{Ibid.},\ p. 29.\]
Administrators,\textsuperscript{350} appear to be the only direct identification of adult education subunits. He appears to have used generic labels to identify adult education subunits elsewhere in his Dissertation where the term marginality was used.

To achieve clarity in the application of concepts of marginality in organizational settings it appears that four key elements must be identified: the adult education subunit, the comparative subunits, the parental organization, and the status variables. When any of these four elements is less than distinctly identified, conceptual ambiguity exists. While generic labeling may be useful in systems theory, the use of generic terms, the use of different labels for common elements, and the naming of several adult education elements, comparative elements or parental organizations or contexts when discussing marginality, impairs understanding of the meaning of the concept. All three conceptual problems occur in Clark's Dissertation as is shown in Table 3. Multiple adult education subunits were named in all but two of Clark's uses of the term marginality. Generic terms were used to identify the adult education subunit in all seventeen uses of the term marginality. Clark also used seventeen different terms to denote adult education subunits. It is assumed that he used some adult education subunit labels synonymously, but in few instances did he equate the terms or use them consistently.

Clark identified comparative elements in three of the

\textsuperscript{350}Ibid.
seventeen contexts wherein the term marginality was used. He used six generic labels to identify comparative elements, four within a single context of term use.\(^{351}\) Clark identified the hierarchical level of a comparative element in only two cases.

Because the status of adult education elements may vary from system to system and from system to subsystem, the specific designation of elements is imperative in applying concepts of marginality.

Clark did not specifically apply his concepts of marginality outside of organizational contexts of the field of adult education. Relatively few distinct parental organizations and comparative elements were identified; he did not restrict application of his concepts of marginality to either a particular organizational unit or to a single administrative hierarchical level. Sufficient evidence exists in the contextual information accompanying the seventeen uses of the term marginality to confirm that Clark's applications were within organizational settings.

Clark did not apply his concept of marginality to independent adult education units or to adult education occurring outside organizational settings. While he did speak of the marginality of adult education, which has been suggested as an appropriate designation for the entire field, including both organizational and non-organizational components, there is insufficient evidence beyond his use of the phrase to suggest

\(^{351}\)Ibid., pp. 26-7.
that he intended to address marginality outside of an organizational context.
CHAPTER V

DIRECT LABELING OF CONCEPTS OF MARGINALITY
IN CLARK'S MONOGRAPH

Clark used the term marginality twenty-nine times in the text of what has been denoted in this thesis as the Monograph, first published as "Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity." The manuscript which was said by Clark to be based on his Dissertation,\textsuperscript{352} is important because of its broad distribution to the public by at least three publishers, in at least two editions, through at least six printings.\textsuperscript{353} It was concluded earlier in this thesis that sustained demand for the article and book may be indicative of the popularity of the concepts which Clark introduced in them. It appears to be the Monograph, with few exceptions, which is cited by authors in the field of adult education. Because of the apparent popularity of this manuscript, each of the twenty-

\textsuperscript{352} Clark, Monograph, Acknowledgments.

\textsuperscript{353} See Bibliography for listing of publishers and printing dates.
nine textual uses of the term marginality will be cited in sufficient length to facilitate their discussion, analysis, and critique.

The twenty-nine uses of the term marginality appearing in the text of the manuscript will be labeled M1 through M29 in this chapter as they are sequentially cited and discussed. The two uses appearing in the table of contents and index will be cited, but not alpha-numerically labeled. Term uses will be identified by their assigned labels in Table 4, and will be discussed. Tabled categorizations and analysis will be presented after all term uses have been cited and discussed. They will then be presented under the Summary Analysis and Critique section of Chapter VI. Because not all observed data from analysis of uses of the term marginality in Clark's Dissertation lent itself to categorization and tabling, a similar outcome is anticipated with data from the Monograph. Such data will be analyzed and critiqued in order of Clark's use in the Monograph in the Non-categorical Observations subsection of Chapter VI.

Use of the Term Marginality Within Clark's Monograph

Clark entitled Chapter II of both his Dissertation354 and Monograph,355 "PRESSURES ON A MARGINAL PROGRAM." In his Monograph he first used the term marginality in the first subheading of Chapter II:

355Idem, Monograph, p. 57.
MARGINALITY OF ADULT EDUCATION

In broad terms, the primary mission of a public school system in the United States is the education of the young. Different school levels are accepted as legitimate concerns of tax-supported education on the basis of their part in the grades progression.

In contrast to elementary, high school, and junior college education, the adult program is a separate, peripheral activity, and its clientele is completely outside the compulsory-attendance age group. When an adult program is initiated, it must make its way within a family of established programs, contending with the strong, central departments for budget support and favorable treatment. Since its inception, adult education has been, and to some extent still is, a marginal program within the school system.

Full-time attendance is compulsory until the age of sixteen in California. If a person drops out of school after that age and has not graduated from high school, he must attend a continuation school for four hours a week until he is eighteen. Continuation schools are not now considered a part of adult education. State of California, Education Code, 1953, secs. 16601, 17001.

Clark appears to be applying his concept of marginality to an adult education element within the context of a public school system in the United States. In the Introduction of his Monograph, Clark identified his case study to be that of an individual "adult school," which he further defines as a "school unit" of a "formal organization." He identified the adult education element in this quotation as an "adult program" and as

---

357Ibid., p. 43.
"a separate, peripheral activity."\(^{358}\)

While the term school can be understood as an institution or institutional division; or as a verb meaning to train or teach,\(^{359}\) Clark clearly identified it in his Introduction as an institutional unit. Similarly, the term program, used in quotation M1, can be understood as an institutional unit or as a process.\(^{360}\) However, the term activity, also used in quotation M1, is commonly thought of as a "specific action."\(^{361}\) With Clark's first use of the term marginality in this Monograph, it is difficult to determine whether he is describing the status of a particular organizational unit or a specific action. Either position appears to be supportable.

The question of whether the adult education element is an organizational unit or a process in a given use of the term marginality may be answered through identification of pertinent comparative elements and parental system or context. Clark's reference to "a public school system in the United States"\(^{362}\) in quotation M1 is a logical parental organization, but sheds little light on the nature of the adult education element for either an organizational unit or an adult educational process could be considered part of such a system.

Clark contrasts his "adult program" to "elementary, high

\(^{358}\)Ibid, p. 57.

\(^{359}\)Webster, 1973, s.v. "school".

\(^{360}\)Ibid., s.v. "program".

\(^{361}\)Ibid., s.v. "activity".

\(^{362}\)Clark, Monograph, p. 57.
school, and junior college education," but notes that his "adult program" must make its way within a family of established programs, contending with strong, central departments for budget support and favorable treatment."$^{\text{363}}$ Both the general grouping of "elementary, high school, and junior college education," which are traditionally thought of as processes in the field of adult education, and "strong, central departments," might constitute comparative elements in quotation M1.$^{\text{364}}$ The first would support the labeling of Clark's "adult education"$^{\text{365}}$ or "adult program"$^{\text{366}}$ as a process, the latter strongly identifies it as an organizational unit.

Clark's second use of the term marginality, in his Monograph is a rephrasing of quotation D3 from his Dissertation. Both quotations are presented:

(D3)

It is difficult to assess such a factor as organizational marginality, since the question of validation involves acceptance by different groups within and without the school system, and acceptance on various grounds.$^{\text{367}}$

(M2)

It is difficult to assess organizational marginality precisely, since it depends upon the degree of acceptance afforded a program by different groups within and outside the school system. As evidence,

$^{\text{363}}$Ibid.
$^{\text{364}}$Ibid.
$^{\text{365}}$Ibid.
$^{\text{366}}$Ibid.
however, we may note some symptoms of the peripheral status in which the adult schools have operated.\[^{368}\]

In his Monograph Clark does not refer to organizational marginality as a factor, as he did in his Dissertation. He clarifies what he perceives the relationship between organizational marginality and acceptance by groups internal and external to the parental school system to be. In his Monograph, he noted that it is not the validation of the assessment of organizational marginality, but rather the assessment itself that involves and is dependent on acceptance by groups internal and external to the system. He appears to define organizational marginality in quotation M2 as the "peripheral status" of a "program" which is dependent upon "the degree of acceptance" afforded the program by groups internal and external to the system.\[^{369}\] He identified the adult education element in quotation M2 both as a program and as adult schools. The school system he refers to is the logical parental organization. Because the contextual level changes throughout the Monograph, Clark's reference to a school system could be that of the Los Angeles School System,\[^{370}\] the California State Department of Education,\[^{371}\] or the public school systems of the United

\[^{368}\]Idem, Monograph, p. 58.
\[^{369}\]Ibid., p. 58.
\[^{370}\]Ibid., pp. Acknowledgments, 47.
\[^{371}\]Ibid., pp. 43-5, 47, 51.
States, all of which were repeatedly named by Clark in his Monograph prior to his first use of the term marginality in the document.

Clark's next six uses of the term marginality are in his presentation of what he initially identifies as symptoms of marginality, but which he reintroduces as an evidence, contributing factor, index, ambiguous index, and hypothetical index. Clark enumerates six variables in his Monograph and describes them. He uses the term marginality in clarifying his first, second, third, fifth, and sixth variables.

Because Clark's first and second variables were taken almost verbatim from Clark's Dissertation, and because the discussion, analyses and critique of term use, including the data classified from the quotations and presented in Table 3 of this thesis, applies likewise to their presentation in the Monograph, only the discussion will be repeated and the corresponding quotation numbers will be given. Where other variables have been repeated, reference will be made to the primary document and only alterations to the presentation of the variable will be discussed, analyzed, and critiqued.

In Clark's third use of the term marginality, in his Monograph, he labels what he had introduced as a symptom of marginality as an evidence of marginality:

\[373\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 58.}\]
\[374\text{Ibid.; 375Ibid.; 376Ibid.; 377Ibid.}, \text{p. 60.}; 378\text{Ibid.}\]
\[379\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 57-60.}\]
1. Some evidence of marginality is indicated in the constitutional status of adult education. The state school system is composed of elementary, high school, and junior college districts; these are the basic legal units for finance and administration. Once voted into existence by the local electorate, these districts, under their respective boards of education, must maintain appropriate schools. In contrast, adult education does not have a district status, and adult classes must be attached to the basic legal units. Also, adult education is backed mainly by permissive legislation; the state authorizes adult classes, but makes no mandate for them. Classes in citizenship and literacy are the main exceptions to this nonmandatory status. Clark refers to the adult education element both as adult education and as adult classes. The adult education element may be labeled as an adult education subunit by virtue of its being attached to elementary, high school, and junior college districts or the state school system. Both the districts and the state school system constitute parental organizations—the districts are immediate parental organizations and the state school system may be noted as a supra-parental organization. Both parental organizations have primary objectives and functions other than the education of adults and comparative subunits internal to each system are assumed to exist and to fulfill the stated primary objectives and functions of the parental organizations.

The variable of marginality noted by Clark in quotation M3 is legislative disparity. Clark noted that both the parental organizations and their primary subunits have legislative

\[380\text{Ibid., p. 58.}\]
mandates and that adult education operates with no mandate under permissive legislation.

Clark used the term marginality in his Monograph in explaining his second variable of marginality:

(M4)

2. As frequently happens with a new activity, adult education began as a secondary responsibility of administrators working with other programs. The administration of adult education in the state had this character until 1931, and it was symptomatic of the program's second-class position. After 1931 there were separate principals, but mainly in part-time posts. The number of full-time positions has gradually increased, but it is only within recent years that the largest department in the state, for example, has been manned completely by full-time administrators (the adult education branch of the Los Angeles school system in 1947-48). Part-time administration has been a contributing factor to, as well as a symptom of, a marginal position. This index suggests that marginality has been partially reduced during the last twenty-five years.381

In this quotation Clark identifies three values of a variable of marginality. He claims that the common variable is a contributing factor, symptom, and an index of marginality. The three variable values identified by Clark differentiate among administrative status: the status wherein administration of the adult education subunit is a secondary responsibility; the status where separate, but part-time administrators are appointed; and the status where full-time administrators are appointed as administrators of adult education subunits. The gradual increase in full-time positions within the Branch, which increase Clark refers to in the quotation, indicates that the

381Ibid., p. 58.
variable is continuous rather than discrete. An individual administrator may be appointed for any portion of a full-time equivalent.

Clark appears to use the terms activity, adult education, program, and activity synonymously in quotation M4 for purposes of identifying adult education organizational subunits in a general sense. He more specifically identifies the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System as a specific example of an adult education organizational unit experiencing a state of marginality during 1931 through 1948. He refers to the Branch as a department in the state.

Clark appears to first make general statements concerning his concept of marginality and then to cite his specific application, that being the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System.

Clark used the term marginality for the fifth time in his Monograph in describing what he identifies as his third symptom. (M5)

3. A third symptom of marginality is the absence of separate plant facilities and other fixed capital. If adult education were a basic purpose of the schools, with a status approximating that of other levels, it would possess special facilities. If a comparison is made to the junior college, the loss in organizational stability is apparent. Once a school system has equipped a junior college with classrooms, machine shop, library, and football stadium, there is a reasonable guaranty that it will remain. The adult school, in contrast, has no physical roots with which to protect itself against retrenchment; it can more readily be consolidated or discontinued. Moreover, plant facilities must be used that are not easily adapted to adult use. Classes are held in elementary and high school rooms or at branches located on nonschool properties. The adult administrators seek separate facilities, but they have little chance of
obtaining them from public funds. Thus it becomes a struggle to obtain even small wooden bungalows on school property for the sole use of adult classes in Los Angeles.

Comparisons with junior colleges are particularly useful, since adult education and junior college education are the younger school programs. High schools began to push upward into the thirteenth and fourteenth years about 1907; separate junior colleges were authorized, with state support, in 1921. Their initial expansion thus began in approximately the same era as that of the adult schools. State of California Department of Education, Thirty-third Biennial Report, 1928, Part I, pp. 27-29.  

Clark describes the adult education element said to be experiencing marginality as adult education, an adult school, classes, and adult classes in Los Angeles.

Clark identifies his variable as "the absence of separate plant facilities and other fixed capital." Clark has identified a negative—the absence of something—as a symptom of marginality. Such an assertion is illogical. Burke's explanation of the function of negatives helps to substantiate the absurdity of suggesting a negative as a symptom. Noting that the addition of negatives "to the universe is solely a product of human symbol systems" Burke declared that:

...there are no negatives in nature, where everything simply is what it is and as it is. To look for negatives in nature would be as absurd as though you were to go out hunting for the square root of minus-one. The negative is a function peculiar to symbol

---

382 Ibid., p. 59.
383 Ibid., p. 59.
systems, quite as the square root of minus-one is an implication of a certain mathematical symbol system.

The quickest way to demonstrate the sheer symbolicity of the negative is to look at any object, say, a table, and to remind yourself that, though it is exactly what it is, you could go on for the rest of your life saying all the things that it is not. "It is not a book, it is not a house, it is not Times Square," etc., etc. ... But so far as the actual state of affairs is concerned, some situation positively prevails, and that's that.\textsuperscript{385}

Perhaps all that is necessary is to redefine separate plant facilities and other fixed capitol as an index of status rather than accept Clark's definition of the general absence of separate plant facilities and other fixed capitol as a "factor" contributing to low status or as Clark worded it, "the precariousness of the adult schools."\textsuperscript{386} He appeared to have been explaining how separate plant facilities and other fixed capital brings status and stability to organizational units possessing it. Clark characterized the adult education subunits in California as having few separate facilities and limited fixed capital. For Clark to then suggest that stability is lost through possession of "a large capital investment"\textsuperscript{387} is contrary to the balance of Clark's argument and is felt to be in error.

If Clark's preceding statement is accepted as error and the existence of separate plant facilities and other fixed capital

\textsuperscript{385}Ibid., p. 9-10.

\textsuperscript{386}Clark, Dissertation, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{387}Ibid.
is redefined as an index of status, then Clark's interpretation of the effects of this index of marginality seems reasonable in the context of his case study of the adult schools within the Los Angeles Public School System. Again, however, relativeness is a factor. Much depends on the nature of the parental organization. If it is the nature of the organization to utilize facilities owned by others rather than to secure and maintain facilities for its primary purposes, and the organization has little fixed capital, then it would be illogical to maintain that the adult education subunit operating under conditions similarly experienced by other subunits within the organization is experiencing organizational marginality. True the organization as a whole may be marginal to society, but the description of such a status calls for use of concepts quite distinct from Clark's concept of marginality.

Clark did not use the term marginality in the description of his fourth variable of marginality.\textsuperscript{388}

Clark enumerated his fifth and sixth variables of marginality in his Monograph, identifying them as "an ambiguous index," a "hypothetical index," and as a "symptom" of marginality.\textsuperscript{389}

(M6 and M7)

5. The most important symptom of the present marginality of the adult school is the necessity of having to sell the program to the public and especially to other educators. This need is strongly

\textsuperscript{388}Idem, Monograph, p. 59.

\textsuperscript{389}Ibid., pp. 59-60.
felt within the ranks of the Los Angeles adult administrators. It stands out in the reports of such state-wide groups as the California Association of Adult Education Administrators and in the bulletins of the Bureau of Adult Education of the California State Department of Education. The administrators define their position as "stepchild" in nature. They perceive that they are not afforded a fundamental acceptance by other schoolmen and by state legislators.

...the adult programs should...be accepted...as an equal partner when it comes to the status of the administrator, the pay of its teachers, use of facilities and so on. This equality should be thoroughgoing and sweep away the various forms of second-class treatment of adult educators and their students which are still found in many districts. Members of governing boards, superintendents, and day school administrators and teachers...tend to tolerate or show condescension toward adult programs as though they were step-children in the family of public schools, taken in for their subsistence allowances rather than for themselves.  

To the extent that the program's educational value is ranked low relative to other uses of school funds, the position of the adult school is insecure. Organizational marginality is the basic source of insecurity for administrative branches of adult education. The long-term problem of adult-school administrators is to achieve a "peer" position. They badly need a parity level, clearly defined and respected by all. The search for acceptance is a struggle for security.

---

7 Ibid., pp. 80-81.  

Clark's context of application in the preceding quotation

---

390 Ibid., pp. 59-60.
is "adult school"\textsuperscript{391} in particular, and "Los Angeles"\textsuperscript{392} in general. Clark has added to his description of the variable the quotation from the Montecito Workshop wherein he addresses the status of adult education administrators, but appears to do so in the light of its effect on acceptance of adult programs which tended to be tolerated as "step-children in the family of public schools."\textsuperscript{393}

Clark's used the term marginality for the eighth and ninth times in his Monograph in description of his sixth variable of marginality.

(M8 and M9)

6. Since adult education is financed within high school and junior college districts, much of its budgetary support has been derivative and often unanticipated. The amount of state aid is an ambiguous index of program marginality. The early bonuses for adult education were indicative of little local support and reflect the attempts of state authorities to back the program. In the face of local marginality generous state aid has been a strong prop. This suggests a hypothetical index. One real test of program strength would be the scaling down of state aid to the same proportion allotted to other programs. The reduction would force local boards to assess program value. A real test is not likely to happen in a clear-cut way, but posing it as a hypothetical test is useful. Both advocates and opponents of the present program agree that fundamental changes would be made. Opponents have sought to limit state aid for certain types of classes, knowing that local boards would not support these classes out of local taxes. Adult educators, on the other hand, have feared and fought such changes. The existing program could not maintain itself in its present form if its budget value were reduced. Since state aid may be modified from year to year, adult administrators are always faced with the possibility of an adverse change.

\textsuperscript{391}Ibid., p. 59.

\textsuperscript{392}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{393}Ibid., p. 60.
It seems evident that security for the adult school is dependent upon the acceptance, principally by those with power within school ranks, of adult education as a central activity of the public school, or, minimally, acceptance at a well-defined, stabilized parity level. That this position has not been achieved is reasonably clear to both participants and observers.\textsuperscript{394}

Clark appears to make a distinction between what he terms program marginality and local marginality. He labeled the "amount of state aid"\textsuperscript{395} as an ambiguous index of program marginality and cites as evidence the fact that state financial support of adult education programs is not reflective of support such programs receive locally. It appears that Clark's evaluation of marginality is from a local perspective rather than from the perspective of the state or from perspectives of internal and external status granting groups considered either individually or collectively. Clark's distinction between program marginality and local marginality appears to be based on an evaluative perspective, rather than on differentiation among adult education elements or values said to be experiencing marginality. Clark refers to the ambiguous element or value said to be experiencing marginality as adult education, a program, program value, classes, an adult school, and as a central activity of the public school. Once the questions of evaluative perspective and identification of the element or value are addressed, the third delemma is the determination of

\textsuperscript{394}Ibid., p. 60.

\textsuperscript{395}Ibid.
the range of context under consideration. In quotations M8 and M9 Clark refers to consideration of marginality on a local basis by local board, within school ranks including high school and junior college districts, and on a state basis.

Clark's next two uses of the term are to explain the relationship of the concept of marginality to that of an enrollment economy. Clark defined an enrollment economy as a state in which the number one administrative concern is enrollment and sustained attendance in the face of voluntary student participation. Clark suggested:

(M10 and M11)

...that the enrollment economy constitutes the basic complex of pressures operating upon the adult school. This is because organizational needs for survival and security are distinctly shaped in the adult education context by these factors.

To comprehend its potential impact, the enrollment economy should be seen in relation to other conditions. The peripheral status of the adult school is very important: the greater the marginality, the stronger is the pressure of the enrollment economy. School systems will not contribute generously to a program they only weakly accept; program administrators who are insecure because of marginal status are more susceptible to the pressures upon them.

Purpose plays a significant role in relation to operating pressures. In the following section, the manifest goals of adult education are analyzed. This discussion will then provide us with a configuration of three historical conditions: the marginality of organizational activity, the pressures of the enrollment economy, and the potential effect of stated purpose.396

Clark identifies the adult education element as an adult

---

396Ibid., p. 62-3.
school and later in the quotation refers to it as both a program and as adult education. Previously in his discussion of the enrollment economy, he identified the necessity for the adult schools to compete for scarce funds with "elementary and high school units," which units had priority claims on the funds. These units constitute the comparative elements in the first application of a concept of marginality. The parental organization is identified in this quotation as "school systems," but earlier in his discussion of the enrollment economy, Clark specified the parental unit in the California context to be "school districts" assumed to be the elementary, high school and junior college districts identified in discussion of his first variable of marginality. The California State Department of Education would, therefore, constitute a supra-parental organization.

Clark appears to be applying concepts of marginality to three distinct elements: first, to the adult school; second, to program administrators; and third, to an organizational activity. Marginal status, a term used in the quotation to describe the relative state of existence of program administrators, assumed to refer to administrators of adult schools, has been defined earlier in this thesis by this author

\[397\text{Ibid., p. 61.}\]

\[398\text{Ibid., p. 62.}\]

\[399\text{Ibid., p. 61.}\]

\[400\text{Ibid., p. 58.}\]
as a synonym for marginality.

Clark next uses the term marginality in summarizing the effects of the third historical condition identified by him in quotation (M11), goals of adult education.

(M12)

In summary, the diffuse goals of adult education are not likely to control decision-making. Their generality widens the discretion of program administrators. In the context of the enrollment economy pressures, where organizational survival and security depend upon the solving of attendance problems, the day-to-day interpretation of such open-ended purpose is likely to be shaped by these solutions. And, in the context of marginality, it is even more likely that basic organizational needs will rule the day.

As the most significant factors in the environment of decision-making, the three conditions specified in this chapter may be viewed as underlying the development of the adult school in California. These abstracted elements do not determine all facets of organizational behavior, but they distinctly and importantly shape orientation, motivation, and action.401

The adult school in California constitutes the adult education element in the preceding quotation. No comparative elements or parental organizations are identified.

Clark does not specify in which ways his three conditions shape orientation, motivation, and action in adult education elements, but he appears to suggest that where adult education elements experience marginality, the likelihood that their organizational needs will be given priority decreases. It is assumed that adult education elements experiencing marginality

401Ibid., pp. 65-6.
will be influenced more by the needs to respond to pressure groups, requests and mandates from the parental organization within which they exist, and to the necessity to attract and retain enrollment, than to idealistic goals and objectives which have been established by administrators of the adult education element. Clark appears to view adult education elements experiencing marginality as possessing very little internal control over their existence and development.

Clark's next three uses of the term were used to describe how marginality perpetuated a dependency on state aid within California:

(M13, M14, M15, and M16)

In the adult school the assessment of course value becomes very difficult. Traditional methods of evaluation—written work, examinations, course accreditation—are not feasible, and there are no systematic techniques to take their place. Attendance has become the evaluational criterion, applied across the board to courses, teachers, and student groups. The adult administrators stress this as their basic standard. Courses are deemed successful or unsuccessful on this basis, and it is felt that where students remain with a class they must be benefiting from it. The enrollment criterion is an objective, easily applied yardstick. Moreover, it reduces administrative anxiety by lessening the need for contending with purposes as criteria of course initiation and evaluation. With open-ended goals, purpose criteria have been ambiguous. The concreteness of the attendance criterion makes it highly serviceable in this context. The enrollment standard possesses an objectivity and universal meaning that is somewhat similar to the profit criterion of success in private business.

It should be understood that these operating procedures have arisen in the context of organizational marginality with its pressures for adaptation. Until the marginality of the adult school is reduced, or special safeguards are given to the program, administrators must bank heavily on the survival and security potentialities of state aid.
Thus marginality forces attention toward attendance. This condition holds for the adult education branch, thought it has the largest public-school program in the country. The peripheral nature of the branch's present activity is partially indicated by its status as a 2 per cent item in the budget.

In a special meeting with the board of education in January, 1953, the Los Angeles adult administrators stressed that the chief instrument of curriculum evaluation is the "attendance that remains" in classes. Two other methods of evaluation were mentioned: reports by advisory committees and classroom visitation. It is realistic to stress, as the administrators emphasize, that the logic of the situation makes attendance the yardstick of evaluation.

Special Meeting of the Board of Education, January 8, 1953 (field notes of author).  

The Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System is the only adult education element which was positively identified in the preceding quotation. On a more generalized level, yet still confined to organizational contexts, Clark identified organizational categories of adult education elements including adult classes, adult schools, and the Branch, which groupings or sub-groupings could be the focus in application of a concept of marginality. Clark's reference to a program and to public-school programs in the United States could denote any or all of the adult education categories just enumerated or could be used to denote educational processes occurring within these contexts. No comparative elements are named by Clark in the preceding quotation.

Clark refers to operating procedures having "arisen in the context of organizational marginality, with its pressures for

\(^{402}\)Ibid., p. 83.
adaptation." The operating procedures he refers to appear to be the acceptance of an enrollment criterion as the basis for course initiation, acceptance of level of attendance as a universal evaluational criterion for course success, and for teacher and student performance; and establishment of open-ended goals. The absence of goals within an adult education subunit would constitute the existence of an open-ended perspective. In this quotation Clark does not suggest a causal relationship between marginality and these cited operating procedures. In his earlier discussion of one of the operating procedures, the enrollment economy, Clark noted:

the greater the marginality, the stronger is the pressure of the enrollment economy. School systems will not contribute generously to a program they only weakly accept; program administrators who are insecure because of marginal status are more susceptible to the pressures upon them.  

It is not apparent whether the marginality which Clark addresses is that of the organizational unit or of the adult administrator. Nevertheless, it is the adult administrator who is most susceptible to the operating pressures in a context of marginality.

Clark states that "marginality forces attention toward attendance. This condition holds for the adult education branch, though it has the largest public-school program in the

403 Ibid.
404 Ibid., p. 62.
405 Ibid., p. 83.
country."\textsuperscript{406} This untested assumption by Clark will be challenged in the Non-categorical Observations section to follow. Clark continued to suggest that the "peripheral nature of the branch's present activity is partially indicated by its status as a 2 per cent item in the budget."\textsuperscript{406} Clark appears to equate a "peripheral nature" with a condition of marginality and appears to be suggesting that both absolute size and relative size are indices of varying significance of marginality.

The sixteenth and seventeenth uses of the term in Clark's Monograph were used to explain an other-directed administrative orientation. \textsuperscript{(M16 and M17)}

Marginality, diffuse goals, and the pressures of the enrollment economy lay the basis for a strong "other-directed" orientation on the part of adult education administrators. They tend to face outward, toward clientele and critics, not inward toward traditional rules and their own conception of right and wrong. The pressures of the enrollment economy foster sensitivity to outside demands; insecurity resulting from marginality reenforces this sensitivity, and open-ended purpose encourages it.

The importance of the other-directed orientation is evidenced by the administrative duties that are deemed most significant. Administrative duties may be divided into three categories: routine school administration; selection, training, and supervision of teachers; and community relations. Overriding the internal duties in importance is the work outside the schools. Some of this emphasis appears in the following description by the supervisor of adult education:

\begin{quote}
In Los Angeles we like to have Principals organize and direct the program in the various communities. We want the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{406}Ibid.
Principal to be one who has extensive community contacts. We want him to be enthusiastic; to be a promoter; to be an evaluator; to be one who is alert to organize and develop any proper educational program, in any place at any time, which will serve the adult community in which his school is located.39

The principals are expected to build programs that will serve a particular neighborhood. They are to canvass individual and group desires by means of the petition, the sign-up list, and informal assessment. They are expected to take an active part in community voluntary associations; a good adult administrator is effective on the "luncheon circuit." This type of work not only results in a larger number of classes but has value in improving public relations. Also, to protect themselves against program restrictions by higher authorities, the principals give attention to political activity. This was evident in 1952-53, both in relation to the state legislature, which was considering restrictive legislation, and the local board of education, which was dubious about the value of many courses. For a number of reasons, then, the role of the administrator becomes that of a salesman-promoter, and the adult administrator often speaks of himself in such terms.

In this way the highly competent "modern" principal becomes defined as one who is vocal in championing adult education, and adroit in developing community contacts. As a concomitant, internal administration and the training of a teaching force tend to be deëmphasized. Supervision, in particular, becomes devalued as a proper activity of the administrator.

38Riesman uses this concept to denote the type of character of many persons in modern society. "Other-directed" behavior is especially sensitive to outside cues from the immediate environment, in contrast with inner-directed and tradition-directed behavior. Of special interest here is that other-directed behavior can be the product of role mandates as over against the dictates of personality. In the present context the term is used to refer to the orientation of a work role. Personal experience with administrators indicates a range of personality types among them, with many tending to be inner-directed men. The pressure of the job, however, is to force other-directedness regardless of character type. See David
Clark apparently equates an other-directed program with low status or low acceptance, depending on which of Clark's concepts of marginality is being applied. He noted that marginality "reënforces" a "sensitivity...to outside demands," which sensitivity is fostered by pressures of an enrollment economy and is encouraged by an open-ended purpose.\(^7\) Because of this attempt by Clark to show the relationship among the four concepts, it would appear that Clark views marginality, an enrollment economy, and open-ended goals as mutually exclusive concepts. However, his definitions of each are too abstract to allow identification of possible common elements among them. When Clark maintains that "marginality, diffuse goals, and the pressures of the enrollment economy lay the basis for a strong 'other-directed orientation on the part of adult education administrators,'"\(^9\) it is not clear whether he views an other-directed orientation as an index of each of the three concepts or whether all three are causes of the other-directed orientation. If the latter, then the three concepts of marginality, an enrollment economy, and open-ended goals, may have one or more common causal elements.

\(^7\)Ibid., pp. 106-7.
\(^8\)Ibid., p. 107.
\(^9\)Ibid., pp. 106-7.
Clark uses a number of terms to identify adult education elements. The terms adult classes and courses might be accepted as synonyms. Although much of Clark's preceding commentary is at the class level within various levels of the California School System, his level of focus might be considered to be that of schools because of his examination of administrative roles at this organizational level. No comparative elements are specifically identified.

Following a "review of administrative practice in the adult education branch," Clark wrote of the necessity for "marginal school programs" to defend and legitimize themselves. His eighteenth use of the term marginality was in explanation of the first of "three basic principles of legitimacy that have been widely used in attempting to gain acceptance for a service program." (M18)

1. Adult education is a low-cost operation. The seeds of this principle lie in the generous state support discussed in chapters i and ii. It is an argument used principally within school systems when the program must be defended before boards of education and other administrators. One point in the argument is that local districts do not have to spend much for the program, since it is covered in large part by state funds. A second point is that the program takes only 2 or 3 per cent of the school budget, and no substantial saving can be made by cutting into it. The greatest temptation to support

\[\text{\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 118.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}Ibid.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.}\]
the program in this way lies in districts where the program is most insecure and where, at the same time, it has more than paid for itself out of state funds. It is least used where the adult education men realize that acceptance on this basis is debilitating, for it perpetuates their marginality and undermines more ethical principles. State leaders have cautioned against this type of defense, urging that the program be defended on the ground of its intrinsic education value.\textsuperscript{10} In the Los Angeles system the principle is used infrequently and in a mild form. It is sometimes stressed that adult education is less expensive than the high school and junior college programs, with the implication that the program obtains greater returns per dollar of expense and is efficiently administered.\textsuperscript{11} This argument has utility, especially when used in conjunction with the following two principles. But it is clear that this is a minimal-defense type of principle, tending to legitimize adult education at the margin.

\textsuperscript{10}Dr. George C. Mann, chief of the Bureau of Adult Education, has stressed this point in conferences and workshops of adult education.

\textsuperscript{11}In Los Angeles in 1952-53, direct per capita costs were $365.44 for junior colleges, $349.82 for senior high schools, and $223.23 for adult schools. The adult administrators bring this comparison in expenses to the attention of the Board of Education.\textsuperscript{413}

Clark repeatedly referred to a "program" which may be equated with all formal adult education classes in a parental organizational system within California, or a portion, thereof. While he does refer to the adult education element as simply adult education, it is assumed his reference was synonymous to what he repeatedly identified as "the program."\textsuperscript{414} Clark identified three potential parental systems, the local school

\textsuperscript{413}Ibid., pp. 118-9.

\textsuperscript{414}Ibid.
districts, the Los Angeles School System, and the California School System. There is no indication as to which level or whether his description of organizational systems applied to all three. Clark compared "adult education"\(^{15}\) to "high school and junior college programs"\(^{16}\) assumed to be a comparison of adult education programs collectively to programs occurring in high schools and junior colleges. Collective groupings could be made at any of the three school system levels identified by Clark in quotation M18--district, Los Angeles School System, or state level. While Clark's application is non-specific in that a particular adult education element and parental system are not named, and specific comparative elements are, therefore, not identifiable, it nevertheless is consistent, with two exceptions. First, Clark footnotes an example which is not consistent with his discussion, and second, when he applies his concept of marginality it is to adult education men,\(^{17}\) not to the programs on which he focuses elsewhere throughout the quotation.

This inconsistency in the footnoted material is in his comparison of senior high schools and junior colleges with adult schools. An earlier assumption was that Clark's "program"\(^{18}\) referred to adult education classes aggregated. Clark's unit of

\(^{15}\)Ibid., p. 119.
\(^{16}\)Ibid.
\(^{17}\)Ibid.
\(^{18}\)Ibid.
comparison at this point appears to be a cumulative total of all adult schools to cumulative totals of comparative elements within a common parental system.

Clark's nineteenth use of the term occurs in the introduction of his Chapter V, focusing on continuing insecurities of adult schools and efforts to reduce their vulnerability:

(M19)

The adult program is expected to be "educational" and worthy of public funds. And what is educational and valuable is defined by historically derived norms and values. The behavior of teachers and administrators at other school levels is governed by relatively stable expectations in the school and in the community. Although these norms arose from and are centered around the education of the young, they are generally transferred to the adult school. A course is expected to have an educational rationale; teachers should transmit knowledge and skill to students at a high rate of return on the school dollar; teachers should not be too adaptive to student demands; history and mathematics are more legitimate than hobbies as subject matter; administrators are to be professional program builders, articulating and integrating courses into meaningful curricular patterns.

The adult-school administrators cannot ignore these traditional norms, no matter how much they may feel their work [is] misunderstood. Since it is so important to them that marginality be reduced, the judgment of established groups on proper behavior becomes a crucial matter. It is not surprising, therefore, that the work of the adult administrators must be aligned with a logic of respectability, as defined by existing norms and proper educational practice. To put it bluntly, the service program must face up to the school context. Hence the dilemma of the adult school: Are the administrators to follow the logic of an out-and-out service program, as it is propelled by the demands of the enrollment economy, or should they allow themselves to be guided by general school norms, gaining acceptance by doing the traditionally proper thing? This dilemma is no trivial matter, since it is formed by conflicting
organizational needs. In general, the short-run needs of the enrollment economy are incompatible with the long-run need of obtaining educational respectability.

Clark addressed the relationship between a concept of marginality and "the judgment of established groups on proper behavior,"\textsuperscript{20} which proper behavior he labeled as traditional norms. He appears to have used different concepts of norms within the quotation. There is difficulty in determining Clark's precise definition of his concept of marginality in this quotation because he names several distinct adult education elements.

While parental systems are identified only as school systems by Clark in the preceding quotation, other school levels mentioned by Clark may be understood as terms denoting comparative elements.

Clark's use of three terms denoting the existence of adult education elements at two or more levels is problematic. In quotation M19, Clark wrote of courses, programs, and schools. Both courses and schools might be referred to as a program so Clark's use of the term is unclear. If the adult education element is identified as courses, then comparisons might be made among courses taught in public elementary schools, junior high schools, high schools, junior colleges, colleges, and universities. If the adult education element is specified as a

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 123.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
school, then status is considered among all other comparative subunits within a common parental system, not just of courses which such comparative subunits sponsor.

Clark suggested that adult schools had difficulty "attaining a reputable status"\(^\text{21}\) in association with his twentieth use of the term, marginality. Clark referred to a Senate interim committee constituted in California in 1951 with investigatory and punitive powers.\(^\text{22}\) He noted:

\[\text{(M20)}\]

\begin{quote}
The 1951-1953 investigation of the adult education program in California highlights the difficulty the adult school has had in attaining a reputable status under its triple handicap of marginality, open-ended purpose, and severe enrollment economy pressures. The rules of administrative conduct that have emerged within the service organizations are not compatible with gaining acceptance on traditional grounds. The administrators have tried to justify their practices by means of the ideology of service, but they must contend with the traditional principle that each course should be judged on its relative educational merits. The latter means program building on the basis of professional discrimination among endless subject-matter alternatives.\(^\text{23}\)
\end{quote}

Clark most frequently defined marginality as low status of an adult education element within an educational organization. In quotation M20, Clark appears to be giving his interpretation of the outcome of the Senate interim committee investigation which he felt highlighted "the difficulty the adult school has

\[^{21}\text{Ibid., p. 129.}\]
\[^{22}\text{Ibid., pp. 125-6.}\]
\[^{23}\text{Ibid., p. 129.}\]
had in attaining a reputable status.\textsuperscript{424} While this passage can be interpreted to mean that Clark feels the adult school had attained a reputable status with difficulty, it is unlikely he intended such an interpretation. When Clark uses the terms reputable status, it is understood to mean a high ranking on variables viewed favorably by a specific individual or group and a low ranking on variables viewed negatively by the same individual or group. Concepts of reputation and status demand both value judgments on given variables and ranking of elements according to their conformity with such judgments.

If Clark's concepts of "reputable status"\textsuperscript{425} and marginality are defined as opposing concepts of status on given variables, and if those variables are common in both cases, then it was circular reasoning to suggest that marginality is part of a triple handicap making it difficult to attain a reputable status. Clark is, therefore, interpreted to be saying that low status is one of three variables making it difficult for adult schools to achieve high status—not a well thought out statement.

Clark used three term in the preceding quotation to identify adult education elements: program, school, and course. It is assumed that his concept of program included both the adult school and the courses he referred to elsewhere, but it may have been more all-inclusive, suggesting the inclusion of

\textsuperscript{424} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{425} Ibid.
other unidentified adult education elements. In his comments on the actions of the Senate interim committee on adult education, Clark referred to adult classes and adult education. Adult classes may have been included in Clark's concept of program and he may have used adult education and the term, program, synonymously.

Despite attacks from a legislative Senate interim committee, Clark maintained that:

(M21)

The state legislature may threaten the adult school's legitimacy and perpetuate its marginal status, but it cannot directly supervise the program nor divert it from a service orientation. The adult school survives such pressures; but its position is not strengthened thereby.

A more fundamental threat to the adult school now comes from an internal source rather than from such external ones. This is the expansion of the junior college into adult education. If we wish to understand the basic sources of continuing insecurity for the adult school, we must briefly discuss the California junior college. For it is in defending the adult school enterprise against the junior college expansion that the perpetuation of marginality becomes most injurious. Where attacks from the legislature, interest groups, and some educators reverse the process of legitimation, the adult school is more vulnerable to competition from other school departments. The likelihood is enhanced that other educational levels will become the chosen instruments of public-school adult education, with school funds and popular support going to them. Clientele groups do not seem intensely loyal to particular adult schools, but rather are attached to the notion of having interesting classes provided at convenient locations. The junior college now claims it can provide such a service better than can the adult school.\footnote{Ibid, p. 130.}
Clark entitled a three and one-half page section of his Monograph, "Marginality of Adult Education." While at times he discussed the marginality of the field of adult education, in quotation M21 he specifically discusses the marginality of adult schools and the threat posed to the adult schools by the junior colleges of California of becoming the principal vehicle for education of adults. The discussion does not concern an increase or decrease of status for adult education in general, but rather the possible reassignment of mandate for education of adults from one system subunit to another. Clark speaks of the "expansion of the junior college into adult education." This in and of itself does not necessarily mean a lower status for an adult school so long as junior college programs do not directly compete with adult schools for enrollments, facilities, subject areas, system financing, or on the basis of whatever variables of status are being used. However, even when geography separates the service populations, similar programs, such as the education of adults, tend to compete for common resources. When an adult school program is held constant, alterations in any comparative element can affect a change of status for the adult school. When Clark speaks of "defending the adult school enterprise against the junior college expansion," the expansion could be thought of in two different ways. The junior

\[\text{\textsuperscript{427}}\text{Ibid., pp. 57-60.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{428}}\text{Ibid., p. 130.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{429}}\text{Ibid.}\]
colleges might directly compete with an adult school by offering similar courses to a common population, or indirectly by offering alternative curricula to a common population or by placing an additional funding demand on a common parental system.

He wrote that "it is in defending the adult school enterprise against the junior college expansion that the perpetuation of marginality becomes most injurious." This is interpreted to mean that because of the marginality of an adult school, it has insufficient power to defend its own territories. These territories might include a claim to state funds and an exclusive mandate for the education of adults, geographic areas, populations, subject areas, courses, curricula, or programs.

It is somewhat difficult to conceptualize from quotation what Clark meant when he wrote of the possibility of the state legislature threatening the "adult school's legitimacy," and of "attacks from the legislature" reversing the process of legitimation. Adult education in the California School System has existed under permissive legislation, meaning that "the state authorizes adult classes, but makes no mandate for them." The process of legitimation of adult schools within the California School System included

\[\text{30} \text{Ibid.} \]
\[\text{31} \text{Ibid.} \]
\[\text{32} \text{Ibid.} \]
\[\text{33} \text{Ibid., p. 58.} \]
enacting of permissive legislation, allowing establishment of adult classes and schools, permissive use of public school facilities, granting of state apportionment funds to evening high schools based on "actual attendance," a special bonus grants for "the first thirty units of attendance," b redefining of the attendance day from the 4-hour high school day to a 3-hour day giving adult schools a one-third increase in ADA state funding, c and tying apportionment funding levels for high schools to the success of their associated adult schools based on average daily attendance. d These may have been actions Clark had in mind when he wrote of reversing the process of legitimation. It is impossible to determine whether he had withdrawal of this permissive legislation and these supports and advantages in mind when he wrote of reversing the process of legitimation, or whether extension of overlapping mandates, supports and advantages to other subunits within the system is the reversal process Clark intended to address.

Clark refers to individual adult schools six times in this quotation, to adult schools collectively once, and he uses six additional labels to denote adult schools individually or collectively. Clark compares the adult school(s) to both "other school departments" and "other school levels" within the

---

a Ibid., p. 52.
b Ibid.
c Ibid., pp. 54-5.
d Ibid., pp. 55-6.
California School System. His use of the term levels, is confusing in that it may refer to organizational differentiations based on an unannounced variable, such as number of years of schooling, or it may refer to learning attainment assessed on the basis of an unspecified value or instrument reflecting such values.

Clark summarized his chapter on "CONTINUING INSECURITIES" in which he discussed attacks from the State Legislature and competition from community colleges within the state of California, by reviewing what he perceived as "two main sources of continuing insecurity":

This chapter has reviewed two main sources of continuing insecurity for the adult school in the California public school system: the challenge to legitimacy from lay quarters, and the competition of the community college. The first causes insecurity by blocking the move of the adult school toward an accepted role; it tends to keep the program marginal. The community college contributes to insecurity by threatening to take over adult education within the local school system. This would not be a threat if the adult school were firmly established and accepted; it is vulnerable because of its marginality. Thus the challenge to legitimacy contributes to the second source of insecurity.

Clark appears to be defining marginality in the preceding quotation as both the condition of low acceptance and as being

\[\text{M22}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{38}}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 130.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{39}}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 123-41.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{40}}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 140.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{41}}\text{Ibid.}\]
less than "firmly established." According to earlier concepts of marginality used in this thesis, based on definitions of status, adult education organizational subunits may be both well-accepted and established, yet may be afforded low status within an organization. Such low status may persist despite the existence of well-developed classes, adequate resources to achieve most institutional objectives, instructors who received appropriate training, achievement of and continued maintenance of both an acceptable level and efficiency of work and product, and both standards for and a record of outcome and efficiency which match or exceed those of similar institutions. Status of adult education subunits among other subunits within a common parental organization, which is one concept of marginality, is highly dependent on internal strengths and distributions of status within a common parental organization.

Conceptually it would appear that effects of marginality would be highly influenced by the range and distribution of status within an organization and by the rate of parental organizational transition. If an adult education subunit is viewed favorably, is highly supported, and the funding or success of the parental organization or its other subunits is highly correlated with the success of the adult education subunit, as was the case when state apportionment levels for high schools in California were tied to adult school ADA levels, then even when the adult education subunit receives a low

\[\text{\ref{footnote}}\] Ibid.
178

ranking, detrimental effects to the adult education subunit are likely to be mitigated. Both the degree of required change and its rate will influence the effects of marginality.

Clark addresses the marginality of the adult school in the California school system in quotation M22. He also discusses adult education within "the local school system." One's view of organizational transition and variables affecting it may vary as it is considered from different organizational levels. Clark's frequent shifting from one adult education element to another and between system levels increases the difficulty of comprehending both his reported observations and the range of explanations for such transition. In the preceding quotation it might be reflected in the difference in considering the marginality of adult education and the marginality of the adult school. Marginality of an adult school increases the possibility of a transfer of adult classes from the subunit of which the adult schools are a part and wherein the classes are not well accepted and have a low status, to another subunit wherein adult classes and administrative practices in support of the classes are more harmonious with the balance of the subunit.

In quotation M23 Clark identifies marginality as a variable influencing change in educational values and in the school units through which they are implemented. Clark noted:

\[\text{\textendquote}^{43}\text{Ibid.}\]
The emphasis upon attendance in this report, for example, is comparable to the emphasis it receives in administrative practice. Moreover, this report has indicated that such an emphasis is mainly a product of organizational conditions and processes, not a matter of "good" or "bad" motivation of individual administrators. There is little doubt that organizational marginality is a prime condition affecting the evolution of school programs and educational values. It is hoped that other inquiries will refine these points and further isolate the organizational developments that lead to predictable institutional trends in education.

Clark announced in his Introduction of the Monograph that his interest was why and how educational values change.

In modern society, what occurs in various institutional systems is a matter of organizational action. Educational values are obviously implemented by school units; if we are concerned with why and how these values change, we must look to the organizations themselves and to their problems. With formal organization having become the tools of social action in large, complex societies, the study of institutional dynamics entails the way in which administrative branches are shaped and in turn affect the nature of an institution.

Educational values identified in quotation M23 were said by Clark to be affected by organizational marginality. Clark stated that organizational marginality affects both "the evolution of school programs and educational values." Clark stated that his Monograph was concerned with how and why educational values change. This is his first application of a
concept of marginality to educational values in his Monograph. Two adult education elements are identified as experiencing organizational marginality. The school programs could be considered as adult education subunits although no comparative element or parental organization is specifically named. Likewise with Clark's identification of educational values, no comparative values are named nor is the system in which the values are held.

Clark's twenty-fourth use of the term marginality is in his introduction of four characteristics of organizations which he felt caused unguided change:

(M24)

We shall next consider four characteristics of organization that generate unguided forms of institutional change. These aspects of organization are generalized here, since they are potentially applicable to other contexts. They are: the nature of administrative purpose, the marginality of an organizational activity, the extent of centralization of authority, and the degree of professionalism among organizational personnel.

6One of the earliest treatments of institutions in American sociology, that of William Graham Sumner, stressed a distinction between enacted and crescive (unenacted) institutions. More recent views have emphasized that all institutions have crescive elements, and that institutional development is mainly a matter of naturally emergent forms of behavior. See Maclver and Page, loc. cit.447

In quotation M25, Clark appears to define educational activity as both process and as an organizational subunit.

447Ibid., pp. 144-5.
First, it appears that he considers the educational activity as part of a movement, the adult education movement. Second, he wrote of administrative goals, which he imprecisely labeled as goals of leadership, being transmitted to the hierarchically least significant subunit of an adult education subunit (adult education subunit as defined in this thesis). Clark wrote:

(M25)

In the educational activity described in this report, the original purposes of the adult education movement were so broadened after 1925 that it became synonymous with all adult learning; moreover, specialization of purpose was not carried out. The diffuse goals of higher levels of leadership have simply been transmitted down the organizational hierarchies to the smallest subunits of the adult education apparatus. The emergent structure of the adult school has placed a number of obstacles in the way of an effective breakdown for purpose. First, the pressures of marginality and the enrollment economy force administrative action to be guided by situational imperatives and to be little affected by codes directly related to educational ends. Second, preprofessional administrative training has been inadequate, and there has been little opportunity to inculcate administrative codes before the principals face difficult problems of organization. Third, the conditions of work have not permitted the stabilization of a teaching force, and hence the transmission of specific purposes to lower personnel has been unduly complicated. Fourth, as a subunit of large organizations, the adult school has specialized not in subject matter but in serving a geographic area. In Los Angeles there have been a few important exceptions, such as the Americanization and Citizenship Center. Geographic specialization has naturally been called for by the spatial distribution of school plants and student populations, and has been favored by organizational pressures.\textsuperscript{448}

The relationship Clark intended to establish between the

\textsuperscript{448}Ibid., pp. 147-8.
educational activity of his report and the adult education movement which he equated with "all adult learning," is ambiguous, although it is assumed that the educational activity would be considered to be part of a total adult education movement and part of "all adult learning." When he writes, however, that "the diffuse goals of higher levels of leadership have simply been transmitted down the organizational hierarchies to the smallest subunits of the adult education apparatus," he confines his application to what has been termed organizational marginality within this thesis. That is, he addresses the status of an adult education organizational element which is attached to a parental organization wherein the primary objectives and functions are other than the education of adults.

Clark identifies two distinct adult education organizational elements in the quotation: the adult school and the Americanization and Citizenship Center, both of which are organizational subunits of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System.

---

449 Ibid., p. 147.
450 Ibid.
451 Ibid.
452 The term subunit is used here to denote (2) a subordinate portion of a larger adult education organizational unit, not as defined for use elsewhere in this thesis where it is used to denote (1) an organizational adult education element which is organizationally subordinate to a parental organization or physically larger or more powerful organizational element whose primary objective and function is not the education of adults.
Clark's reference to "a subunit of large organizations" is ambiguous. The Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, while a subunit, in sense one, of the Los Angeles School System, is larger in comparison to the twenty-four adult schools and the Americanization and Citizenship Center, which organizational elements might be considered as subunits, in sense two, to the Branch.

While two organizational elements are identified in quotation M25, both are considered to be adult education subunits in sense one. They may be considered individually or collectively in establishing status among other subunits of a common parental organization. When considered individually, the remaining subunit constitutes one comparative element, but standing alone is of little value in establishing the status of adult education subunits within a parental organization wherein primary objectives and functions are other than the education of adults. While more than one adult education subunit may exist, and when establishing the marginality of such an individual subunit one might make comparisons among other adult and non-adult education subunits, comparisons to other adult education subunits only would be of little value in attempts to establish the status of an adult education subunit within a total parental organization wherein the primary objective and function is other than the education of adults.

When more than one adult education element is identified in

---

Clark, Monograph, p. 148.
an application of a concept of marginality, and such elements are considered to be part of a common parental system, each might constitute comparative elements, along with other non-adult education elements, when the marginality of an individual adult education element is being assessed or considered. Because the utility of comparisons among adult education elements for purposes of establishing the marginality of individual adult education elements is perceived to be negligible, adult education elements are not listed as comparative elements in the individually tabled contextual and key element analyses of term uses by Clark for the term marginality.

Clark's last four uses of the term marginality in his Monograph appear in his discussion of the "Effect of Marginal Status." The section is an expanded version of his Dissertation section titled, "The Effect of Marginality." In renaming the section, Clark substitutes the terms marginal status for the term marginality. These terms were accepted by this author as synonyms earlier in this thesis.

While specific adult education subunits, comparative elements, and parental organizations are named in Clark's lead paragraph, generic identifications are employed with his twenty-sixth through twenty-ninth uses of the term marginality. He wrote of "peripheral programs [assumed to be his identification

\[454\] Ibid., pp. 148-50.

of the adult education element] within multiprogram organizations [generic terminology for parental organizations];""56 "worker education programs [adult education elements] within trade unions [parental organizations];""57 and "extension programs [adult education elements] in universities [parental organizations];""58 and maintained that these adult education elements within their corresponding parental systems "are plagued by the same difficulties that prevail within the public school framework""59—a generic identification of the supra-parental system of his case study.

In writing of the effect of marginality, however, Clark distances his context from the specific enumerated examples to use generic identifications of adult elements and comparative elements. He explained:

(M25)

Security is the prime prerequisite for responsibility in education, in the sense of consistent, goal-directed behavior.11 Marginality as a prime source of insecurity, tends to undercut the autonomy of administration, and to render decision-making more susceptible to external influences. Administrative action is then judged to be irresponsible, inconsistent in terms of goals, and overly responsive to immediate desires. This study has shown that the marginal status of adult education is likely to make administrators especially sensitive to the preferences of community groups, and oriented toward using the program for such ulterior motives as

---

"56 Idem, Monograph, p. 148.
"57 Ibid.
"58 Ibid.
"59 Ibid.
improving public relations for other school departments.

For an extended, general treatment of executive responsibility, see Barnard, op. cit., chap. xvii.  

Clark is interpreted as maintaining that marginality is a prime source of insecurity. He says it is marginality which "tends to undercut the autonomy of administration," understood to be the autonomy of administrators of the adult education element, not so much the autonomy of administrators of the total system. Clark further suggests that it is marginality which renders administrative "decision-making more susceptible to external influences." Clark suggests that marginality sensitizes administrators to immediate demands of external groups and use of the adult education element for secondary purposes such as for "improving public relations for other school departments [considered within this thesis to be comparative elements]." Likewise, it is surmised that his reference to a program was to denote the use of the adult education element for improvement of public relations within other comparative elements within a common parental system, which comparative elements Clark identified as "other school

\[\text{\textsuperscript{460}}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 149.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{461}}\text{Ibid.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{462}}\text{Ibid.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{463}}\text{Ibid.}\]
Clark animates his concept of marginality with term use M27. He wrote:

(M27 and M28)

It follows that a peripheral status will shape administrative ideology, calling for doctrines that will strengthen the organization. Since marginality seeks adjustments beneficial to security here and now, it also demands an administrative ideology that will provide a morally satisfying rationale for these adjustments. In adult education, marginality has strengthened the need for a doctrine of service, or what might also be called a doctrine of immediate needs. The service doctrine currently in use may be viewed as a natural response to insecurity, for this ideology clearly sanctions the tendency to provide service to many groups within and outside the school system in return for their support.\(^6\)

Clark refers to the adult education element in M27 and M28 simply as adult education. He appears to use the nonrestrictive terms in an effort to generalize his concepts of marginality across the field of adult education. Although he has used concepts of marginality outside of organizational contexts in his Monograph, he appears to constrain his generalization in these quotations through his reference to "the organization."\(^6\)

The purpose of Clark's animation of his applied concept of marginality in quotations M27 and M28 is unclear. He does not explain the way in which marginality would seek adjustments, demand an administrative ideology, or strengthen a need.

The final text use of the term marginality in the Monograph

\(^4\)Ibid.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Ibid.
appears in Clark's summary of the "Effect of Marginal Status": 467

(M29)

A marginal position for an activity within larger organizations weakens the hand of its own work force in controlling its development. In its institutional consequences, this means that organizational marginality will typically contribute to an unguided institutional evolution. 468

Clark continues to generalize in his summary of the effect of marginality. While he does not confine himself to the field of adult education, nor specify his "activity" 469 as an adult education element, these assumptions are made. An activity might exist anywhere in society, but Clark appears to confine his focus to organizational contexts through noting that his activity occurs or exists "within a larger organization," and through his reference to "organizational marginality," and "institutional evolution." 470

An activity is more frequently thought of as a process than as an organizational unit. However, the latter is assumed because Clark suggested that the activity existed within a larger organization and because his reference to "an unguided institutional evolution" 471 in the Monograph would most

---

467Ibid., pp. 148-50.
468Ibid., p. 150.
469Ibid.
470Ibid.
471Ibid.
logically be in reference to the adult schools of the Los Angeles School System.

The term marginality is used twice additionally within Clark's Monograph, first in the Table of Contents listing the subsection, "Marginality of Adult Education," and finally within the Index.

In all, Clark used the term marginality twenty-nine times in the text of his Monograph.

Examination of Clark's twenty-nine uses of the term marginality from the text of his Monograph has resulted in the identification of numerous distinctions among concepts of marginality. The notation of such distinctions enables their tabling for purposes of further analysis. Chapter VI is a description of the table and the analysis made possible through the textual examination contained in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid., pp. 57-60.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE OF USES OF THE TERM MARGINALITY IN CLARK'S MONOGRAPH

Each of Clark's uses of marginality was quoted in context from his Monograph and discussed in the preceding chapter. Data were identified using the classification scheme proposed for categorizing uses of the term marginality tabled from Clark's Dissertation.

Categories used in Chapter IV for classifying uses of the term marginality are used in this chapter to classify uses of the same term from Clark's Monograph. New elements and contexts within categories are reflected in the classification table and will be discussed. This chapter is dedicated to the presentation of tabled observations from the twenty-nine uses of the term marginality which were identified in text contained in Clark's Monograph, and to their discussion and analysis. Observations will also be made pertaining to uses of the term marginality in the Monograph which do not lend themselves to categorization. This will occur under the section heading, Non-classifiable Observations. The twenty-nine term uses have been
assigned the designations M1 through M29.

Categorical definitions will stand as proposed earlier in the definition of categories accompanying presentation of the classification schema in Chapter IV. New elements or contexts added to the schema will be discussed as data in the various categories are reviewed. General observations concerning Table 4 will follow.

The basic premise stated in Chapter IV concerning the feasibility and importance of identifying the adult education element, comparative elements, and the parental system or context, when using concepts of marginality, is accepted likewise for uses of the term identified in the Monograph.

**Marginality of the General Value of Adult Education and Learning**

Clark announced that his concern in writing the Monograph was for the how and why of values change.

Educational values are obviously implemented by school units; if we are concerned with why and how these values change, we must look to the organizations themselves and to their problems.⁷³

Because of the preceding introductory comment in the Monograph, it was anticipated that concepts of marginality might be applied by Clark to denote the status of either adult learning or adult education beliefs or standards, singly or collectively, among comparative learning or educational beliefs or standards, respectively, which values are held elsewhere in

⁷³Clark, Monograph, p. 43.
OF THE TERM MARGINALITY IN HIS DISSERTATION

EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Parental Organization

NON-ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT
Marginality External

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other School Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other School Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Central Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Established, well-Accepted Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Comparative Element Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within An Immediate Parental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within A Supra-Parental Organization (Level III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California School System (State Dept. of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles School System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity
Class
Course
Function
Interaction
Program

Marginality External to the Field of Adult Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Contextual and Key Element Analysis of Burton R. Clark's Marginality of the General Value of Adult Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Values</th>
<th>Quotation Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Branches of Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult School Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult School(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americanization and Citizenship Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Adult Education of the California Association of Adult Education Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Adult Education Subunit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Educational Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A single application of a concept of marginality to values was identified in the Monograph. Rather than using the concept of marginality to denote the status of adult education or learning values, the status denoted through Clark's use of the term "organizational marginality" was said to be "a prime condition affecting the evolution of school programs and educational values." It appears he is stating that organizational status of either an adult school or "a marginal school program" affects the evolution of educational values. It is not clear whether he believed the evolution of educational values is affected throughout the total system or whether the effect is confined to values of the adult education subunit(s) or segments thereof.

While quotation M23 is an example of an application of a concept of marginality to values, it is an indirect rather than a direct application in that Clark suggests that organizational marginality affects the evolution of educational values, which values might experience marginal status in relation to other more central values held elsewhere in the larger system.

When Clark proposed his hypothetical test designed to "force local boards to assess program value" in quotation M9, he wrote of the worth of programs, not of the status of values of

\[^{74}\text{Ibid., p. 141; see M23 for complete quotation.}\]
\[^{75}\text{Ibid., p. 140.}\]
\[^{76}\text{Ibid.}\]
an adult education program relative to values held elsewhere within organizational subunits of a larger parental system wherein the primary values were not the education of adults. Worth denotes an absolute value judgment, status a relative standing. It was the absolute value of a program which Clark addressed in quotation M9, not the relative standing of the specific values associated with the program. Thus it is suggested that the concept of values marginality defined within this thesis was not the concept of marginality inferred by Clark in this instance.

**Marginality External to the Field of Adult Education**

Organizational as well as non-organizational elements may experience marginality external to the field of adult education. Because Clark used the term educational values in association with his use of the term marginality in quotation M1, the possibility exists that he was addressing the marginality of educational values. Insufficient evidence existed, as illustrated by the lack of data falling within this category in Table 4, however, to conclude that Clark was addressing the status of adult education values in relationship to other educational values within an organization or system, or within a broader societal context.

**Marginality of the Field of Adult Education**

While Clark used the term, adult education, in association with seventeen of his twenty-nine applications of the term marginality within his *Monograph*, no comparison was made to
other fields of study or practice, and no direct application of a concept of marginality to the field as a whole was apparent. While his use of the term, adult education, might lead to the conclusion that concepts of marginality are applied to the field of adult education as a whole, absence of comparisons in the document to other fields of study or practice does not support such a conclusion. Clark's reference to "other programs" might be understood as a reference to a field of study or practice separate from adult education were it not for his use of the term program elsewhere in citations in which he used the term marginality as a designation for organizational units.

Because of the multiple adult education elements named in association with Clark's use of the term marginality in his Monograph and the multiple comparative elements named in three of the seven instances in which he used the term marginality, determining how Clark has applied a concept of marginality in each of his twenty-nine applications has been a tedious, and in most instances an impossible task. Comparative elements named by Clark appear to denote segments of the field of adult education rather than the whole field.

Clark titled his second subsection of Chapter II, "Marginality of Adult Education." While one might prematurely conclude that he was addressing the marginality of the field, a

---

477Ibid., p. 60.
478See references M1, M5, and M18.
479Clark, Monograph, p. 57.
closer examination of the adult education and comparative elements named by Clark in the section results in identification of various concepts of marginality being applied to segments of the adult education field. Clark makes comparisons to elementary education, public high schools, junior colleges—treated as different school levels. He appears to use the term level to denote organizational divisions or subunits rather than other fields of study or practice. His further comparisons were to senior high schools, other educational levels, strong central departments, other school departments, high school programs, junior college programs, established programs, and other programs, and to elementary, high school and junior college education, leads to the conclusion, because of the nature of comparative elements identified by Clark, that his concepts of marginality were applied to segments of what traditionally would be considered to be the field of adult education.

Within the Monograph and associated with Clark's use of the term marginality, no concrete evidence was identified which would indicate that Clark used the term to denote the status of the field, as a whole, to other fields of study or practice.

**Organizational Marginality**

With the exception of the one application in quotation M23 of a concept of marginality to values, all other uses of the term by Clark in his Monograph appear to be confined to organizational contexts. It is not concluded that all concepts of marginality applied by Clark in the Monograph were confined
to organizational contexts. Rather, the absence of identification of non-organizational comparative elements by Clark, and his identification of numerous adult education and comparative elements illustrate his tendency to confine his use of concepts of marginality to organizational contexts.

Each of three elements identified in the analysis of Table 3 as essential elements for both application of and interpretation of concepts of marginality within the field of adult education represent key classifications in Table 4 and will serve as chapter subtitles within which identified elements classified in the table will be discussed. The importance of key elements in understanding and applying concepts of marginality was described as it was introduced in Chapter IV.

Adult Education Element

The term adult education element is used here to denote the individual(s), process(es), location(s), or organizational subunit(s) said by Clark to be experiencing marginality in the field of adult education. Terms used by Clark in his Monograph to label the adult education element vary in specificity. The two terms used by Clark most frequently in association with his use of the term marginality—the terms program and adult education—may denote adult education subunits, processes, or values. Clark used the term program in association with eighteen of his twenty-nine uses of the term marginality. The term program in these eighteen passages appears to have been used by Clark to denote the adult education element said to be experiencing marginality. Used by Clark in association with
these same eighteen uses of the term marginality were fifteen additional labels which would also be understood to be designations of the adult education elements said to be experiencing marginality. The fifteen labels were: administrative branches of adult education, adult classes, adult education, adult education men, Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, adult education departments, adult school enterprise, adult school program, Americanization and Citizenship Center, Bureau of Adult Education of the California Department of Education, California Association of Adult Education Administrators, courses, program values, public school adult education, and public school program.

It appears that Clark used several of these labels synonymously. In other instances it would appear that he was suggesting that several organizational units, such as classes, programs or adult schools, experience marginality as a collective. In still other quotations, among the fifteen identified as containing the adult education element labeled program in addition to one of more additional labels identifying the same or additional adult education elements, it becomes clear that Clark was suggesting with a single use of the term marginality that multiple adult education elements were experiencing or may experience the condition.

Clark used the term adult education to denote the adult education element seventeen times in association with his use of the term marginality. Of the seventeen quotations in which the term adult education appears, the term adult schools was used to
denote the same or additional adult education elements eight times; and the term program was used twelve times to denote the same or additional adult education elements. Eight labels in addition to adult education and adult schools were used to denote adult education elements in quotations within which Clark used the term marginality: activity, adult classes, Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, adult education departments, courses, adult education men, adult school enterprise, and public school adult education. Clark offered no reason for his shifting among labels used to denote elements said to be experiencing marginality. While several terms used by Clark could reasonably be understood as synonymous labels, several terms used in the Monograph to denote elements said by Clark to have experienced marginality are used as distinct labels.

Only four of the seventeen labels used by Clark in his Dissertation to denote elements identified to have been experiencing marginality through use of the specific term were used similarly in the Monograph. Four exceptions were: administrative agencies, adult administrators, adult education enterprise and organization. He used seven adult education element labels in the Monograph which had not been used in the Dissertation in association with the term marginality: educational values, administrative branches of adult education, adult education men, adult school enterprise, Americanization and Citizenship Center, courses, and public school adult education.
The labels for the adult education element denote individual elements in five instances. Clark's Monograph individual elements. In five instances the labels for the adult education element identified in association with Clark's uses of the term marginality denotes multiple elements which, for purposes of determining status, are to be considered collectively. In the majority of instances the specificity of terms used by Clark to identify adult education elements used in association with his use of the term marginality, and description of contexts to which the labels pertain were insufficient to determine whether labels were used to denote elements to be considered individually or collectively. Concepts of marginality associated with values and individuals are distinctive from concepts of marginality used to denote status of organizational subunits and processes, which appear to be Clark's most common applications of the term marginality in both the Dissertation and the Monograph.

Clark, in association with his use of the term marginality, uses adult education element labels in his Monograph which in normal usage would be understood as designations of organizational units, organizational subunits, educational or learning processes, locations, or values. Because of multiple adult education element labels being used in association with most uses of the term marginality in the Monograph with inadequate contextual information available from Clark's writing in most instances to determine the nature of the concept of marginality as applied, it is only through supposition that the
reader can attempt to understand Clark's various concepts of marginality.

As in the previous analysis of adult education element labels used in association with the term marginality by Clark in his Dissertation one might attempt to identify each label from the Monograph according to its possible application to organizational units, organizational subunits, individuals, processes, locations, and values. Observations regarding use of adult education element labels common to both manuscripts appear to hold in contexts common to both. Clark introduced four adult education element labels in the Monograph. When he wrote of the marginality of administrative agencies, it could be in reference to the status of independent adult education institutions in society. Adult education subunits within larger systems were primary objectives, and functions were other than the education of adults, or adult education administrative agency values in relation to those held elsewhere within society. Clark's reference to the marginality of adult administrators can be understood as addressing the status of individual or groups of adult administrators in relation to other administrators within a common organization, system, or society. Although the label adult education enterprise as used by Clark would most likely be understood as denoting an adult education organizational unit or subunit, one might also understand it as a process label. When Clark refers to the marginality of organization, because the document focuses on adult education, the use of the term as a label for an adult education unit or subunit would be a common
interpretation.

Clark's writings applying his concepts of marginality in the *Monograph* can be characterized as being somewhat casual and non-specific. Further interpretation of his use of adult education element labels used in association with the term marginality in the document and any statistical manipulation of the data beyond the reporting of frequencies seems inappropriate.

**Comparative Element**

Comparative elements serve as reference points for determining status of adult education elements when named in association with applications of concepts of marginality. Without identification of comparative elements, applications of concepts of marginality are incomplete and unclear. Furthermore, the determination of status demands the comparison of like classes of elements—organizational units to organizational units, processes to processes, values to values, individuals to individuals, and comparison of locations to locations.

Clark identified comparative elements in ten of the twenty-nine contexts in which the term marginality was used in his *Monograph*. In the remaining nineteen contexts, his use of the term marginality was unclear, based on the absence of identified comparative elements.

Clark used twenty-three different comparative element labels in the ten contexts wherein he identified comparative elements in association with his use of the term marginality.
Up to six comparative element labels were used in association with a single use of the term marginality. Frequently when multiple distinct comparative elements were identified, they were not of a like class. In term use M1, for example, Clark used the comparative element labels elementary, high school, and junior college education; other school levels; established programs; and strong central departments. Education, school levels, programs, and departments do not belong in a common class when defined through popular use. Clark presents the reader a task more challenging than comparing apples and oranges. And what is the adult education element named by Clark in association with these comparative elements? Clark wrote of an "adult program," defining it as "a separate, peripheral activity," and of "adult education," clarifying it as "a marginal program within the school system." In the first instance, Clark appears to be defining the adult education element as an activity, and in the second instance as an organizational subunit. Attempting to compare what appear to be two distinct adult education elements to education, school levels, programs, and departments for purposes of determining status is not a clear-cut task.

There appears to be some basis for comparison among some adult education and comparative elements identified in association with term uses M1, M10, M11, and M18. No such logical basis for comparison appears to exist between adult education and comparative elements named in association with term uses M5 and M21.
Clark confines his identification of comparative elements to a single element or class of elements in four\textsuperscript{880} of twenty-nine uses in the Monograph. In one of the four instances, M9, the comparative element named by Clark is potentially comparable to adult education elements named by him in association with his use of the term marginality.

Only the general label for comparative elements, "other school levels," was repeated from the Dissertation in Clark's Monograph. Sixteen additional comparative element labels were used in the Monograph in association with nine of Clark's twenty-nine uses of the term marginality. None of the newly introduced comparative element labels was used more than twice in the document in association with Clark's use of the term marginality.

The use in the Monograph of only one comparative element label from the six previously used in the Dissertation and the introduction of sixteen additional comparative element labels appears to be a significant observation in the analysis of Clark's uses of concepts of marginality in the Dissertation and Monograph. The further observations concerning Clark's identification of adult education and comparative elements which do not lend themselves to logical comparison for purposes of establishing status, have a negative impact on conceptual clarity associated with Clark's use of the term marginality in his Monograph.

\textsuperscript{880}See term uses M9, M19, M22, and M26.
In summary, the sparsity of comparative elements and Clark's tendency to identify multiple comparative elements in association with his use of the term marginality, when such comparative elements are identified, are major barriers to conceptual clarity. In the first instance the reader is left without a basis of comparison for purposes of establishing status among elements. In the second instance Clark's identification of multiple comparative elements presents an impossible task when either the comparative elements are not of a common class or comparative elements or parental organizations do not lend themselves to the necessary comparisons for establishment of status.

Parental Organization

Specification of a parental organization adds clarity to application of a concept of marginality through identifying the range across which status is to be assessed. While there are no conclusive attempts by Clark in the Monograph to apply concepts of marginality beyond the boundaries of various school systems, his use of numerous adult education and comparative element labels in association with his use of the term marginality in the document are seldom sufficiently specific to determine the range across which status is to be assessed.

Clark used both generic and specific labels in his Monograph to identify parental organizations. In his introduction of manuscript sections in which he used the term marginality, Clark frequently introduced parental organization labels, which might be thought of as contextual labels in that
they identify the range of application within which a concept of marginality applies. Clark often specifically or generically identified more than one parental organization in such introductions and in association with individual uses of the term marginality. Most labels clearly identified distinct parental organizations.

When both specific and generic labels were used in association with a single use of the term marginality, it was often difficult to discern whether or not the specific context was part of the larger generically labeled context, or whether both the generic and specific parental organization labels identified an identical context.

Clark's identification of parental organizations in direct association with his uses of the term marginality or in introduction of manuscript sections wherein use of the term marginality occurred, or his use of specific or generic labels for adult education and comparative elements, were sufficient in twenty-one of twenty-nine cases in which the term marginality was used in his Monograph to conclude that the parental system was within the generic category designated as a "school system." Clark used the generic categories of "large organizations" twice, local school system once, a school system in the United States thrice, elementary school districts thrice, high school districts twice, junior college districts four times, and local districts once. The parental organization most frequently identified in association with Clark's use of the term marginality in his Monograph was the California School System,
named in association with seventeen of his twenty-nine uses of the term marginality. Reference was made ten times to the Los Angeles School System.

Specific identification of parental organizations were given in Clark's references to the Los Angeles School System and to the California School System. Again, while these labels are considered to be specific, each might require detailed definition to facilitate a full understanding of contexts of status. Of sixty-nine references to parental organizations occurring in association with uses of the term marginality in the Monograph, twenty-seven were specific and forty-two were generic. Parental organizations were identifiable in all but four instances. More than one parental organization was mentioned in association with nineteen of the twenty-five uses of the term marginality in which parental organizations were identified. Up to four distinct organizations were identified in association with an individual term usage. Again, when multiple parental organizations are identified within the context of a single use of the term marginality, the specificity of the term and concept of marginality is weakened.

Non-organizational Marginality

The Non-organizational Marginality categorical label appearing in Table 4 is for the designation of adult education elements felt to be experiencing a state of marginality outside of formal organizational contexts.

While Clark used the terms activity, classes, courses, and programs within the Monograph as adult education element labels,
no application was specified as occurring outside of the formal organizational settings which were the foci of Clark's study. While there is a lack of supportive evidence for the classification of Clark's usage of these terms as non-organizational, there is concurrently a lack of sufficient contextual detail in association with Clark's uses of the term marginality in the Monograph to rule out classifications within this category.

Summary of Contextual and Key Element Analysis for Clark's Use of the Term Marginality within the Monograph

Clark made conflicting statements in his Monograph concerning the focus of the document. In his Acknowledgments he claimed that: "This study is based upon a doctoral dissertation completed in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles." The dissertation to which he refers is assumed to be his own, wherein he announced his case-study-in-depth to be the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System.\footnote{Idem, Dissertation, pp. 3-4.} Next he announced that his "sociological study of educational administration directly concerns the adult school in California."\footnote{Idem, Monograph, p. 43.} The Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System was organizationally charted by Clark as including twenty-four such schools. The question became whether the study concerned the specific Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System, its twenty-
four adult schools, or all adult schools in California. When Clark announced that the "adult school in California has gradually taken on a service character,"\textsuperscript{83} one then needed to ask whether Clark was writing of individual adult schools or adult schools collectively.

It then appears that Clark makes a distinction between adult education and adult schools when he noted that "the marginal position of adult education within the public school system and the effect this status has upon the adult school"\textsuperscript{84} is the first of three factors considered to be of basic importance in "accounting for the emergence of this service character."\textsuperscript{85}

Within the opening three pages of the Monograph Clark began to identify keys to understanding his application of the term marginality, a puzzle which becomes increasingly confusing through his use of twenty-four adult education element labels in association with his twenty-nine textual uses of the term marginality. Most distracting to the effort to understand his use of the term marginality was his use of several adult education element labels in association with a single use of the term marginality. This necessitated determinations of whether the labels were used synonymously, whether Clark was suggesting that each element experienced marginality, or whether the

\textsuperscript{83}Ibid., p. 45.

\textsuperscript{84}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{85}Ibid.
existence of multiple adult education elements was indicative of casual writing.

Had Clark been more consistent in his use of comparative element labels and in his labeling of parental systems or contexts, much of the confusion associated with his use of the term marginality in the *Monograph* may have been clarified. Obviously from interpretation of the data, this did not occur. Clark identified comparative elements in only seven contexts associated with his twenty-nine uses of the term marginality. Although parental systems or contexts were labeled by Clark in twenty-five of the twenty-nine contexts, the naming of multiple systems and contradictory systems was the rule.

Not a single instance was identified where information was adequate to identify the status noted by Clark's use of the term marginality. While he did identify what he felt were variables of marginality, identification of organizational elements among which the variables were to be measured for the determination of status was found to be inadequate in the *Monograph*, without exception.

In summary, there appears to be little logical consistency in Clark's identification of adult education elements, comparative elements, and parental systems or contexts labeled in association with his use of the term marginality in the *Monograph*. As illustrated in the preceding analysis of each element category, Clark chose to use generic terms when applying his concepts of marginality. Clark did not identify, in most instances, specific adult education elements in association with
his use of the term marginality. When identification of the adult education element was specific, the identification of their nature was never adequately specific for determination of their nature—be they activities, classes, courses, functions, interactions, programs, or organizational units—and to facilitate their comparison to other elements in a logically consistent parental system or context.

Clark's writing is casual to the extent that it demonstrates inconsistency among key elements which he identified in specific contexts, and lack of detail, made it impossible to draw conclusions concerning the condition Clark intended to denote in each context.

While Clark's use of various adult education and comparative element labels, and parental systems or contexts alternate so frequently that no conclusions concerning specific applications intended by Clark may remain unchallenged, there do appear to be tendencies of application within the Monograph. These tendencies could be characterized as application of the term marginality to denote the organizational status of adult schools collectively in comparison to other subunits within the California School System. No specific applications to independent adult education units or to their subunits or to adult educational elements outside of organizational contexts were identified.
CHAPTER VII:

USE OF THE TERM MARGINALITY IN CLARK'S DISSERTATION AND MONOGRAPH: COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

This chapter has two primary purposes. First, the uses of the term marginality in Clark's Dissertation and Monograph will be compared and contrasted. Comparisons of the data will be by contextual and key element categories as identified and labeled in Tables 3 and 4. Second, ancillary observations not lending themselves to categorization will be thematically labeled and analyzed. Most themes to be discussed in this chapter illustrate deficiencies in Clark's definition and application of concepts of marginality and are intended to help in the identification of distinctions that are necessary for the establishment of a typology for classification of precise concepts of marginality that will be proposed in Chapter VIII. They are viewed as potential aids for the defining of concepts of marginality.

Tabled Data: Compared and Contrasted

Tables 3 and 5, the contextual and key element analyses of Burton R. Clark's uses of the term marginality in his Dissertation and Monograph, respectively, serve as the basis for this first analysis. The data will be compared and contrasted by category, but first some general observations will be
Clark used the term marginality seventeen times in his Dissertation, a 233-page manuscript. The term was used in text twenty-nine times in Clark's 159-page Monograph. This is once for every 5.1 pages in the Dissertation compared to once for every 13.7 pages for the Monograph. Both documents reported the same study yet the frequency of Clark's use of the term in the Monograph was more than double the use in the Dissertation. A number of plausible explanations account for this. Clark, recognizing the popularity of the term, may have sought to further define his concepts of marginality in his Monograph, and thus used it more frequently. Clark's Dissertation was academically supervised. His Monograph may not have been so critically reviewed. Terms such as marginality may have been used by Clark in an attempt to convey meaning succinctly, thus accounting for the increased frequency for term use and the shorter document.

Although Clark did announce that the focus of his Dissertation was general educational values, no specific use of the term marginality to denote the status of adult education values was identified. In quotation M23, Clark noted that "There is little doubt that organizational marginality is a prime condition affecting the evolution of school programs and educational values." This was the sole specific application of the concept to values identified in any of Clark's writings,

**Idem, Monograph, p. 141.**
although from his introduction, one might have expected concepts of marginality to have been focused on general values.

No concepts of marginality appear to have been specifically applied external to the field of adult education in either document. None appears to have been specifically applied in non-organizational settings. The lack of affirmative data does not preclude the potential application of additional concepts of marginality within either context. It only reflects the fact that Clark did not make such an application.

With each use of the term marginality, Clark named an average of 3.2 different adult education element labels in the Dissertation and 3.1 in the Monograph. The variation is insignificant. Seventeen adult education element labels were used in the Dissertation. Thirteen of the seventeen labels were used in the Monograph and an additional seven elements were introduced.

The most significant changes were the dropping of Clark's application to "educational values" and his added specific application to "adult education men."487 This is an application of administrator system marginality, a human system marginality concept.

While Clark dealt with aggregate adult education subunits such as adult classes, adult education departments, adult schools, and activities in his Dissertation, labels identifying the adult education elements as individual elements equalled

487 Ibid., pp. 118-9.
aggregate labels in the Monograph.

The naming of comparative elements in association with the use of the term marginality increased from six labels being used in association with two of the seventeen uses of the term in the Dissertation to five labels being used eleven times in association with seven uses of the term marginality.

Nine labels were used to identify parental systems in Clark's Dissertation and eleven in the Monograph. Of the nine parental system labels used in the Dissertation, three were specific and six were generic. Of thirty-one label uses, nine were specific and twenty-two were generic. Sixty-nine parental system label uses were recorded for the Monograph. Twenty-seven were specific and forty-two generic.

Most often, Clark used generic labels to identify adult education and comparative elements, and parental systems or contexts in both documents. His writing concerning concepts of marginality was casual rather than scientific.

While Clark frequently identified adult education elements and parental systems, he seldom made comparisons for purposes of establishing status in association with his use of the term marginality.

In summary, Clark's application of concepts of marginality in the two manuscripts is described as conversational, rather than rigorously specific.

Ancillary Observations

While observations concerning Clark's use of labels for the identification of critical elements pertaining to concepts of
marginality have lent themselves to categorization, other observations do not and must be discussed thematically.

Several of the themes have been touched upon through presentation and analysis of tabled data. The thematic presentations allow development of distinctions which are important to processes whereby concepts of marginality are defined and tested. Some observations pertain to Clark's contradictory use of the term marginality; others to his casual handling of terms in his *Dissertation* and *Monograph* which have an effect on the clarity of his use of the term marginality. It is through meticulous examination of these observations and others that the implications of Clark's uses of the term marginality can best be recognized and serve as guidelines for further definition of concepts of marginality.

**Foci of Clark's Doctoral Study**

A major problem with Clark's introduction of concepts of marginality to the field of adult education rests with his inability or unwillingness to focus on a single context, or when switching contexts, to positively identify the adult education element said to be experiencing marginality. Clark announced in the introduction to his *Dissertation* that his study was one of "organizations, their values and their practices." He further specified that within his study, adult education was "considered the general value that is undergoing implementation by adult

---

education schools and departments."

Initially, one is led to believe that the general value of adult education will be the focus of Clark's Dissertation wherein his concept of marginality would be a description of the status of the general value of adult education to other societal values, such as the education of youth, defense, welfare, and secondary education. While Clark equated adult education with the general value, he also announced that his study was of organizations, identified as adult education schools and departments through which the general value of adult education is implemented. When one applies concepts of marginality to organizational practices, the ranking of a practice within an adult education context to comparative practices outside the context or outside the field of adult education, whichever is specified, is denoted. If the term function is understood to denote an activity, then Clark may have been suggesting that the sensitivity of an adult education subunit to vocalized public demand increases for purposes of security as the marginality of each adult education subunit activity increases.

Clark identified several foci for his study, including adult education organizations, adult education organizational values, and adult education organizational practices. Concepts of marginality may be applied to any of these foci to denote the status of adult education organizational units or subunits, adult education organizational values, or adult education

Ibid.

Ibid.
organizational practices in relation to organizational values, units, or values within comparative organizations, respectively.

Designations of status among organizational units, values, and practices, represent distinct concepts of marginality. It appears that Clark applied various concepts of marginality within his Dissertation and Monograph. Tabling of information relative to Clark's applications of the term marginality within his Dissertation and Monograph indicates his predominant focus on the school system wherein any of the three enumerated states of marginality might exist.

Although Clark explained in his Dissertation that his original intent was to limit his "purview to just the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System in order to have a case study in the institutionalizing of adult education," he also announced another focus. The necessity of examining "certain state-wide conditions in order to understand the development of local school units" became apparent to Clark after several months of research and was a strength of his Dissertation. The frequent transition between levels of application within Clark's Dissertation, however, has been puzzling. The designation of a level of application is essential in the assessment of organizational marginality.

In quotation M22 Clark first noted a causal relationship

---

91 See Table 3: Contextual and Key Element Analysis of Burton R. Clark's Uses of the Term Marginality in His Dissertation.

92 Clark, Dissertation, p. 3.
between his two variables, organizational marginality and educational values, which educational values, Clark noted, were "obviously implemented by school units." While both adult education elements, school programs, and educational values, may be considered to exist in organizational contexts, only in Clark's application would the school programs be classified as adult education subunits using the definition proposed earlier in this thesis. It is equally problematic that neither comparative subunits are identified in relationship to the named adult school programs, nor are comparative values identified for the adult educational values, said by Clark to be affected by organizational marginality. Furthermore, although Clark names numerous potential parental organizations for the school programs said to be affected by organizational marginality, there is no indication as to which is appropriate with this application. Likewise, the larger system wherein both the adult education values and comparative values exist is unannounced and is not discernable.

Lack of identification of the aforementioned data results in imprecise applications.

While many different adult education and comparative elements, and parental organizations, are identified in both Clark's Dissertation and Monograph, it appears there is a shift in focus between the two documents, despite Clark's announcement that his Monograph "is based on a doctoral dissertation

\(^{493}\text{Clark, Monograph, p. 43.}\)
completed in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.\footnote{Ibid., Acknowledgments.} He announced that his dissertation was:

...a study of organizations, their values and their practices. It directly concerns the development of adult education in the public school system of California.\footnote{Idem, Dissertation, p. 1.}

He described his "case-study-in-depth" to be of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System\footnote{Ibid., pp. 3-4.} which included the twenty-four adult schools of the system and the Americanization Center, among other organizational subunits.\footnote{Ibid., p. 48; Chart of the Organizational Structure of the Adult Education Branch, Division of Extension and Higher Education, Los Angeles School System, 1952-53, reproduced as Table 1 of this thesis.}

Clark's introduction of his monograph reflects a shift in the nature of his focus, which in turn has an impact upon the identification of comparative elements and parental organizations as they relate to application of concepts of marginality within the adult education field:

This sociological study of educational administration directly concerns the adult school in California and the way in which it has been shaped over the last quarter of a century as a definable and distinct type of public school enterprise....The adult school provides good case material for the analysis of institutional change in education....

The general finding of the study is that the adult school in California has gradually taken on a service character: programs are highly adaptive to the...
expressed interests of students and community groups, and the schools are in close relationship to their clientele.\textsuperscript{498}

The shift in focus is from the Adult Education Branch when the marginality of all twenty-four adult schools was considered collectively along with that of other units of the Branch, to where the marginality of individual adult schools is the focus. While a number of parental organizations are identified in both documents, it appears that the parental organization for the distinct case studies shifts from being the Los Angeles School System\textsuperscript{499} in the Dissertation to the California School System in the Monograph.\textsuperscript{500} Clark's naming of a "public school system in the United States"\textsuperscript{501} could support the identification of either the Los Angeles School System or the California School System as the pertinent parental organization in this, Clark's first use of the term marginality within his Monograph.

Because the case study is announced differently for each document and the focus appears to shift, it would be logical that the term, program, designates different adult education elements in the common title given to Chapter II in each document, "PRESSURES ON A MARGINAL PROGRAM." Likewise, when Clark addresses the "MARGINALITY OF ADULT EDUCATION"\textsuperscript{502} in his

\textsuperscript{498}Idem, Monograph, pp. 43-5.
\textsuperscript{499}Idem, Dissertation, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{500}Idem, Monograph, pp. 43-5.
\textsuperscript{501}Ibid., p. 58.
\textsuperscript{502}Ibid., pp. 57-60.
Monograph, quotation M1, it is entirely possible that the term, adult education, was meant to reflect distinctly different adult education elements paralleling the different meanings suggested by his use of the term program in the two documents.

Most perplexing was Clark's switch of focus in his Monograph from adult education programs, to his footnoted examples applied to adult schools, and then to his unexpected application of a concept of marginality to "adult education men." Such unannounced shifts in focus do not produce the contextual consistency necessary for considerations pertinent to development of a distinct concept, its theoretical testing, and empirical verification. The preceding observations support the conclusion that Clark used concepts of marginality to justify his theories of transition which he felt accounted for states of existence of adult schools and other adult education elements. Clark did not set out to develop or precisely define new concepts of marginality. Clark lacked a consistent focus in the reports of his research. This has been a major cause of confusion for readers seeking to understand the precise meaning of the term marginality in Clark's Dissertation and Monograph.

Introduction of the Term Marginality to Adult Education

While Clark is credited with introducing the term marginality to field of adult education in his Dissertation and Monograph, it would be presumptuous to suggest that he introduced the concept of marginality to the field. The data

503Ibid., p. 119.
would suggest that he used a single term to introduce and denote several indistinct concepts of marginality. It appears that once Clark used the term, he defined multiple concepts of marginality through indirect means.

He used a number of labels to denote the adult education elements which he described as experiencing marginality. Additional labels were used to denote comparative elements in reference to which the status of the adult education elements were described. Still other labels were used to denote parental systems and contexts, used to limit the range of comparison for purposes of determining status. Clark's use of the terms source, index, effect, symptom, base, evidence, contributing factor, condition, and hypothetical index appear to further define his use of the term marginality through identification of variables pertinent to his concepts of marginality. Because Clark did not provide a succinct definition for each of his various uses of the term marginality, it is only through consideration of these defining processes that one might understand Clark's several uses of the term and the meanings he assigned to each usage. It is also through consideration of these defining processes that one may recognize strengths, weaknesses, inconsistencies, and contradictions among Clark's concepts of marginality.

Various of Clark's processes directed at defining concepts of marginality are discussed in the thesis subsections to follow.
Relationship of Concepts Suggested

One of Clark's approaches to defining a concept of marginality was to relate it to other concepts. Clark related his concept of marginality to several other concepts in quotations M16 and M17. His explanation of the relationship among enrollment economy, open-ended goals, other-directed orientation, and concepts of marginality creates more questions than it solves. His concepts are not well defined, their indices are not adequately identified, and his treatment of the concepts as though they are mutually exclusive, is troublesome. It would appear that the four concepts may have common components, the identification of which would aid in explanations and testing of relationships.

Additionally, Clark's identification of various adult education subunits and parental organizations, without identifying the focus, range, or limits of application, makes it difficult to test his hypotheses theoretically or empirically. He does not specify his focus or list any comparative elements by which adult education subunits and parental organizations might logically be deduced.

Clark related a concept of marginality to yet other concepts used in his writings. In his Dissertation he stated a relationship between his concept of organizational marginality and the validation of an assessment of marginality. In quotation M2 he ambiguously states that either organizational marginality or the assessment of it is dependent upon "the degree of acceptance afforded a program by different groups
within and outside the school system." Clark continues in quotation M2 to equate his concept of organizational marginality with "peripheral status." Clark's hypothesized relationship between organizational marginality, defined as status within an organizational context, and acceptance will be discussed further in a later section of this thesis.

In summary, it is suggested that Clark's strategy of defining concepts of marginality by relating them to other concepts perhaps added to confusion surrounding his use of the term. Without a succinct definition for a concept of marginality and an understanding of its variables, the challenge to understand it in relationship to yet other vague concepts seems insurmountable.

Distinctions Between Concepts of Status and Acceptance

A major flaw in Clark's discussion of concepts of marginality in his Dissertation and Monograph is his confusion of concepts of status with concepts of acceptance. Clark appears to equate concepts of marginality with both status and acceptance.

In efforts to understand Clark's concept of marginality as it is applied in the field of adult education, it is important to distinguish between the concepts of acceptance and status. One might be equally accepting of adult education subunits and other subunits within a common parental organization. A

504Ibid., p. 58.
505Ibid.
measurement of status, however, infers both the ability to differentiate among such subunits and demands a ranking of subunits. Rankings allow one to denote the higher or lower status of the adult education subunit to comparative subunits. Rankings of status expressed as ratios denote the ability to differentiate and communicate the higher or lower status of the adult education subunit in relationship to comparative subunits.

It is felt that Clark's inconsistency in defining marginality as acceptance and also of defining it as status is more indicative of inattention to detail within his writing than to an intentional use of the terms synonymously. The definition of status for the term marginality has been assumed in the writing of this thesis and is supported by Clark's subsequent references in his Dissertation to states of existence of adult education elements, including his reference to a marginal status,\textsuperscript{506} and the multiple use of the terms, marginal position.\textsuperscript{507} It is maintained that acceptance denotes approval, whereas the affording of status implies an ability to differentiate among variables, which variables form the basis upon which one element is ranked above comparative elements. Marginality, or status, within the organizational contexts of adult education denotes the valuing of a comparative element above that of an adult education element. If validation of an assessment of marginality of an adult education element involves

\textsuperscript{506}Ibid., p. 36.

\textsuperscript{507}Ibid., pp. 27, 172 (3 uses), 203.
assessing acceptance, as Clark maintained in quotation D3, it is because the two distinct concepts are correlated, not because of a causative relationship which Clark, in quotation M2, maintains exists. Individuals and groups may be highly accepting or highly rejecting of adult education elements and their comparative elements. Only a concept of status requires their ranking. Organizational marginality is a concept denoting status within an organizational context.

While the term condition often carries with it negative connotations, it is also a designation of a state of being, a healthy state, and a social position or rank.\textsuperscript{508} In quotation D1 Clark defined marginality as a condition. From quotation D2 one might interpret marginality to be "the rank order of acceptance of different school programs."\textsuperscript{509} From quotation D3 one comes to understand marginality as a "precarious state," and more specifically as a "status," or relative state of existence, although Clark confuses the definition by suggesting the assessment of marginality is difficult because "the question of validation involves acceptance by different groups within and without the school system, and acceptance on various grounds."\textsuperscript{510} Based upon these first three quotations it is impossible to determine whether Clark is using the terms acceptance and status synonymously or is implying a high

\textsuperscript{508}Webster, 1973, s.v. "condition".

\textsuperscript{509}Clark, Dissertation, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{510}Ibid., pp. 25-6.
correlation between the two. Clark's standard formula for an index of marginality within quotation D13 appears to be the establishment of a ratio of an adult education element variable value to a variable value derived from a parental organization or from a total system.

First, let us consider the concept of acceptance. The existence of an adult education subunit within a parental organization is indicative of a degree of acceptance. To suggest that acceptance of an adult education subunit declines as its percentage of the total budget is reduced may have some basis. But to suggest that acceptance of an adult education subunit is lower than a comparative subunit in a different system based on a lower percentage of total budget may be fallacious, for the percentage of total budget given an adult education subunit may be influenced significantly by the number of subunits in the system or other intervening variables. Inferences of correlation between percentages of total budget and acceptance of adult education subunits is questionable.

Although Clark appeared to confuse the concepts of acceptance and status, the contention that concepts of marginality are concepts of status has been supported throughout this thesis. Clark insinuated through his proposed indices that the marginality of an adult education subunit was indicated by a comparative ratio of values for a common variable of the adult education element and parental organization. A ratio comparison of variables existent in an adult education subunit and those in a parental organization tells nothing concerning status until it
surpasses fifty percent. When the adult education subunit becomes in fact the predominant subunit, which might be indicated with a fifty percent ratio, or greater, of reliable indices, a logical conclusion can be made that the adult education subunit is not marginal. This might be based on such variables as size of enrollment, or budget, insofar as these variables in their context of use are reflective of status. In a state of existence where the adult education subunit maintains ratios for indices of status in excess of 50 percent, the adult education subunit possesses the highest status within the system. However, even where the adult education subunit encompasses more than fifty percent of the budget, enrollment, staff, and productivity of a parental organization, the possibility of the subunit experiencing marginality is not eliminated for the education of adults may be considered to be a secondary objective which enables the accomplishment of a primary objective.

Outside of this exception, other subunits within the parental organization must be identified along with their variable values and those of the adult education subunit in order to allow the establishment of ratios of status. It is as illogical to suggest the marginality of adult schools is represented by a ratio of their individual budgets to the budget of the total system as it is to suggest that a ratio of their total budgets to the total system, in and of itself, is indicative of marginality, defined as less than the highest status afforded within a given system. While it is impossible
to identify a state of marginality through such a comparative ratio, the absence of marginality might be indicated whenever the adult education subunit constitutes a majority of the whole.

One might suspect that marginality would decrease with increasing unit size, but at least in California, this did not seem to be the case. Even though the Adult Education Branch, understood to be that of the Los Angeles School System and not of the California state system, was identified as the largest public school program in the United States, Clark observed that marginality and diffused, open-ended program goals existed in general in the Branch.

If unit size were an index of marginality, then the fact that the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System is the largest in the United States would mean that marginality was universal in the public school setting.

Clark's two references to "the school system," and his references to "an expanding system" and "the total system" have been assumed to be references to the Los Angeles School System and not to the entire California State School System.\(^{511}\) The Los Angeles School System is considered to be the immediate parental organization of the Adult Education Branch. The Los Angeles School System in Clark's ratios is also used as a comparative unit to the Adult Education Branch. Hence, in indices which are presented by Clark in quotation D13, it serves as both a parental organization and comparative element.

\(^{511}\)Ibid.
Ratios presented by Clark in quotation D13 are not indices of status, but are, at most indices of acceptance. Comparisons between any subunit and its parental organization may reflect acceptance, but they do not constitute statements of status without identification of other organizational subunits and without the establishment of their relationships among other subunits of the organization or system.

Defining Marginality Through Identification of Conceptual Elements

Because expressions of status demand comparisons of elements across a given range, identification of such elements and the range is of primary importance for clarity where concepts of marginality are applied. Clarity of an application within adult education demands the identification of the adult education element said to be experiencing marginality, identification of comparative elements in relationship to which the status of the adult education element is determined, and identification of the parental system or context which is a specification of range across which elements will be ranked for purposes of establishing status.

There appear to be three major weaknesses in Clark's identification of these critical elements. First, Clark frequently used generic rather than specific labels to identify adult education and comparative elements identified in association with his use of the term marginality. Both generic and specific labels were also used to identify parental systems and contexts. Use of generic labels does not permit the reader
to visualize specific applications of the concept.

Second, several adult education elements and/or parental systems or contexts are frequently identified by Clark in association with a single use of the term marginality. Where more than one adult education element is identified in association with a single use of the term marginality, it is difficult to determine which of the adult education elements is said to be experiencing the condition of marginality and whether a common concept of marginality applies in each case. Likewise, when multiple parental systems or contexts are identified in association with a single use of the term, it is difficult to ascertain which identifies the range across which comparisons are made for purposes of establishing status. The identification of either individual or multiple comparative elements is not problematic in that the status of an adult education element may be in relation to either an individual comparative element or multiple comparative elements.

Third, when multiple comparative elements are identified, they frequently do not belong to a common class, which class must be in common with that of the adult education element. Without identification of comparative elements, be they organizational units, values, or practices, concepts of marginality defined within this thesis as designations of status are rendered incomplete and meaningless.

Clark used concepts of marginality within his discussion of an enrollment economy in quotations M10 and M11 to denote the status of an adult school, program administrators, and an
organizational activity. His reference to a program in the quotations could denote either the adult school or activity which he named. The term adult education used in quotation D10-D11 could be in reference to any or all of the three adult education elements named by Clark.

Clark's reference to programs in eleven of his seventeen applications of the term marginality within his Dissertation and in eighteen of his twenty-nine applications of the term marginality within his Monograph would allow application of the concepts of practice marginality and organizational marginality, alike, for the term program may be understood as a practice or as an organizational unit or subunit. While Clark did refer to adult education activities and functions which might be considered to be practices, the identification of various organizational units, such as adult education departments, branches, districts, classes, and bureaus in his application of concepts of marginality, leads to the conclusion that his most frequently used concept of marginality within both his Dissertation and Monograph was that of organizational marginality.

Utilization of a concept of organizational marginality demands the identification of the adult education element. Clark identified a number of adult education units within the Los Angeles School System for the 1952-3 academic year, as enumerated and discussed earlier in this thesis, in an

\[512\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 44.\]
organizational structure chart within his **Dissertation**. It appears that Clark's use of the term *activity* in quotation M25, which could be understood as either an adult education subunit or process, may have been purposely selected for its ambiguity, allowing for broad interpretation of his observations. In the quotation, Clark announced his intention to generalize. This may also account for the lack of identification of both comparative elements and parental

---

Ibid., p. 49.
organizations for both adult education elements, school programs and educational values, said by Clark to be affected by organizational marginality.

Clark identified comparative elements in association with only two of his uses of the term marginality in his Dissertation and in association with only seven of his twenty-nine uses in his Monograph. His identification of comparative elements in quotation D3 is problematic in a number of ways. Within the quotation, Clark addresses the difficulty in assessing and validating organizational marginality. In providing examples of organizational marginality, he identified a number of adult education elements and named several comparative elements.

In his first example, Clark appears to label the elementary, high school, and junior college levels of education as the primary education ladder and notes that adult education is not part of the ladder. If one is to interpret Clark literally, the unit for comparison are the different existent levels of education. Clark did not note whether the system was society or an educational system, although in keeping with his organizational focus, the latter would be assumed. For this concept of marginality to be more meaningful, educational levels would have to be identified so comparisons could be made among those educational levels and the adult education level. Contrasting the level of adult education and those units said by Clark to be part of the primary ladder, he noted that clientele

\[5^{14}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. 25-6.}\]
of adult education "exists almost completely outside of the compulsory-attendance age."\textsuperscript{515}

It is difficult to follow Clark's transition from his contrasting levels of education to his introduction of the variable of compulsory-attendance age. If Clark's compulsory-attendance age is the basis for assessment to a particular educational level, then his junior college educational level is troublesome because attendance at junior colleges is largely by those outside of the compulsory-attendance age, the same as with most adult education. It is assumed that the pre-school education and higher education would both constitute additional comparative education levels, although these levels are not identified by Clark.

In the literal interpretation of Clark's writings, the unit of comparison for quotation D3 is the level of education, perhaps determined in part or in full by the variable of compulsory-attendance age. While the comparative elements were identified as elementary, high school, and junior college educational levels, the adult education element was denoted simply as "adult education."\textsuperscript{516} To facilitate comparison, parallel units, and in this case levels, were assumed. In the next sentence in quotation D3, however, Clark identified what he had labeled "adult education" as "a separate, peripheral

\textsuperscript{515}Ibid.
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activity". A proper application of a concept of marginality would not allow comparison of non-parallel units, i.e., activities with educational levels. In the third sentence of quotation D3, Clark's unit of focus changes from an adult education activity to an "adult program" within a school system and the comparative elements become what Clark terms "a family of well-established, well-accepted programs." Clark in the fourth sentence of quotation D3 reverts back to terming the adult education element an "adult activity" which exists in a somewhat precarious state, which state is not specifically denoted by Clark to be marginality, but is assumed to be what later in the paragraph he terms as organizational marginality. The fifth sentence of quotation D3 again identifies comparative elements for the adult education element based on the variables of "budget support" and "general organizational position." This time, however, Clark identifies the comparative elements not as levels of education, activities, or programs, but as "primary departments." These primary departments are assumed to exist within a parental organization which encompasses both the primary departments and an adult education element. The adult education element had been identified in the preceding
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sentences as both "adult education," and as an "adult program" within a school system.\textsuperscript{523} In the current application of a concept of marginality it is now noted as an "adult activity."\textsuperscript{524}

Comparison of an adult activity to primary departments is at best difficult and at worst impossible for purposes of determining status. Clark's mixing and matching of three distinct adult education elements with four differing comparative elements within quotation D3 is counter productive. Designations of status are most meaningful in the field of adult education when comparisons of organizational adult education is with comparative organizational units, practices are compared with practices, and processes are compared with processes.

Other comparative elements were identified by Clark in his Dissertation, but none in association with a use of the term marginality. The additional comparative elements were identified by Clark in two organizational structure charts\textsuperscript{525} of the Los Angeles School System and of the Adult Education Branch of the Division of Extension and Higher Education of the Los Angeles School System for the 1952-3 school year. The importance of these comparative organizational units in the establishment of status of the various adult education organizational units, which were identified in the same charts,

\textsuperscript{523}Ibid.
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was not noted by Clark in his written development of the concepts of marginality within his Dissertation. These comparative organizational subunits were matched to their appropriate adult education subunits earlier in this thesis.

Quotation M25 is significant as an illustration of an application of a concept of marginality by Clark wherein he identifies no non-adult education comparative elements, two distinct adult education subunits, and only generically and geographically the parental organization as being a "large organization" with an example provided from the "Los Angeles" context.\textsuperscript{526} It is the preceding application which spurs discussion of the possibility of using adult education elements as comparative elements where the marginality of a portion of the total combined adult education element within a system is being evaluated. Comparisions among adult education elements in such an application are thought by this author to be a weak indicator of status of an individual adult education element within a total system wherein the primary objective and function is other than the education of adults.

Clark's disregard for the importance of identifying the adult education element, comparative elements, and parental organization or context with each application of a concept of marginality is regarded as a major problem in his application of concepts of marginality within his Dissertation and Monograph. Clark tended to identify several adult education elements and

\textsuperscript{526}Clark, Monograph, pp. 147-8.
comparative elements without appropriately matching them. When he wrote of indices, symptoms, bases, sources, evidences, factors, and effects of marginality it has been difficult to identify the specific adult education element and comparative elements which are of concern. It is not apparent whether Clark recognized the significance of designating specific adult education elements and their comparative elements, plus any common parental organizations, in denoting or evaluating the status of adult education elements. While Clark structurally and hierarchically charted various educational units and subunits of the Los Angeles School System, the transition to identifying and labeling them specifically as adult education subunits and as comparative subunits in his applications of concepts of marginality did not occur. Clark appeared to be indicating in quotation D4 the relative nature of a concept of marginality as he cited "the formal or 'constitutional' status of adult education" as an evidence of "relative marginality."

Cited by Clark for comparison to the adult education element were the "elementary, high school, and junior college districts" of the state school system. He noted that these comparative organizational subunits of the state system were under mandate to "maintain appropriate schools" whereas adult education existed locally under permissive legislation. Clark, in this

---
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quotation, speaks within the organizational context of the California School System and considers adult education subunits collectively as he makes comparisons to other subunits within the state school system. His comparison of the adult education element is to primary subunits within a parental organization or state school system rather than to all other subunits including secondary and tertiary subunits within the system. Clark might be understood as saying that when parity exists between an adult education subunit and primary subunits within a common parental organization, the adult education subunit would not be judged to be experiencing relative marginality. This means that the primary subunits and the adult education subunit experienced, concurrently and uniformly throughout each separate element, either mandatory or permissive legislative mandates within a common parental organization, then any organizational marginality experienced by the adult education subunit would not result from the legislative mandate.

The resultant general rule of thumb would be that when the adult education subunit exists under like conditions as other subunits within a parental organization, the adult education subunit would not be experiencing organizational marginality. An example of an exception to the rule would be when equally important, but different, mandates are legislated or given to the adult education subunit from other subunits. When the adult education subunit is judged to be fulfilling an equally important organizational mandate or function, then an index of similarity would not be a valid index of organizational
marginality. Mandates used for comparisons might include not only formal organizational objectives, but general expectations by groups internal and external to the parental organization. The terms, other units, have been used in this discussion to suggest that the relevant comparisons would be made between the adult education subunit and the other subunits of the parental organization, not restricted to comparisons between the adult education subunit and primary subunits, secondary subunits or subunits through which tertiary objectives are achieved, commonly labeled as support services within larger organizations. Primary subunits seek to fulfill major objectives of an organization, secondary subunits play subordinate roles in fulfilling major objectives or fulfill less important objectives, and tertiary subunits fulfill functions, many of which would otherwise need to be performed by primary or secondary subunits to insure stability or to enable and facilitate the performance of what are considered primary educational objectives.

The extended reasoning which followed Clark's suggestion of the importance of relativity may be faulty. Regardless of the relationship of the adult education subunits to other subunits within an organization, comparative variable data are only meaningful in the assessment of organizational marginality if they are a standard for, or if they exert an influence on the status of the adult education subunits among other subunits. Status is afforded by groups both internal and external to the parental organization. The mistaken idea of a direct
relationship between relative marginality of an adult education subunit and correlations of sameness, rather than parity, of the adult education subunit to other subunits seems to have been common in the adult education field.

As conceptualized by Clark, marginality is highly dependent upon the comparative strength of variables for an adult education subunit and other subunits of the organization. But such comparisons should be based on parity, not sameness. Strength of marginality for the adult education subunits may be highly correlated with comparative ratings of characteristics of other subunits to the adult education subunit, but only to the extent that status of the adult education subunits by internal groups as well as by groups external to the parental organization is affected. Marginality is relative status, which may or may not be correlated with comparative ratings and is, therefore, difficult to assess and validate.

In summary, much of the confusion surrounding Clark's use of the term marginality may be attributed to a lack of specific definitions for various concepts of marginality and to Clark's failure to identify and specify adult education and comparative elements and parental systems or contexts associated with each use of the term.

A Relativistic Concept

A relativistic concept, such as marginality presents many challenges for the researcher. Some authors in the field of adult education tend to equate single variable ratios, representing variable strengths within the adult education
element and the comparative elements, with marginality. Clark's initial concept of marginality is a ratio of status. However, both Clark and other authors stopped short of discussing the importance of identifying the comparative elements and the strength of the variables as they affect status.

All too frequently, reporting of such comparisons leaves the impression that where disparity exists between the adult education subunit and the comparative subunits within the organization, marginality is automatically assumed. Disparity among some variables might not be reflective of status accorded by some relevant groups. Disparity among some variables may be highly correlated with status. Each variable must therefore be correlated to status for each relevant group.

One variable described by Clark was the contractual arrangement of a parental organization with administrators of its various subunits. Rather than gauging the variable to a common yardstick, such as denoting each administrative contract as a percentage of full-time equivalent, Clark identified three nominal categories capable of making distinctions not possible with a continuum. His categories were those of part-time, split-assignment, and full-time. Clark's part-time and split-assignment categories are distinctive in that the split-assignment category appears to denote both a part-time assignment to the adult education subunit in addition to either administrative assignments elsewhere in the parental organization or in other roles within the parental organization, whereas his part-time category appears to denote an
administrative assignment within the adult education subunit, in addition to either no additional employment or employment outside the parental organization in administrative or other capacities.

Clark noted that adult education began in the state of California as a secondary responsibility of administrators. After 1931 separate principals with part-time contracts became the rule. Administrators of adult education had gradually been granted full-time contracts until 1947-8 when the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System became fully manned by full-time administrators. Clark stated that the presence of full-time rather than part-time administrators in the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles School System was an "index...that marginality has been reduced over the last twenty-five years." Because the transition in Clark's case study was from split-assignment, to part-time, to full-time administration of the adult education subunit, and because Clark reports decreasing marginality for the adult education subunit during the twenty-five year time period, it might be concluded that split-assignment administration is associated by Clark with the highest degree of marginality.

From a different perspective, full-time and part-time administration lie at opposite ends of a continuum and split-assignment administration becomes a nominal category of part-time administration which denotes the total range of the

\[530\text{Ibid., p. 27.}\]
continuum, except for the full-time end of the continuum.

The validity of Clark's proposed variable is highly questioned by this author. The variance of contractual arrangements with administrators does not appear to be reliably correlated with status of an adult education subunit, but rather to be more a function of individual organizational management styles, standard administrative procedures for initiating subunits, and unit size. Carey's hypotheses concerning correlations between general university acceptance of an adult education subunit and liberal education programming "were framed in terms of the status of the adult division within the university system." Among other methods, Carey attempted to measure status of the adult division "by noting the policy-making committees upon which the adult dean or director sits." His questionnaires showed that:

...deans who sat on no committees were typical of the smaller evening colleges and extension divisions in the early stages of development. Deans who sat on the more powerful committees were found in the more mature divisions, though here they were more likely to be found in evening colleges than in extension divisions.

Carey's observations leads to the hypothesis that as the status of an adult education subunit increases so will the likelihood that its chief administrator will serve as one of the central
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administrators in a university setting, with increased committee assignments and with administrative responsibilities which extend beyond the boundaries of the adult education subunit. If the preceding hypothesis is true, then Clark's equation of split-assignment and high marginality would appear to be false. It is felt by this author that the variable of split-assignment is more likely unreliable or is nonmonotonic. Furthermore it may be a noncontinuous variable.

In summary, it would appear that Clark identified several of his variables of marginality through observing differential treatment of adult education subunits and of other subunits. While he did not announce his intentions as his comparisons were made, the results were the identification of a number of variables which he labeled as indices, sources, bases, evidences, symptoms, and effects of marginality. The concept of relativeness is an important factor in the assessment of marginality.

Consistant Use of Defining Terms

Clark used a number of terms and concepts the process of defining concepts of marginality. Among the terms Clark used in association were: sources, indices, effects, symptoms, bases, evidences, a contributing factor, a condition and a hypothetical index of marginality.

The explanatory power and research utility of his concept of marginality is directly affected by the precision with which he uses the enumerated terms. Synonymous use of different terms results in perplexity in scholarly attempts to comprehend the
precise meaning of the concepts.

Clark first referred to "Sources and Indices of Marginality" in quotation D2, a subheading. He described three sources or indices of marginality (two of which are quoted in D4 and D5), never specifically identifying any as a source of marginality and identifying only the second (D5) as an index "that marginality has been reduced over the last twenty-five years." In Clark's repeated introduction of the subsection he switched his labeling from "Sources and Indices of Marginality" to "bases and symptoms of peripheral status." In this subsection he equated marginality to peripheral status. It appears also that he equated "sources" of marginality with "bases" of marginality and "indices" of marginality with "symptoms" of marginality. An early scholarly dilemma related to this subsection is the question of whether one should begin with the determination of distinctions among sources, indices, bases, and symptoms of marginality or accept Clark's synonymous usages of the terms.
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In Clark's first example of a source, index, base, or symptom of marginality, he introduces a fifth term which he also appears to use synonymously with the previous four: "First, some evidence of relative marginality is indicated in the formal or 'constitutional' status of adult education." 5\textsuperscript{41} It is unclear whether Clark is equating an "evidence" 5\textsuperscript{42} of marginality with a source, index, base, or symptom of marginality, or with all of them. Each of the five terms has the potential for making distinctions among conditions of marginality. Synonymous usage of these terms complicates attempts at understanding.

Clark's application of the terms of source, index, base, symptom, and evidence to his first example will be examined for purposes of determining the degree of clarity or ambiguity brought by Clark to his concept of marginality through introduction of these defining terms. Through examination of Clark's first example of a source, index, base, symptom, or evidence of marginality, necessary processes will be identified for making and testing these distinctions. Until adult education and comparative elements, and parental organizations or contexts are positively identified; the status of the adult education element is observed, defined, measured and tested; pertinent groups and the variables upon which each affords status are identified; distinguishing among Clark's examples of sources, indices, bases, symptoms and evidences is difficult and

\textsuperscript{541}Ibid.
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tenuous.

Clark's first example (D4) of a source, index, base, symptom, or evidence, of marginality was the relative "'constitutional' status"\(^5\)\(^3\) of adult classes in comparison to elementary, high school, and junior college schools. An initial difficulty is the comparison of adult classes and other schools. An effort to understand a concept of marginality might logically lead to the comparison of organizational units, but the units must be of a comparable nature, e.g., adult classes with representative classes from elementary, high school, and junior college schools or adult schools with elementary, high school, and junior college schools. Here it is not the setting that is of importance, but rather the establishment of clear reference points to facilitate the determination of status. Without reference points or the identification of comparative elements, the status of an adult education element cannot be established. Status cannot be established in isolation.

Clark noted what he perceived to be differential treatment of adult education subunits and other organizational subunits within a common parental organization, the California State School System. The problem was that when Clark attempted to compare constitutional status within these units, he named adult education organizational units which were not comparable. Without comparable units, one cannot establish comparative status. The adult education element he identified as "adult

\(^{5\text{a}3}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 26.}
education," and "adult classes." For purposes of comparing constitutional status, which he more specifically designated as legislative mandate, Clark named the non-adult education organizational elements of elementary, high school, and junior college districts. With Clark's variable, legislative mandate, it is possible to distinguish between the direct mandate to the districts and the permissive mandate for adult education classes. The proper comparison of the variable, however, would dictate that it be made at organizationally comparable levels—the class level, the school level, or the district level. Clark appears to have been making comparisons at the district level. His organizational charts identify the Adult Education Branch as the adult education subunit at the division level in the Los Angeles School System during the academic year 1952-3. The Los Angeles School System is considered to be the parental organization. Clark's organizational charts indicate that it had several divisional subunits. Clark's comparison of the legislative mandates between school districts and adult classes is troublesome in that the organizational units within which the variable is identified and measured for purposes of comparison are not at comparable organizational levels. To understand Clark's first example of a source, index, base, symptom, or evidence of marginality for purposes of determining the logical

\[5^{44}\text{Ibid., pp. 26-7.}\]
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appropriateness of his labels, a decision must be made as to which level Clark seeks to apply his concept of marginality. Is he considering the status of adult classes considered collectively among other classes occurring in elementary, high school, and junior colleges, considered collectively by school; the status of individual adult education classes among individual public school classes; or the status of the composite average adult education class within the system among the composite average of other school classes within the system?

A second step toward understanding the concept of marginality as applied by Clark in quotation D4 involves identifying the evaluative perspective. The marginality of an adult education element in relationship to a comparative element or elements may be established from the perspective of a single group; or it may involve establishing the status of the adult education element in relationship to a comparative element or elements from the collective perspective of all groups internal and external to the system which affect the status of the adult education element; identifying, scaling, and weighting the indices upon which status is afforded by each; calculating the resultant ratio; weighting the significance of each evaluative group to afford status; calculating weighted group scores; and additively calculating a pooled organizational system marginality score.

Each individual or group viewing a common adult education element, using common comparative elements as reference points, and making comparisons across a like range defined by a common
parental system or context, might afford varying ratios of status to the adult education element due to the possibility that each might afford status based on different variables or might assign different levels of importance to each identified variable. The variation in status granted by individuals and groups, as well as variations among bases upon which status is granted, complicate assessments of total status experienced by an adult education element. Because many individuals and groups influence the status of an adult education element, measurements of marginality may be extremely tedious and difficult.

Representations of marginality are apt to be expressions based upon a restricted number of variables, status granted by a restricted number of individuals or groups, or a combination of them. Thus, it is important to specify when expressions of marginality are representative of status granted by certain individuals and groups or are based on a restricted number of variables as opposed to such assessments of marginality being based on all individuals and groups affecting status of the pertinent adult education element and on all variables influencing their granting of status.

Once the comparative elements are identified, the level of comparison established, and the evaluative perspective announced, then Clark's proposed variables can be tested to establish whether they are sources, indices, bases, symptoms, or evidences of marginality.

Without the additional information prescribed above, it would be difficult to determine if the variable noted by Clark
in his first example is a source, index, base, symptom, or evidence of marginality. Stated definitions for each of the preceding terms, which were used by Clark, might be an initial step in such a process. The status or marginality of an adult education element is a representation of human judgment based on comparative criteria, selected or established by the evaluative body.

In Clark's first example of a source, index, base, symptom, or evidence of marginality, where mandated rather than permissive legislation was the rule, the source of marginality would not be the outward legislative manifestation, but rather the evaluative or legislative body which affords status, a portion of which status might be manifest in legislative mandate. Factors affecting the degree of afforded status might also be considered to be sources of marginality, but would best be described as contributing factors.

"Bases" of marginality as referred to by Clark appear to be rather ambiguous. The term basis may be useful as a designation for the "principal component" of marginality or status when one is conceptualizing marginality.

An index of marginality is usefully understood as "a ratio or other number derived from a series of observations and used as an indicator or measure (as of a condition, property, or
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phenomenon)." Marginality, as defined within this thesis, is status, a condition of existence. In Clark's first example, an index of marginality might be considered to be a ratio derived through comparing the percentage of mandated elementary, high school, and junior college classes to the total number of classes within the school system to the percentage of mandated adult education classes to total number of adult education classes within the system. Usefulness of the index is enhanced when its relationship to the condition is specified, e.g., causative or symptomatic.

In Clark's first example one might argue that a differential legislative mandate is a symptom of marginality rather than an index of the condition. Such differential treatment might be characteristic of marginality but may have arisen from other causes. Even when ratios can be empirically calculated, a judgment must be made as to whether the identified variable is truly an index or whether it is a symptom which may be indirectly caused by conditions other than marginality.

Because a symptom is "something that indicates the existence of something else," measurement of a symptom is not a direct measurement of a condition of marginality. Clark viewed marginality as an undesirable and detrimental condition of adult education. The term symptom is frequently used in description and diagnosis of disease and undesirable
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conditions and its use within Clark's Dissertation may be felt to reflect his bias. As in medicine where a symptom complex is "a group of symptoms occurring together and characterizing a particular disease," symptom complexes for concepts of marginality may lend themselves to identification and measurement.

Clark, after alerting the reader that he intends to note "some bases and symptoms," "sources and indices of marginality," introduces his first example by noting that: "First, some evidence of relative marginality is indicated in the formal or 'constitutional' status of adult education." He apparently uses the concept of evidence synonymously with base, symptom, source or index, or all of these terms. Webster defines evidence as "the state of being evident." Evident is an adjective denoting that which is "easy to see or perceive; clear." While legislative mandate may be readily perceived, and a ratio calculated for the comparative elements, it is not quite so clear whether it is a reliable indicator of the condition, or is merely symptomatic. If adult education classes
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are at times afforded higher status by various internal and external groups than those classes which are legislatively mandated, then legislative mandate ceases to be a reliable index of marginality, may not be a cause of existent marginality of the adult education element, and may more appropriately be termed a symptom of marginality.

The purpose of the preceding section has been to explore the precision with which Clark used the terms source, index, base, symptom, and evidence within, and in introduction of, his first example. Clark, in his introduction, implied that some of the terms were synonymous in that he introduced the section as pertaining to sources and indices of marginality, reintroduced it as pertaining to bases and symptoms of marginality, and noted that his first example was an evidence of marginality which he was synonymously equating with at least two of the four introductory terms. Clark's casual use of these five terms has been substantiated through examining his use of each in the preceding discription of his first variable, discussing definitions for each, and by examining the implications of Clark's use of the terms in the context of his presentation of his first variable of marginality. This exercise illustrated the perplexity any scholar would face in interpreting Clark's work in the face of synonymous and ambiguous term usage. The exercise was fruitful in identification of concept elements and illustrated potential difficulties in identification of key concept elements and in operationalization of concepts of marginality.
Clark identified his second example as a contributing factor, symptom and index of marginality:

The part-time nature of administration has been historically both a contributing factor to and a symptom of the marginal position of the adult education departments. This index would indicate that marginality has been reduced over the last twenty-five years.\textsuperscript{558}

While Clark appears to be making a distinction between a "contributing factor" and a "symptom" of the marginal position "of the adult education departments," his distinction is not clear nor elaborated upon and is further complicated by his equation of "the marginal position of the adult education departments" which denotes physical location of the element, with marginality or status.\textsuperscript{559} It is doubtful that Clark intended to make such a distinction despite his notation that his example which is "both a contributing factor to and a symptom of the marginal position of the adult education departments" is also an "index" of marginality.\textsuperscript{560}

Having identified his examples as sources, bases, symptoms, and an evidence of marginality, and having directly used the term index only once, that being when he labeled his second example, Clark, after discussion of his third example, stated that there are a "few other indices of marginality."\textsuperscript{561} If Clark
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is to be taken literally, then what he has labeled sources, bases, symptoms, and evidences of marginality are also indices of marginality. This example further illustrates the perplexities of such synonymous term usage.

Clark discussed additional indices of marginality and noted that "the amount of state financial support" is "an ambiguous index of the educational value of the program in the eyes of both educational and legislative authorities." An ambiguous index might be one which reflects two or more meanings, is not clear or is vague. If the amount of state financial support were an accurate index, then absolute marginality of the adult education element would vary proportionately to state funding levels to the adult education element. Defining the index as such would result in increasing marginality of the adult education element whenever funding to the adult education element was decreased, regardless of the ability of the state to pay, or regardless of proportionate funding levels to the comparative elements. Perhaps Clark regarded state funding as an ambiguous index because he did not identify other fundamental elements necessary to evaluate the level of marginality. He did not identify the adult education element, the level of focus, the comparative elements or the status granting bodies. Furthermore, Clark regarded absolute state funding levels as the index rather than the ratio of the percentage of total budget
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for the adult education element comprised of state funding, to the percentage of total budget for the comparative elements comprised of state funding. Granted, because of political involvement, state funding is regarded as a marginally useful index of marginality. Nevertheless, increased ambiguity existed in Clark's use because of his failure to identify necessary elements for evaluating the marginality of an adult education element and his regard of the absolute level of state financial support as the index rather than the proposed ratio.

Clark also makes reference to a hypothetical index, derived from implications of state funding. He uses the descriptor hypothetical because he projects what might occur "if state apportionments for adult education were scaled down to the same proportion of costs as is covered for other programs." His reference to a hypothetical index is perplexing because rather than identifying an index, he outlines what he elsewhere refers to as "an objective test of the acceptance accorded the program by local Boards of Education and Superintendents" and "as an hypothetical case study." Further confusing Clark's "hypothetical case study" is his reference to "acceptance accorded" rather than to afforded status. It is possible that
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Clark meant to infer that accorded acceptance is an index of marginality.

Clark, in a summary section of his Dissertation, addresses "The Effect of Marginality." He makes a quantum leap from an ill-defined concept to enumerating the effect of that status. An effect is commonly defined as "something that is produced by an agent or cause: something that follows immediately from an antecedent: a resultant condition." Much of what Clark notes as effects of marginality might be better understood as descriptions and indices of the condition of relative status rather than effects thereof. Even in Clark's examples of causation, he describes both the condition and its tendency to repeat or extend itself in what might be considered to be a spiraling cycle of cause and effect—effects of the condition being causative in maintaining or increasing the intensity of the condition.

The following comparative statements were made by Clark in his Dissertation subsection, "The Effect of Marginality." The statements might more appropriately be defined as indices rather than effects of marginality, particularly if the adult education and comparative elements, and parental organization are identified and if it is possible to express relative variable strengths occurring in the adult education and comparative
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elements as ratios: "greater need to adapt;" "less likelihood that change will be controlled from within;" "strong[er] need for outside interest and support;" "less likely to be maintained in 'internal' terms of the organizational personnel;" and "decision-making is more subject to the pressures of ad hoc demands."\(^{572}\)

Listed as effects of marginality, but believed by this author to be possible antecedents of marginality, are Clark's statements that "for adult education, a marginal position in school systems": "increases sensitivity of the program to vocalized public demand;" reduces the "autonomy of the organization;" "shapes the doctrines that emerge as program rationales;" "strengthen[s] the need for a doctrine of immediate needs;" "pushes the program toward an uncontrolled development, with its course determined by outside forces;" and "weakens the hand of its own work force in controlling its development."\(^{573}\) Clark further noted that in a state of organizational marginality the "organizational needs of security and stability are compelling;" and "adjustments are likely to be made that reduce internal control of changes in norms and values."\(^{574}\) As previously stated, the preceding phrases which were labeled by Clark as effects of marginality are equally acceptable as descriptions of the condition. In the final analysis, the

\(^{572}\)Ibid.

\(^{573}\)Ibid., pp. 172-3.

\(^{574}\)Ibid., p. 173.
identification of effects of a given state of marginality in the field of adult education will remain unclear until the concept of marginality is well defined, an adult education element is observed in a specific state of marginality, the status of the adult education element is measured and verified, and the outcomes of the condition are observed.

Further confusing Clark's discussion of the effect of marginality is his synonymous use of "a marginal position" and "marginality," which has been defined in this thesis as relative status. A marginal position within an organization or society is considered to be only one index of a condition of marginality. In order to establish the relative organizational position of an adult education element within a system, other units of the system must be identified for purposes of comparison.

An index, source, symptom, base, evidence, and effect of marginality may be expressed either qualitatively or quantitatively. 577

575 Ibid., pp. 27, 172 (three references to a marginal position), 203.

576 All eighteen uses of the term in Clark's Dissertation are referenced in the preceding thesis subsection.

577 Steven's magnitude estimation procedures, which are discussed in the appendix, provide the method and justification for quantifying nonmetric variables. Magnitude estimation may facilitate operationalization of concepts of marginality.
Conceptual Testing of Concepts of Marginality

In describing marginality, Clark made a number of statements concerning variables, sources, indices, effects, symptoms, bases, conditions, and contributing factors. Such conclusions may be conceptually and empirically tested.

In quotation M10 and M11 Clark hypothesizes the direct relationship: "the greater the marginality, the stronger is the pressure of the enrollment economy."\(^{578}\) Within the context of the California State Department of Education this hypothesis is conceptually acceptable, but has not been tested. It is conceptually feasible, however, that other variables of marginality could affect the status of an adult education element without any variance in the enrollment economy pressure occurring, thus not supporting the hypothesis. Clark's conclusion in association with term uses M13, M14, and M15, was that "marginality forces attention toward attendance."\(^{579}\) He appears to have observed specific cases within the context of the California State School System and, because funding of adult education schools within Los Angeles was, at the time of his observation, based almost entirely on average daily attendance (ADA), he appears to have attributed the adult school's preoccupation with attendance to a condition he termed marginality and then generalized his conclusion without indicating contextual limitations, restrictions, or

\(^{578}\)Idem, \textit{Monograph}, p. 62.

\(^{579}\)Ibid., p. 83.
implications. He appears not to have tested this relationship. Clark observed that "until the marginality of the adult school is reduced, or special safeguards are given to the program, administrators must bank heavily on the survival and security potentialities of state aid."  

Clark next suggests that the "peripheral nature of the branch's present activity is partially indicated by its status as a 2 per cent item in the budget." Clark is assumed to be equating the terms "peripheral nature" in this quotation with his concept of marginality. However, Clark's ratio is of the adult education subunit to the parental organization rather than to comparative subunits within the common parental organization, which comparison is essential in assessing marginality. For purposes of denoting status among subunits, comparisons might be made among either the absolute size or each subunit or among percentages representing the relative size of each subunit to the parental organization.

In summary, absolute size of the adult education subunit in Clark's case-study-in-depth is not a valid index of status. The relative size of the adult education subunit may be a base upon which to predict status among subunits within the common parental subunit, but is not a definitive indicator. It is possible to examine Clark's data to find evidence that adult
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580 Ibid.
581 Ibid.
582 Ibid.
education organizational units received preferential treatment and were afforded high status. The doubling of state appropriations earmarked for adult education between 1947 and 1952 may be indicative of high status afforded to adult education by the general population of the state through their legislators.\footnote{Idem, Dissertation, p. 22.} Because a concept of status requires identification of comparative units from which comparative variable values can be obtained, confirmation of the preceding assertion would require a knowledge of growth patterns between 1947 and 1952 for comparative organizational elements. In the context of Clark's application, comparisons to the growth patterns of elementary and high schools in the common parental system would seem appropriate.

Clark wrote of the necessity of adult schools to depend on state aid for survival and security in quotation M13-M15. One might consider preferential state funding to be an index of high status. While the appropriation of state funds to adult classes and schools, and to elementary and secondary classes and schools has been described as being on an approximately equal basis, in actuality adult classes and schools received preferential treatment. Funding began on an equal basis. "The evening program received financial support at approximately the same level as other school programs."\footnote{Ibid., pp. 14-5.} Clark reported that in 1921 adult classes and schools had received special treatment.
State aid to local districts for their adult programs became a major stimulus to expansion with the addition of a special bonus in 1921. This bonus was instituted in a period of strong interest in immigrant and literacy education. Its effect upon the financing of adult school classes was considerable. When added to the regular attendance apportionments, the bonus provision had the effect of covering or nearly covering the full cost of the classes. Local districts frequently were able to show a profit on the program. The biennial reports of the State Department of Education indicate this was the case. The director of the Department of Adult Education stated about this bonus provision several years after it had gone into effect:

"The law which provides for the financing of these classes is particularly well-planned. It provides for a bonus... making a total of $2,700 a year bonus on the first thirty units of attendance. This is sufficient to pay the salary of the director and insure the district of enough state and county money to pay more than two-thirds and in most cases all the cost of maintaining such classes." This bonus remained a major stimulus to local programs until it was repealed in 1945. It was not limited to particular categories of evening school activity. Adult administrators today commonly refer to the "foresight" that was involved in having this 1921 law so broadly worded that its program applicability was unlimited. It is generally accepted within adult education ranks that the 1921 bonus provision, together with the basic attendance reimbursements, provided the financial platform for rapid expansion in the nineteen-twenties.

12Assembly Bill 439, Approved June 1, 1921, amending Section 1761 of the Political Code. Amendments to the School Law, California, 1921.

13The 1921 "bonus provision" allotted $2,700 for the first thirty units of attendance in evening high schools and in "special day and evening classes" attached to day schools. Thus adult education attendance could, as a matter of accounting, be parcelled out in small packages to a large number of schools within one school system. One researcher has shown that this amounted to over [more than] $180,000 in one year (1937-38) in Los Angeles, and that adult education in Los Angeles received support from the
state that year at the rate of $127.79 per average daily attendance, compared to $85.50 for the support of regular high school. At that time the Los Angeles adult program was about 90-100% supported by state funds. See Ruth E. Meilandt, *A Study of the Adult Education Program of the Los Angeles City High School District*, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1938, pp. 32-34.


From this point of view, which challenges Clark's perspective, one might question how Clark could say that the adult classes and schools were experiencing marginality when they were receiving preferential funding to the tune of $127.79 per average daily attendance as compared to the $85.50 per ADA granted by the state to high schools. The marginality was not in relation to the level of state aid per student in the program.

A second bonus became policy of the California State Department of Education in 1931. 586 Identified as an "administrative" bonus, it required the appointment of separate evening high school administrators, and while it further required the establishment of coordinated programs of study, 587 the net effect was the separation of adult education

586 Ibid., p. 17.
587 Ibid.
administrative units from those of associated high schools. Such special treatment of adult education elements could be interpreted as evidence of the high status adult education classes and schools enjoyed rather than of their marginality.

In 1921 the "first-thirty-units bonus" was repealed, but an equally preferential state financial bonus was extended to adult education classes. Whereas state funding of elementary and high schools continued to be funded with the average daily attendance calculated on a four-hour day, an ADA for adult classes and schools was legislated to a three-hour day.

Using the variable of state financing, this means that adult education classes and schools enjoyed a 4:3 ratio of status for state financial support over elementary and secondary classes and schools. While Clark's concept of marginality is based on a number of variables, adult education, it would appear, had high status when it came to state support if the rate of payment, rather than the total amount provided, is considered.

Clark looked at the same funding situation and felt that heavy state support meant little local support and loss of local control over adult education classes and schools. He labeled the "amount of state aid" as an "ambiguous index of program marginality" and noted that:

588 Ibid., p. 18.
589 Ibid., pp. 19-20.
the early bonuses for adult education were indicative of little local support and reflect the attempts of state authorities to back the program. In the face of local marginality, generous state aid has been a strong prop.\textsuperscript{590}

It would appear that Clark viewed his data from a particular perspective, perhaps from that of local administrators whom Clark felt possessed limited control over the development of their programs. Certainly from the perspective of state legislators adult education enjoyed high status as evidenced by their almost total support of adult education programs in some areas and the preferential funding of adult education courses--to the tune of one-third more--in comparison to funding levels for elementary and secondary classes. From the perspective of state legislators, and state level administrators, adult education classes held high status. It would appear that Clark felt adult classes experienced marginality locally, but he made a general pronouncement of marginality, without restrictions. He appears to have based his judgement or assessment on a negative--adult education did not receive local funding equal to local support of elementary and high school courses. But how would one logically conclude that because adult education classes--classes already entirely funded by the state in some instances, and which were receiving in 1937-8 $127.79 per ADA compared to the $85.50 per ADA given for elementary and secondary classes--did not receive equal local funding that they experienced marginality? Had such local

\textsuperscript{590}Idem, Monograph, p. 60.
support been forthcoming it would have further perpetuated the preferential treatment for adult education classes and broadened the ratio of status between adult education classes and other classes within the educational system. In the absence of such strong legislative support, it is difficult to anticipate the support adult education would receive through local channels.

While Clark may have recognized the ambiguity of his treatment of marginality and may have sought to clarify it in the preceding quotation through his use of the "local marginality" label, he does not appear to have pursued the testing necessary for the further development of the marginality concept or concepts.

Local property owners are characterized as being resistant to paying for any goods or services locally which can be funded from state revenues. Local channel funding is generated from taxation of a local target population--property owners. State revenues are generated from the general population, which includes the property owners, but are broader based and are generally viewed as taxes on income, production, and consumption. What Clark might interpret as little local support might be a reflection of the efforts of a special interest group--property owners--who may afford high status to adult education classes, but who have special interest in seeing that it is financially supported through revenue imposed on a broader range of the population rather than on taxes raised through property taxes. Property owners with declining incomes, who stand the risk of losing residences and other property in order
to pay local taxes based solely on assigned property values, might attack funding of adult education locally out of self-interest, without opposing or even encouraging increased funding from state coffers.

Further supporting the counter argument that adult education enjoyed priority status in the California School System rather than marginality, is legislation which in effect demanded from those in the high school systems support of adult classes within their districts. This was accomplished by tying the level of funding of high school courses per ADA to the size and success of adult education enterprises within the common system. This occurred through the "equalization formula" recommended by the State Department of Education in 1947, which formula and its effect were explained by Clark:

> The purpose of the formula was to provide additional state aid for poor school districts. The state determines which districts are poor, i.e., have the greater per-child financial burden, by comparing enrollment figures for a district against its taxable assessed wealth. How much equalization money, if any, a district will receive in addition to its basic aid, is determined by its relative position in the equalization formula. The gaining of equalization funds hinges on the ratio between enrollment and district wealth. Increased enrollment makes a district poorer, i.e., a greater burden on its own tax levy. The special consequence this formula had for adult education comes from the fact that adult education funds are handled within the financing of high school districts. Its attendance is part of the reportable attendance of the high school component of a school system. Thus a basic way for high school districts to become poorer in the terms of the equalization formula is to increase the size of their adult education programs. The attendance population of a high school district can be rapidly expanded in

this fashion. With the limits on day school student body set by the demographic characteristics of the general population, and by the efficiency of truant officer operations, the main potential for expansion in enrollment and income remained adult education. Thus a district may, for example, increase its returns in the high school category from $100 per ADA to $130. The increased return per unit of attendance is applicable to all attendance of the high school district, not just the adult education units. Thus an enlarged adult education program became after 1947 a major means of increasing district revenues.\textsuperscript{592}

The equalization formula effectively, yet possibly unintentionally, made adult education a priority within the state by tying the financial support and well-being of many school districts to the size and efficiency of their adult education classes and schools.

From this perspective, such adult education classes and programs enjoyed priority status, not marginality as Clark contended. Perhaps Clark's assessment of the marginality of adult schools in California is attributable to the fact that districts within Los Angeles, the context in which his study was conducted, were not numbered among the poor of the state and thus the equalization formula in Clark's view "had little direct effect in Los Angeles."\textsuperscript{593} Even without the extra status accruing to adult education classes and schools through increased direct funding based on ADA in adult education classes, and the extra support and prestige derived from high schools wherein the level of state funding per ADA was based in

\textsuperscript{592}Ibid., pp. 20-1.

\textsuperscript{593}Ibid., p. 21.
part on the success of adult education classes in terms of ADA, adult education classes still received preferred treatment and funding status over the comparative elementary and high school classes. This was manifest in state financial support of classes based on average daily attendance.

Clark referred to these financial bases and bonuses when he noted "the early and generous support responsible for the growth of adult education in California." Nevertheless, Clark in analyzing the preceding data pronounced that adult education was afforded low status—that it was in a state of marginality.

This author believes that while the data Clark presented are indicative of high status being afforded adult education by state legislators, it is insufficient evidence to be used as the major factor determining local marginality. The question of local status for adult education classes and schools is even more complex than indicated by the limited data provided by Clark.

While Clark did not identify his concept of marginality as denoting status among specific comparative elements or from a particular perspective, some assumptions can be made based on evidence he presented. If he intended to represent the overall status of an adult education element, then evidence has been insufficient to this point in his presentation to support such a conclusion. For example, Clark presented state of California funding, policies, formulas, and levels, which data he felt were

59A Ibid., pp. 22-3.
indicative of the marginality of adult education elements within the Los Angeles and California school systems. This author suggests these same data may be interpreted to indicate that adult education classes were afforded high status in state legislative circles and that insufficient data were furnished preceding quotations M13-M15 to support any other conclusion. Indicators noted by Clark from the perspective of various interest groups at the local level have been questioned and implications of various perspectives analyzed. If an assessment of total status were sought, local funding policies, formulas, and levels for both adult education and comparative elements would be vital data. Such comparative information for the Los Angeles School System was provided later in a footnote in Clark's Monograph for the 1952-3 school year, but Clark apparently did not consider its implications for his previously presented conclusions.

A comparative ratio of financial allocation from all sources is considered to be an index of total status. Clark footnoted that:

In Los Angeles in 1952-53, direct per capita costs were $365.44 for junior colleges, $349.82 for senior high schools, and $223.23 for adult schools. The adult administrators bring this comparison in expenses to the attention of the Board of Education.

Clark's comparative expenditure ratio reported in the preceding quotation is considered by this author to be an

\[595\] Idem, Monograph, p. 119.

\[596\] Ibid.
invalid index of marginality. A further breakdown of funding, a common unit of measurement, and comparisons among values for given variables is felt to be necessary in order to calculate more reliable and valid indices. Furthermore, additional information is needed concerning confounding variables which might drastically affect a ratio of status. First, it is assumed that "direct per capita costs"\(^5^9^7\) reported by Clark represent the annual dollar expenditures, not allocations, per full-time equivalent, not per student, in the named systems using the average daily attendance standards. This would mean that allocations for students attending less than the specified number of days per year would be reduced on a pro-rated basis. It is assumed that annual per capita allocations to all three named subunits of the California School System are based on the same number of days-in-attendance requirement, otherwise Clark's reported annual dollar ratios should be adjusted in order to more accurately reflect priority for purposes of allocating funding within the parental system.

From the preceding quotation one could understand the reported per capita costs to be for each individual enrolled in the program during a given year, regardless of a student's attendance record. This seems unlikely and the assumption that Clark was reporting dollar expenditures per full-time equivalent (FTE) was made.

The funding per unit of average daily attendance in 1952-3

\(^5^9^7\)Ibid.
for both adult education\textsuperscript{598} and junior colleges\textsuperscript{599} is assumed to have been based on a 3-hour day, whereas for the senior high schools identified by Clark in this quotation, allocations were apparently based on a four-hour day.\textsuperscript{600}

If these assumptions are correct, then this one factor would have a bearing on both appropriate units of measurement and resulting ratios. The similar, but nevertheless different funding ratio from Clark's annual per capita dollar costs report for junior colleges, senior high schools, and adult schools (365.44:349.82:223.23), but felt to be a more valid unit of measurement, would be a ratio based on full-time equivalent standards, but one which adjusts for the variation in the ADA standards among the various subsystems. From Clark's reported ratio, one might be inclined to feel that such a disparity in per capita expenditures between high schools and adult schools ($349.82:$223.23) supports Clark's conclusion that adult education experienced marginality during 1952-3. However, when presented with the possibility that Clark's "per capita"\textsuperscript{601} is not representative of actual individuals in attendance but rather refers to full-time equivalent figures during the given year, and that an attendance day is four hours for elementary

\textsuperscript{598}Idem, Dissertation, pp. 18, 20.

\textsuperscript{599}Ibid., p. 20.

\textsuperscript{600}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{601}Idem, Monograph, p. 119.

\textsuperscript{602}Idem, Dissertation, p. 20.
and high schools and three hours for junior colleges and adult schools, then his reported ratio is invalidated and a different ratio based on a common denominator or unit of measurement is necessary. Reported ratios based on either different variables or units of measurement are invalid. While a common term was used, average daily attendance (ADA), the unit of measurement was not equivalent (see Table 5 for simplified ratios).

Adjusting for only one of several possible confounding variables, average daily attendance, the ratio is drastically altered between high schools and adult schools. It is important to keep in mind that Clark's reported annual dollar per capita costs were probably not tied to the number of students in attendance, but were likely representative of expenses calculated on average daily attendance formulas, formulas which varied among organizational subunits. Reported ratios adjusted to a 4-hour attendance day and to a 3-hour attendance day are equivalent ratios which can be simplified to a ratio of 18:13:11, representing funding levels for junior colleges, high schools, and adult schools, respectively. The ratio between high schools and adult schools from Clark's report of 17:11 is adjusted to 13:11 through consideration of this one variable only.

There are additional factors which might call for adjustments in ratios meant to reflect levels of financial
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603 See Table 6.
Table 5
Adjustment Table for Variations in Average Daily Attendance Standards* Among Organizational Subunits of the California School System, 1952-53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUNIOR COLLEGES</th>
<th>HIGH SCHOOLS</th>
<th>JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>ELEMEN­TARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>ADULT SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark's Annual Per Capita Funding</td>
<td>$365.44</td>
<td>$349.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>$223.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Adjusted to 4-hour Average Daily Attendance</td>
<td>487.25</td>
<td>349.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>297.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Adjusted to 3-hour Average Daily Attendance</td>
<td>365.44</td>
<td>262.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>223.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified Ratio</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Clark reported that average daily attendance was calculated on a four-hour day for elementary and high schools and on a three-hour day for junior colleges and adult schools.

...support among various subunits within a common parental system. On what basis are physical facilities and other overhead costs shared between adult schools and host institutions? Traditionally, adult schools have seldom paid their share of overhead costs from their revenues. Where such costs are reflected in expenditures of elementary and high schools, but are minimally reflected in adult school costs, adjustments must be made if the resulting ratio is to reflect valid comparative support levels among subunits. While there are many ways to share costs and divergent equity formulas, one might consider assigning such costs on the basis of a common full-time equivalent formula.
Adult schools in California through the conclusion of Clark's study had no-tuition-fee policies. Where fees and other income exist, they must be reflected in adult school expenditure figures if valid comparative support levels among subunits are desired.

While full-time equivalent comparisons among subunits may indicate status, other targeted comparisons based on both finances and other variables might be more reliable and valid indices of marginality. These might include comparisons of instructor salaries for identical courses taught within differing subunits, comparison of physical facilities, comparison of program planning expenditures, and comparisons of instructor and administrative benefits.

The first of Clark's three basic principles of legitimacy was the defense that "Adult education is a low-cost operation". Clark's argument that adult education is a low-cost operation appears to be an assessment from a narrow perspective. Adult education classes and schools may be assessed as such from the perspective of local property owners and in terms of increased assessment on local real estate through school taxes necessary to support it, or in terms of savings to local property owners when adult classes and schools are self-supporting or are responsible for increased state support, reducing local taxation of property owners. But assessments ignoring state expenditures, self-generated revenues, and evenly distributed

---

604 Clark, Monograph, pp. 77-9.
construction, maintenance and operating costs of physical facilities are not representative of actual program or school costs. There is no evidence in either Clark's Dissertation or Monograph to indicate that such factors were considered in his assessments of marginality. Neither was there adequate information in either document to enable readers to reformulate the concepts of status.

A more neutral perspective would view, as an example, high schools and adult schools as subunits of a common system. One might term such subunits as "compatible" subunits or "complementary" subunits in that they place compatible demands on common physical facilities. High schools tend to require day-time facility use; adult schools require evening access. The fact that high schools were most often established as publicly supported schools before adult schools might help explain why physical facilities tend to fall under their jurisdiction. Because of the compatibility of adult schools with high schools, their association might be seen as natural. Nevertheless, Clark's contention of a step-child relationship might be a fairly accurate representation of the existent relationship when adult schools are first initiated.

Because of the assumed tendency to justify new or added programs on the basis of increased costs to a system rather than on a shared cost basis, adult education may often be labeled low-cost as Clark has termed it. Thus, part of the costs of adult classes and schools would tend to be hidden in appropriations to host institutions such as high schools. When
such relationships are compatible and are accompanied by the extra benefits, such as those experienced by some school districts in California where increased attendance in adult schools tended to boost the level of funding for the high school, tendencies may exist to hide the true costs of the adult schools figured on pro-rated formulas, state allocations, and tuition charges. Rather than being reported as total expenses, costs would tend to be reported in terms of marginal costs to local property owners, or where possible, as savings. Adult education may not be less costly than high schooling, but it may have been expedient for both subsystems to report adult education as a low-cost operation because of perceived mutual benefits of making it appear as such to the local taxpayers. When state and federal appropriations for physical facilities, overhead, and operating subsidies are added to local property tax assessments for adult schools, the education of adults may not be found to be a low-cost operation as perceived by Clark. These are suppositions which can not be verified nor tested from the limited data in Clark's two manuscripts.

When viewed from Clark's perspective where facilities are constructed and maintained for elementary, high school, and junior college instruction, considered to be the primary goal and function of a system, little additional expense is incurred by the local property owners through the addition of evening adult classes. Adult schools are compatible with the three named organizational subunits primarily because of compatible time demands for physical facilities. Few alterations to high
school and junior college facilities are necessary to facilitate evening adult programs; hence Clark's appraisal of adult education as a low cost operation.

In summary, this thesis section is intended to illustrate the use of conceptual testing of concepts of marginality. Several of Clark's hypotheses made in reference to his use of the term marginality in his Dissertation and Monograph have been challenged through this process. Further, what Clark identified as indices of marginality may be found to be unrelated to the status of an adult education subunit among comparative subunits of a common parental system.
CHAPTER VIII

TYPOLOGY FOR CLASSIFICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF MARGINALITY

This chapter consists of the presentation and discussion of definitions and labels for each concept of marginality that was identified through the examination of Clark's use of the term marginality in his Dissertation and Monograph. Clark's uses were examined for purposes of identifying distinctions among key elements, which distinctions constitute the basis for various concepts of marginality. Different concepts of marginality are distinguished primarily by the nature of their adult education elements and by the contexts in which marginality is to be examined. Some concepts of marginality appear to be distinguished by the categorical limitation of variables to be considered in an assessment of status.

The concepts of marginality identified through this process serve as concrete examples from which a typology will be proposed for the classification of concepts of marginality. Seven basic concepts of marginality are identified and will be defined. Definitions will be stated for four categories of one concept of marginality, and for two categories of another. Additionally, a generic label will be proposed for denoting the
marginality of adult education subunits which are considered to be part of more than one educational system.

The definition of terms is a prior step to defining and labeling the seven proposed concepts of marginality. Eight terms are assigned particular meanings for the proposed definitional use.

Once definitions are established and labeled for each of the proposed concepts of marginality, the typology is tabled for reference purposes.

**Attribution of Concepts of Marginality to Clark**

Clark appears to have been the first author to use concepts of marginality to describe states of acceptance and status experienced by adult education organizational units. While his *Dissertation* is the primary document for examining the initial use and development of the term and concepts of marginality in the field of adult education, it is yet to be referenced, outside of this thesis, by authors applying concepts of marginality in the field.

Nevertheless, most authors in adult education who use the term, marginality, reference Clark and others of his publications in which he discusses marginality. Some authors, however, use the term, marginality, the concepts associated by Clark with the term, and key words found in Clark's work, without reference to his writings. At times, authors merely

---

605 See full listing of works by Clark in which the term marginality was used in Chapter II, *Clark's Monographs Concerning Marginality.*
quote or paraphrase Clark's writings concerning the concepts of marginality, but in given citations, explanations of the term are proposed which seem incongruent with Clark's contextual usages and explanations. Some authors are consistent in their use of the term. Others use the term in several ways, denoting quite different concepts. Additional authors use the term to denote concepts which are in definitional conflict with each other. Some have even sought to apply Clark's term, marginality, to novel relationships which they seek to describe or explain. Nevertheless, no references to sources of the concept of marginality other than Clark were found. Either Clark was cited or the term was used without attribution.

A literature review and study of the concepts of marginality resulted in still additional observations. Some authors were identified who seem to recognize the inconsistency of Clark's conceptualization and use of the term, marginality. These authors incorporate descriptions of adult education and its institutions in their writings, at times utilizing terminology used by Clark in discussing the state of marginality; however, they avoid use of the term itself.

There is little precision and consistency in its use, and the casual usage of the term has yet to be the subject of scholarly study. Most usages of the term by other authors have appeared as quotations and paraphrases of Clark's use of the term and concepts of marginality. No attempts to expand or clarify the concepts of marginality, nor to critique usages of the term were identified with the exception of those by
Burnham⁶⁰⁶ who traced the formulating and application of the "concept of marginality" and by Shotten⁶⁰⁷ who analyzed Clark's organizational model and constructed the alternative Flexibility Model.

The proposed typology for classification of concepts of marginality is for the purpose of distinguishing among various concepts of marginality found in adult education. Use of the term, marginality, to describe status of elements associated with adult education or with the field of adult education may be classified within any of the seven categories of the typology according to their key elements and contextual application.

Seven Major Concepts of Marginality Labeled and Defined

A typology for classifying usage of the term marginality, according to the distinct concepts of marginality it denotes, is proposed wherein seven major concepts of marginality are labeled and defined. Definitions for four categories of one of the concepts, and for two categories of a second concept of marginality, are stated.

Clark's usages of the term marginality found within the basic documents in which he discussed marginality were analyzed

⁶⁰⁶Byron R. Burnham, "The Formulation and Application of the Concept of Marginality in Adult Education," course assignment for Education 514, University of British Columbia, Department of Adult Education, Winter 1980, available from author, 1525 Ellendale Street, Logan, Utah 84321. (Typewritten.)

individually. This literature review allowed an evaluation of Clark's consistency in terms and concept usage and led to the identification of the seven distinct major concepts of marginality incorporated within the proposed typology. A review of literature within adult education to determine whether the term's usages in the general literature corresponded with Clark's usages followed. It was ascertained through these literature reviews that the term had been used to describe at least seven distinct states of existence:

First, applications to denote the status of either adult learning or adult education values, singly or collectively, among comparative learning or educational values, respectively, which values are held elsewhere in society, or a portion, thereof.

Second, applications to denote the status of either adult learning or adult education based on practices, singly or collectively, among comparative learning or education practices, respectively.

Third, applications to denote the societal status of learning situations, singly or collectively, found outside of the formal organizational setting where learning may be either fortuitous or intentional, and where there is no systematic programing of instruction.

Fourth, applications to denote the societal status of independent adult education units, singly or collectively.

Fifth, applications to denote status among organizational divisions of an adult education unit or subunit based on
administrative control, content, or other variables internal to the adult education unit or subunit.

Sixth, applications to the personal status of adult educators, administrators, program planners, students, or other personnel, singly or collectively, among other individuals performing similar roles within a common parental system, whether organizational or societal.

Seventh, applications to denote the status of adult education subunits, singly or collectively, among other subunits within a common parental organization, wherein the primary objective of the organization is other than the education of adults.

These seven concepts of marginality are labeled respectively as (1) values marginality, (2) practice marginality, (3) autonomous extra-organizational marginality, (4) autonomous organizational marginality, (5) intra-organizational marginality, (6) human system marginality, and (7) organizational system marginality and are later in this chapter defined in detail.

In categorizing concepts of marginality from the adult education literature, references to the marginality of adult education and to the marginality of the field of adult education are categorized as autonomous organizational marginality or organizational system marginality only if the contextual usage is judged to logically mandate such categorization. Otherwise such references are interpreted as designations of states of existence for the field of adult education in relation to
society and categorized as autonomous extra-organizational marginality.

A "non-specific usages of the term" category would become necessary in the event it is impossible to categorize a concept of marginality according to the proposed categories. This accommodation would allow for the interpretation that any or all of the conditions, denoted by terminology used within the seven categories of usage, may exist. Identification of additional distinct concepts of marginality may require enlargement of the typology.

A source of confusion in the analysis of Clark's initial concept of marginality was his omission of a succinct definition of his concept. Rather than clearly defining marginality as a concept denoting the status of an adult education subunit in relation to an educational system, Clark described "Sources and Indices of Marginality." He made no distinctions among the state or condition of marginality, sources of marginality, nor indices of marginality, and tended to treat them as one. Clark also discussed validation in speaking of the assessment of marginality. As previously quoted:

It is difficult to assess such a factor as organizational marginality, since the question of validation involves acceptance by different groups within and without the school system, and acceptance on various grounds.  

As Clark did, it is tempting to define concepts of
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marginality primarily through listing sources, indices and validations of the concept, but this approach will not result in precise definitions for the concepts.

**Definition of Terms**

Several terms are required for developing parsimonious descriptions within the proposed categories. These terms are briefly defined as follows:

**Institutional** denotes the presence of formal constitutions, bylaws and objectives which outline organizational purposes and responsibilities.

**Autonomous** denotes "self-governing" and "existing or functioning independently,"\(^6\) whether as an individual or group in a non-institutionalized setting or as an institution.

**System** is used to discuss educational units so arranged that together they form an element bound by a common and orderly organization, objectives, restrictions, and/or influences. It denotes actual ordering of individuals and rules for their interaction.

**Organizational** denotes formal structuring of individuals or groups through incorporation in compliance with governmental requirements. While in the societal setting any interaction among individuals might be regarded as an index of an organization, for purposes of this thesis mere collaboration of individuals, or resultant informal structuring of individuals and roles, will not be interpreted as organizational without

\(^6\)Webster, 1972, s. v. "autonomous."
formal objectives, bylaws, constitution, and/or incorporation.

Instruction denotes the deliberate design and management of events and environment for purposes of facilitating learning.

Adult education subunit refers not to a subdivision of an adult education unit, but rather to an adult education element organizationally subordinate to a parental organization or physically larger or more powerful organization whose primary objective is not the education of adults.

Independent adult education organization or unit refers to an adult education element, formally constituted, wherein the primary objective and function is the education of adults.

Parental organization denotes the existence of an organization created for purposes other than the education of adults, which contains one or more adult education subunits.

Supra-parental organization denotes the existence of an organization composed of lesser organizations, at least one of which contains an adult education subunit.

Typology of Marginality

For purposes of classification of various usages of the term, marginality, several restrictive definitions will be utilized. Each is labeled and succinctly stated in Table 6. Each classification of marginality will be discussed.

Values Marginality

Values marginality is a category of concepts of marginality which denotes the status of either adult learning or adult education values, singly or collectively, among comparative learning or education values, respectively, which values are
Table 7
TYPOLOGY FOR CLASSIFICATION AND LABELING
OF CONCEPTS OF MARGINALITY IN ADULT EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES MARGINALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of either adult learning or adult education beliefs or standards, singly or collectively, among comparative learning or educational values, respectively, which values are held elsewhere in society or a portion thereof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICE MARGINALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of either adult learning or adult education based on professional, customary, or habitual actions, singly or collectively, to facilitate adult learning, among comparative learning or education actions, respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTONOMOUS EXTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL MARGINALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal status of adult learning processes, practices, or events, singly or collectively, occurring outside of an organizational setting, wherein learning may be either fortuitous or intentional, and wherein learning occurs without systematic programming of instruction by the learner, an instructor, programer, or administrator, among non-adult learning processes, practices, or events, respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTONOMOUS ORGANIZATIONAL MARGINALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal status of a self-governing and incorporated adult education unit, wherein the primary objective and function is the education of adults, in comparison to non-adult education units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL MARGINALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status among organizational divisions of an adult education unit or subunit based on administrative control, content, or other variable internal to the adult education unit or subunit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN SYSTEM MARGINALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal status of adult educators, administrators, program planners, students, or other personnel, singly or collectively, among other individuals performing similar roles within a common parental system or context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator System Marginality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of adult education administrators, their attributes or roles, considered either singly or collectively, among administrators, their attributes or roles, in comparative organizational units within a common parental system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client System Marginality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of adult education students, interns, or apprentices, singly or collectively, among students, interns, or apprentices in comparative organizational units within a common system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEM MARGINALITY**

Status of an adult education subunit(**) among other subunits within a common parental organization, wherein the primary objective and function of the organization is other than the education of adults.

**Organizational Micro-system Marginality**

Status of an individual adult education subunit among other subunits within an immediate parental organization, wherein the primary objective and function is other than the education of adults.

**Organizational Macro-system Marginality**

Status of an individual adult education subunit among other subunits within a supra-parental organization, wherein the primary objectives and functions is other than the education of adults.

**Organizational Multiple Subunit Micro-system Marginality**

Status of two or more adult education subunits, considered collectively, among other subunits within an immediate parental organization, wherein the primary objective and function is other than the education of adults.

**Organizational Multiple Subunit Macro-system Marginality**

Status of two or more adult education subunits, considered collectively, among other subunits within a supra-parental organization, wherein the primary objective and function is other than the education of adults. Parental organization is bypassed in order to focus on relationship of the adult education subunits within a larger system.

**INTER-SYSTEM MARGINALITY**

A generic label applicable to both organizational system marginality concepts and human system marginality concepts denoting the composite status of adult education subunits or human systems which are considered to be part of more than one system.

* An adult education unit is an independent and formally constituted organizational element whose primary objective and function is adult education.

** An adult education subunit is not a subdivision of an adult education unit, but rather a legal or formally incorporated adult education element organizationally subordinate to a parent organization or larger or more powerful organization whose primary objective and function is not adult education.
held elsewhere in society or a portion, thereof. Portions of society include organizational contexts to which concepts of marginality were most frequently applied by Clark.

Values are frequently defined as both beliefs and standards. Both beliefs and standards are thought to vary among adult education and comparative elements within both organizational and societal contexts. Values defined as beliefs are different from practices, in that they reflect either what individuals believe should be done or should exist as opposed to how individuals exercise their beliefs and influences. Often there is a discrepancy between what one believes the ideal to be and what one deems is the best option in a given situation. Likewise, there is frequently a discrepancy between what one believes the ideal to be and what one accepts with full approval.

Values, defined as standards, reflect the minimum level of acceptable behavior or existence. In reiteration, standards are thought to vary among adult education and comparative elements across both organizational and societal contexts.

When applying and interpreting concepts of value marginality within adult education, it is important for conceptual clarity to identify the variable as either beliefs or standards.

Values, defined as either beliefs or standards, may be considered to be a cause, source, evidence, symptom, or index of other concepts of marginality existent in the field of adult education. Beliefs and standards are felt by this author to
affect the status of adult education elements denoted by other concepts of marginality. But, when standards and beliefs are the focus in considerations of status, then the concept of values marginality stands as a distinct concept, encompassing the concepts of beliefs marginality and standards marginality.

**Practice Marginality**

Practice marginality is a category of marginality which denotes the status of either adult learning or adult education based on professional, customary, or habitual actions, singly or collectively, to facilitate adult learning among comparative learning or education actions, respectively.

The concept of practice marginality is used to denote the status based on actions actually practiced within adult education among actions practiced elsewhere in organizational and societal contexts.

Areas of practice somewhat unique to adult education, practices which might affect status, include what Verner and Booth termed methods, techniques and devices:

Adult education is not bound by any traditional methodological concept, nor does it attach value to any single process beyond its utility in achieving a learning objective efficiently, effectively, and appropriately for the group being educated....

Three separate elements are included in the notion of process for adult education, and each of these describes a discrete function. The first element is the method: the organization of the prospective participants for purposes of education. The second element involves techniques: the variety of ways in which the learning task is managed so as to facilitate learning. The third and final element involves devices: all those particular things or conditions which are utilized to augment the techniques and make learning more certain.
Adult education is not tied to any particular process. Nevertheless, its status is affected by the professional, customary, and habitual processes it practices.

Verner and Booth defined methods as "the ways in which people are organized in order to conduct an educational activity....A method establishes a relationship between the learner and the institution or agency through which the educational task is accomplished." Methods practiced frequently in adult education include distance education, apprenticeships, discussion groups, workshops, institutes, meetings, forums, assemblies, and community development.

Techniques were defined by Verner and Booth as "the ways in which the instructional agent establishes a relationship between the learner and the learning task." Techniques named by these authors which are frequently used in adult education include projects, buzz groups, group discussions, panels, symposiums, debates, process demonstrations, and seminars.

Verner and Booth noted that the "term devices is a
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convenient way of identifying the many instructional aids that extend or increase the effectiveness of methods and techniques but which cannot themselves instruct. Devices used frequently in adult education include computer hardware, illustrative devices, films and result demonstrations.

All three elements of process described by Verner and Booth—methods, techniques, and devices—may constitute a basis for differentiated status between an adult education element and comparative elements.

Some may view practice marginality as a cause, source, evidence, symptom, or index of other concepts of marginality. Certainly adult education practices affect the status of adult education elements denoted by other concepts of marginality. But, when practices are the focus, then the concept of practice marginality stands as a distinct concept.

Autonomous Extra-organizational Marginality

Autonomous extra-organizational marginality is a category of marginality which denotes the societal status of adult learning situations, singly or collectively, found outside of an organizational setting where learning may be either fortuitous or intentional, and where learning occurs without systematic programing of instruction by the learner, an instructor, a programer, or administrator.

By previous definition, the word autonomous in this categorical term suggests one of two situations. In the first

\[6^{15}\text{Ibid., p. 84.}\]
instance individuals within a natural environment—one that does not fall within the boundaries denoted by organization or institution—learn fortuitously through observation of, or interaction with, their environment. This interaction may be necessitated by their environment, such as learning the first skills of swimming out of necessity in order to escape a river into which one has fallen, or it may be intentional such as practicing short swims in shallow water in an effort to become a better swimmer. These actions and function outside of an organizational setting, are engaged in and controlled by individuals having freedom to engage in or withdraw from a learning situation with no accountability to an institution. Individuals may at times act as their own educational agents when sufficient instructional skills have been gained to arrange their environments and the events within them so as to facilitate effective learning to achieve specific objectives.

To this point individual learning efforts have been described and it is the status of these learning efforts, activities, programs, or experiences which is characterized as low when concepts of marginality are applied.

In the second instance, an individual may choose to learn alone or in cooperation with one or more friends who may either perform as co-learners or who may play the role of "instructional agent." The instructional agent may be chosen
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by the group because of the individual's knowledge of the subject matter or because of specially acquired skills which aid in facilitating learning. An individual who has such skills is often recognized as a leader, facilitator, teacher, instructor, programmer, or administrator regardless of the lack of any formal institutional position or endorsement. Here again, the learning activities, experiences, or programs they participate in are granted less than full status within society.

The classification, autonomous extra-organizational marginality, is also appropriately applied to activities, experiences, programs, and experiences wherein student-tutor relationships exist. Most often the tutor is a friend or family member, but even when the tutor has been hired for professional instruction, so long as the educational agent has been engaged on a personal basis rather than through an organization or institution, the use of the term, autonomous extra-organizational marginality will be used to describe the status of the adult learning activity, experience, or program. These adult learning occurrences outside formal organizational settings have been labeled by some authors as marginal, assumedly to describe their status afforded by society. These "adult learning projects" may be focused, deliberate efforts by an individual to learn and may include the use of a teacher. These learning projects are not limited to verbal information,
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intellectual skill, or cognitive strategy learning outcomes, but may include learning outcomes in the realm of attitudinal change and motor skill development.\textsuperscript{618} Most types of learning outcomes may be achieved in this informal learning environment.

Most learning is perceived by some adult educationists as occurring within the realms of "self-planned learning projects;"\textsuperscript{619} however, many individuals seek the help of one or more teachers in their learning episodes. Most often teachers who are family or friends are recruited on a voluntary basis. At times, monetary compensation is involved. The teachers may also be called educational agents,\textsuperscript{620} tutors, leaders, mentors,\textsuperscript{621} directors, or instructors.

Houle\textsuperscript{622} listed Major Categories of Educational Design Situations (see Table 6) in which he identified four major situational categories: individual, group, institution, and mass. Since the autonomous extra-organizational marginality


\textsuperscript{619}Tough, The Adult's Learning Projects, p. 92.

\textsuperscript{620}Verner, "Definitions of Terms."


concept denotes the state of adult learning situations, singly or collectively, found outside of an organizational setting, the concept of extra-organizational marginality may appropriately be used to note various states of marginality which may occur in three of Houle's four major categories of educational design situations: individual, group, and mass. The autonomous extra-organizational marginality category excludes concepts of marginality applied in institutional settings such as those educational design situations categorized by Houle under his Institution heading.

It might be reasoned that engaging a tutor, leader, instructor, teacher, mentor, or director for instructional purposes transforms a learning situation into an organizational relationship. One might conclude that the formation of groups for common purposes, which common purposes in this case focus on educational pursuits either for specific or common objectives, is in essence the start of an organization. However, for purposes of this thesis, relationships between individuals, and group formation for pursuit of educational objectives will not be considered as an institutional or organizational setting unless formal incorporation occurs. Only when a formal constitution exists or when a unit is formally incorporated will the existence of an organizational relationship be recognized for definitional purposes. While it is possible to employ organizational theory and definitions in analyzing simple student-teacher relationships and educational group activities, for purposes of this thesis, such relationships will not be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>An individual designs an activity for himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>An individual or a group designs an activity for another individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>A group (with or without a continuing leader) designs an activity for itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>A teacher or group of teachers designs an activity for, and often with, a group of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>A committee designs an activity for a larger group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Two or more groups design an activity which will enhance their combined programs of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7</td>
<td>A new institution is designed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8</td>
<td>An institution designs an activity in a new format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9</td>
<td>An institution designs a new activity in an established format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>Two or more institutions design an activity which will enhance their combined programs of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-11</td>
<td>An individual, group, or institution designs an activity for a mass audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categorized as institutional so long as neither of the two criteria for institutional categorization is present.

The status of adult learning activities, experiences, or programs, singly or collectively, which occur outside of formal organizational settings may exist in states of autonomous extra-organizational marginality. The word autonomous as a descriptor of extra-organizational marginality signifies that the individuals who control the activities, experiences, or programs do so independently and have power to control their relationship to society. The individual or group is self-governing in selection and control of learning activities, experiences, or programs, which activities, experiences, or programs are characterized as low status. This independence in action does not mean that autonomous extra-organizational relationships are not influenced by institutions, but rather that individuals controlling them are capable of independent and autonomous actions in contrast with normalizing control exerted through institutionalization. Extra-organizational as a descriptor denotes the absence of a formal institution. When reference is made to adult education activities collectively, or to the field or discipline of adult education, these references will be categorized as autonomous extra-organizational marginality unless specific reference is made to the educational activities occurring within an organizational or institutional setting or unless, because of the contextual usage of the word, marginality, an institutional or organizational context may logically be assumed.
Reference to learning situations within the larger society are only excluded from the autonomous extra-organizational marginality category when an adult education unit is part of a formal institution. Units can be involved in cooperative ventures, so long as they retain their autonomy.

** Autonomous Organizational Marginality **

Autonomous organizational marginality is a category of marginality which denotes the societal status of a self-governing and incorporated adult education unit wherein the primary objective and function is the education of adults.

Reference to independent adult education units denotes formal structuring of individuals or groups through incorporation, which by definition denotes the presence of formal objectives, bylaws, and/or constitutions, or through legislation. These independent adult education units have been created for the express purpose of educating adults. They may sponsor auxiliary activities, but most often their interest in activities which are not expressly for the education of adults is viewed as a necessary or enabling factor in facilitating the provision of adult education. Such secondary and tertiary activities include fund raising, public relations ventures and the sponsorship of joint youth-adult educational programs where the presence and participation of youth facilitates learning by adults. An independent adult education unit might even sponsor youth programs when the sponsorship is considered advantageous to the unit for purposes of maintaining or improving educational opportunities for adults. As in advertising, where product
promoters seek to reach adult buying potential through appeals to children through advertising their hamburgers, cereals or other products which are normally used by both adults and children, one might maintain that 4-H programs are sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Service as a device to reach the intended adult audience. The primary concern of the extension workers in 4-H may not be the education of 4-H members, but rather the dissemination of innovation to an adult audience where such instruction, dissemination of information, or promotion of innovative programs might be resisted if a direct approach were made. Granted, 4-H members acquiring innovative information today may use the information themselves, but with the shrinking farm population, the potential for direct application as a future farmer by learners or 4-H participants has been declining. With these considerations in mind, the argument that 4-H is a device by the Cooperative Extension Service to reach parents and community members with innovative information and programs more than it is an effort to educate youth participants becomes viable.

The use of the word autonomous as a descriptor of organizational marginality signifies that the adult education unit is relatively "free from control by institutions established for other purposes." The organization is independent and is free to engage in or to withdraw from
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cooperative educational ventures and other programs.

In establishing a typology of adult education units, Knowles elaborated upon a scheme developed in 1947 by Houle "in connection with the reorganization of the graduate curriculum in adult education at the University of Chicago." In his typology, Knowles labeled agencies created primarily to serve adults as "Type II" (p. 44) and included within his classification agricultural extension, independent residential centers, and proprietary adult schools. Independent residential centers, and proprietary adult schools written of by Knowles relate directly to the established autonomous organizational marginality classification.

Among adult education organizations classified as independent residential centers the degree of influence exerted by institutions in contrast to the degree of influence exerted by society varies greatly. Knowles reported that:

In contrast to the development of adult education in European countries, where residential colleges and folk schools become highly important institutional forms, their counterparts in the United States have remained a largely peripheral institutional form. The independent center, however, is one of the few forms created expressly for the education of adults that is free from control by institutions established for other purposes. Some independent residential centers have been created expressly for the purpose of educating adults and have avoided institutional influence outside the realm of government.
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regulation. Most independent residential centers, however, are said by Schroeder\textsuperscript{626} to be only semi-autonomous in that they link themselves to other institutions for mutual benefits, such as sharing in the use of public school facilities. When such shared-use-of-facilities arrangements are made, it is best described as a peer relationship because either party is free at will to withdraw from the arrangement in favor of other preferred arrangements. When, however, the provider becomes the sole provider, supplies the facilities well below the rate which could be obtained elsewhere for comparable facilities, and/or has the potential of granting the facilities to a second potential user which would place the present adult education unit at a disadvantage in competing with the potential replacement unit or presently operating competitors, then acceptance of said cooperative arrangements places the adult education unit in an obligatory or subordinate role or position, and in such a state it is subject to some influence exerted by the provider (which might be school boards or other volunteer and citizen boards).

Where the provider supplies facilities to an independent adult education unit at rates well below market value without other compensation to itself, the provider becomes more of a sponsor than a peer of the adult education unit. In such circumstances the adult education unit gives up some autonomy

for the benefits of sponsorship. More often than not in the public school system, however, fuller use of physical facilities such as public school rooms during evening hours by adults is advantageous to the public schools. It strengthens the public school system's case for increased public support, particularly if the independent adult school caters to the local taxpayer. Boards sometimes serve and influence both the providing institution and the independent adult education unit. In such instances, the adult education unit loses some of its autonomy and becomes semi-autonomous. Such semi-autonomous organizations will be considered within the autonomous organizational marginality category so long as they are judged to be sufficiently independent to enable their withdrawal at will from these relationships, while remaining as viable institutions with their own original organizational objectives. Even if survival is only possible through the establishment of similar or additional linkages to other institutions, so long as withdrawal from current linkages is a viable alternative, then classification of the marginality experienced by such an adult education unit is properly made to the autonomous organizational marginality category.

Knowles perceived adult education units in Europe to be more autonomous, on the whole, than their counterparts found in the United States. This is because of the tendency for American institutions to align themselves with unequal and dominant

institutions. While any linkages to another institution might be grounds for exclusion of the marginality of an adult education unit from the autonomous organizational marginality category, for purposes of this thesis the question must be addressed as to whether "control" is lost where such relationships exist.

When associations are mutually beneficial, are of a peer nature and do not take from the adult education unit control of its own functions and future, classification as autonomous organizational marginality will be the rule.

**Intra-organizational Marginality**

Intra-organizational marginality is a category of marginality which denotes status among organizational divisions of an adult education subunit based on administrative control, content, or other variables internal to the adult education subunit.

Other concepts of marginality identified within this thesis concern the status of adult education subunits among other subunits within a common parental system or the status of attributes of an adult education subunit among attributes of other subunits within a common parental system.

Intra-organizational marginality concerns status of organizational divisions of an adult education subunit. Whereas all other concepts of marginality defined within this thesis might be used to describe the status of adult education, in
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whole or in part, this concept is best thought of as a concept denoting marginality in adult education. All organizational elements to which this concept may be properly applied are segments of what has been defined within this thesis as an adult education subunit or to independent adult education organizations, wherein the primary objective and function is the education of adults.

Status among organizational divisions of an adult education unit or subunit is based on administrative control, context, or other variables internal to the adult education unit or subunit. Human System Marginality

Human system marginality is a category of concepts of marginality which denotes the status of adult educators, administrators, program planners, students, or other personnel, singly or collectively among other individuals performing similar roles within a common parental system or context.

The term human denotes that part of an adult education system which is living. While systems may self-perpetuate, man's role in the system is tenative. With the exception of high technology educational systems wherein interaction between the educational agent and learner is anticipated and pre-programmed to facilitate limited continuing interactions, organizational systems cease with the demise of the human element.

The concept of human system marginality denotes both the
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status of the individual and the roles one fulfills among individuals and roles performed by others elsewhere in the system. Clark, in his *Dissertation*, wrote of the marginality of adult administrators.\(^{630}\) Roebuck uses the term marginality to denote the condition or status of an individual within a penitentiary system. In his description of "prisons and their impact on individuals," he wrote of:

> deprivations and frustrations of institutional life which lead to the partial loss of personal autonomy, impersonalization, marginality, mortification, status degradation, and loss of identification with the normal adult role."\(^{631}\)

As with values marginality and practice marginality, human system marginality may be considered to be a cause, source, evidence, symptom, or index of other concepts of marginality. Human system marginality affects the status of adult education elements denoted by other concepts of marginality. Human system marginality is encompassed by the broader concepts of organizational system marginality unless specifically excluded. The human system, seen from a holistic approach, is a naturally occurring portion of educational systems and is only absent when facilitated through high technology responses simulating anticipated responses. When adult educators, administrators, program planners, students, or other personnel, singly or collectively, are the focus, and consideration of other aspects
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of an educational system is ignored, then the concept of human system marginality stands as a distinct concept.

Use of the term, human system marginality, does not preclude consideration of the status of the human portion of an educational system as part of the complete system in considerations of status for the total system, or a portion thereof. Likewise, use of the term, human system marginality, does not preclude use of categories to enable still further differentiation of status based on components of the larger system. Human system marginality will act as a generic classification. A sub-classification of human system marginality is proposed in response to an identified use of the sub-classification in Clark's Dissertation.

Administrator system marginality. When the status of adult education administrators, their attributes, or roles, among administrators, their attributes, or roles in comparative organizational units within a common parental system is being considered, either singly or collectively, the term administrator system marginality is applicable. Such assessments of status may be based on any number of variables which directly concern the human leadership element of an educational system—a peer ranking or rating by the administrators, a ratio or ranking of key administrative salaries, or a community status report for adult education administrators among administrators of comparative organizational units. Administrator system marginality is a sub-classification of human system marginality in that it is
used to address only the status of adult education administrators, their attributes, and roles, considered to be only part of the human systems encompassed by an educational system.

Clark may have used the concept of marginality in his Dissertation which is defined by this classification. He may have felt that "the position and power of the adult administrators," was sources, indices, bases and symptoms, or a symptom of marginality. If such administrative position and power were the variables under consideration in the establishment of status, such as in an exercise to determine the effects of excluding an adult education subunit administrator from the governing board of the parental organization, then it would be an application of administrator system marginality.

Client system marginality. When the status of adult education clients, their attributes, or roles, among clients, their attributes, or roles in comparative organizational units within a common system is being considered, either singly or collectively, the term client system marginality is applicable. Such assessments of status may be based on any number of
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variables which directly concern the human client element of an educational system--a ranking or rating of adult students among other categories of students based on testing of content knowledge from a common course, or societal ranking or rating of adult education clients among clients of other educational systems for purposes of distributing public funds.

Client system marginality is a sub-classification of human system marginality in that it pertains only to the status of adult clients, their attributes, and roles, considered to be only part of the human systems encompassed by an educational system. Clients within an educational system might include students, interns, or apprentices. When their status is considered collectively they may be referred to as classes, groups, forums, assemblies, or communities.

Agencies and organizations external to the adult education subunit or organizational unit may sponsor students, interns, and apprentices through scholarships or contracted seat purchases in given adult education programs. In such roles some may be inclined to consider such agencies as clients in that tuition and fees are paid to the adult education organization by the agency for the learner. In this thesis, such agencies will be considered as co-sponsoring organizations and cooperative agencies, not as clients.

Roebuck's use of the term marginality to denote the

---

condition and status of inmates within a penitentiary system is an application of the client system marginality concept. Inmate status among individuals in other systems in society might be based on autonomy, income, social acceptibility, or any number of adult roles, including that of student within educational systems. A ratio, ranking, or rating of status of an inmate enrolled in an adult education course among students in populations enrolled in similar courses outside the penitentiary system would be an expression of the proposed classification of marginality.

Organizational System Marginality

Organizational system marginality is a category of marginality which denotes the status of an adult education subunit in relation to a parental organization and its other subunits, wherein the primary objective of the organization is other than the education of adults.

Coinciding with the definition of systems proposed in this chapter, the use of the organizational system marginality label suggests that the parental organization and adult education subunit are so arranged that they form an element bound by common objectives, restrictions, and/or influences in contrast to the instance where an adult education unit may exist with less defined links to society at large or a portion thereof. Organizational System marginality is likewise an institutional or organizational concept which necessitates the existence of formal constitutions, bylaws, and objectives which outline purposes and responsibilities. The adult education subunit is
referred to as such because of its subjugative relationship with the parental organization. Most often the adult education subunit is the creation of the parental organization, although it is possible for individuals and groups to organize and then attach themselves to a sponsoring parental or supervisory organization or to go through the maturing phase to gain status as an autonomous adult education agency before attaching themselves to a parental organization. The classification, organizational system marginality, does not dictate nor restrict the type of relationship between the parental organization and the adult education subunit, but merely denotes the existence of a relationship between them wherein the adult education subunit is under the "control" of the parental organization without the power to withdraw as a viable organizational element to act as an independent adult education unit, or to establish itself in cooperative arrangements or as a subordinate subunit within a different system.

Determining the existence of an adult education subunit can at times be difficult. Reference is often made to adult education functions, activities, roles and programs. Authors also refer to sponsoring or undertaking adult education. It is difficult at times to determine whether these functions, activities, roles and programs are occurring within an adult education subunit. This determination is important because

638Ibid.

639Brunner et al., An Overview of Adult Education Research, p. 123.
without the existence of an adult education subunit the concept of organizational system marginality has no applicability. Organizational system marginality is inescapably an organizational concept. In the absence of an adult education subunit the status of these functions, activities, and programs must be considered as occurring within an independent adult education unit, as being an auxiliary function of an organization whose primary purpose is not adult education, or as occurring within society where the applicable concept would be autonomous extra-organizational marginality. Thus, when adult education functions, activities, roles and programs are described as marginal, the application of any of the three named major concepts of marginality could be proper designations of the state of existence. Which concept is applicable depends on the existence of an adult education subunit and parental organization for application of the organizational system marginality concept.

An adult education subunit shall be considered to exist when adult education responsibilities are formally assigned to an individual administrator, educator, or group within an organization, regardless of whether a separate element is formally organized for adult education. Indications of this formal assignment by an organization include existence of a formal mandate, stated adult education objectives, full or part-time adult education appointments and remuneration for adult education functions, and organizationally sponsored adult education program planning and instruction. Thus, in applying
this definition it is possible to have more than one adult education subunit associated with a single parental organization. A more typical pattern, however, might be one where some degree of organization occurs to coordinate adult education within the organization, regardless of adult education's contextual settings. Categories of organizational system marginality will be proposed which distinguish the existence of individual or multiple adult education subunits.

A university professor could perform adult education functions and sponsor adult education programs and activities without organizational sponsorship. Examples of such involvement in adult education outside of formal university responsibility might include teaching an adult education Sunday school class, volunteering instructional time for a one-time community parenting course, initiating a community field day for purposes of disseminating agricultural methods resultant from the professor's university research, or serving as a voluntary program planner for the community. Although phone calls may be placed from university phones, programs planned during normal university hours, and instruction prepared between university responsibilities, it is possible that none of these instances of adult education may be recognized or sanctioned by the university. Thus, none defines nor contributes to the existence of an adult education subunit within the university or parental organization. The association of an individual with an organization does not necessarily imply that all adult education functions, activities, roles, and programs performed by that
individual are functions of the organization. Some of the involvements of the professor described in this example may be indicators of adult education subunits in other organizations, dependent upon their formal recognition by the appropriate organizations. The status of other involvements of this professor in adult education would be classified as autonomous extra-organizational category.

Peters and Kozoll described the diverse contexts within which adult education occurs:

Adult education practitioners operate not only within established organizations but also work outside them as catalysts between organizations, within informal groups and as individuals.\textsuperscript{640}

When one or more adult education subunits exist and function under the control of a parental or supra-parental organization, the term organizational system marginality shall be used to describe the existent status of the subunit or subunits. Use of the term, organizational system marginality, does not preclude use of categories to enable still further differentiation of status within organizations, but will act as a generic classification. Four sub-classifications of organizational system marginality will be proposed.

In summary, adult education functions, activities, and programs occur throughout society. Their marginality, according to Clark, is determined by the degree of acceptance afforded them by society, by independent adult education units and by parental organizations. The organizational or extra-

\textsuperscript{640}Peters and Kozoll, "Organizations of the Field," p. 4.
organizational concept in which these functions, activities, and programs occur is indicative of the relationship to adult education which determines their state of existence or marginality. Mere involvement of an employee, officer or representative in adult education functions, activities, and programs without organizational sanction or sponsorship does not establish them as subunits of that organization. Application of the organizational system marginality concept is appropriate only when one or more adult education subunits exist. The existence of adult education subunits implies the existence of a parental organization.

Had Clark announced a single case study and confined his applications of marginality to one context, there might be good reason to feel an abstraction view of concepts of marginality is most appropriate. Clark, however, was inconsistent in his application of concepts of marginality. The homonymic view used by linguists and logicians make the distinctions between levels of conceptual application and differentiations among the limits of the adult education element which in turn affects the described relationship among the subunits within a common parental organization--important distinctions when studying Clark's use of the term marginality. The homonymic strategy
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641 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, pp. 106-14; Abstraction view adherents would consider marginality as one very general and abstract concept.

642 Ibid.; A homonymic view of concepts of marginality differentiates among the concepts and treats them as independent.
accommodates for Clark's inconsistency in application and enables the definition of sub-classifications felt to be necessary for purposes of distinguishing among organizational system marginality concepts. Four such sub-classification have been identified and will be labeled, defined, and discussed under the thesis headings which follow.

Organizational micro-system marginality. When the status of an individual adult education subunit among other subunits within an immediate parental organization is being described, the term organizational micro-system marginality is applicable. By definition, the primary objective and function of the parental organization must be other than the education of adults. An example of organizational micro-system marginality would be the status of the University of British Columbia Centre for Continuing Education, a distinct adult education subunit, among other subunits within the University of British Columbia.

Organizational macro-system marginality. When the status of individual adult education subunits among other subunits within a supra-parental organization is denoted, the organizational system marginality concept is being applied at a macro level. An example would be the application of the organizational system marginality concept to the Centre for Continuing Education, which for purposes of determining status, would require an understanding of its status among other subunits of the supra-parental organization, the University and College System of the Province of British Columbia. In this example the focus would not be on the organizational system
marginality of an individual adult education subunit within the university, but rather would address the status of the adult education subunit among other subunits of the larger system. Hence, organizational system marginality is considered at the macro level.

Organizational multiple subunit micro-system marginality. This label denotes the status of two or more adult education subunits, considered collectively, among other subunits within an immediate parental organization, wherein the primary objective and function of the organization is other than the education of adults.

An example of a potential application of the organizational multiple subunit organizational micro-system marginality concept would be the consideration of the collective status of the various adult education subunits, among other subunits of the University of British Columbia. While a formal collective adult education subunit encompassing Continuing Dental Education, Continuing Medical Education, Continuing Nursing Education, Guided Independent Study, and the Centre for Continuing Education, does not exist at the University of British Columbia, the organizational multiple subunit micro-system marginality concept would, nevertheless, be applicable if the collective status of these adult education subunits within a common parental organization were considered.

Organizational multiple subunit macro-system marginality. This label denotes the status of two or more adult education subunits, considered collectively, in relation to a supra-
parental organization, where for determination of status the immediate parental organization is bypassed in order to focus on relationship of the adult education subunit to a larger system.

Assessment of the status of adult schools within the California State School System is an example of an application of the organizational multiple subunit macro-system marginality concept. The status of the adult schools is considered collectively rather than individually. Consideration of status is not limited to rankings within the Los Angeles School System, which is the immediate parental organization, but rather status is assessed among subunits throughout the state system. The California state school system is considered to be a supra-parental organization in this application of the concept of organizational multiple subunit macro-system marginality.

**Inter-system marginality.** This generic label is applicable to both organizational system marginality concepts and human system marginality concepts denoting the composite status of adult education subunits or human systems which are considered to be part of more than one system.

Some adult education within the Canadian penitentiary system was labeled by Boshier as "marginal (Clark, 1958)".

The flagship programmes are run by the University of Victoria and, although based on sound theory, are higher education oriented and largely disconnected from other elements in the "system".\(^6\)\(^3\)

The "system" Boshier referred to was that of the penitentiary system—not that institutional system of the University of
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\(^6\)\(^3\)Boshier, *Education Inside*, pp. 169-70.
Victoria. Boshier's focus was on the incongruity of the University of Victoria's educational programs to Correctional Service Canada. Boshier could have identified these same adult education program as part of the University of Victoria. Certain educational programs may experience inter-system marginality. This means that they are considered to be part of more than one system. Within the Correctional Service of Canada, both adult educational programs taught by inhouse instructors and contracted educational programs are considered to be part of the system's offering. Because education of adult prisoners is not the primary objective of the Correctional Service of Canada, the adult education subunit experiences system marginality from the perspective of the penitentiary system. These same adult educational programs, under contract from the Correctional Service of Canada, experience organizational system marginality within the penitentiary system. Because these educational programs within the penitentiary are considered marginal within two systems, they experience inter-system marginality and the effects of marginality may be either intensified or mitigated, dependent upon the correlation of variables of status between the two systems.

**Typology Adaptable to General Systems Applications**

The term, marginality, has been used so inconsistently within the adult education literature that the intention of authors as they apply the term and concepts is likely to be unclear or at least imprecise in most cases. The use of
typologies is one strategy of analysis. Such classification systems based on types facilitates the drawing of distinctions among the various shades of meaning.

The proposed Typology for Classification of Concepts of Marginality is intended to facilitate the classification of all usages of the term marginality which have been identified through an examination of Clark's Dissertation and Monograph. Each of the seven major concepts was defined and expanded as usages of the concepts within the two documents were categorized.

The typology is proposed as a guide for the examination of concepts of marginality used by other authors in the field and as a stepping block to a more complete typology for categorizing concepts used within the literature of the field. The Typology for Classification and Labeling of Concepts of Marginality In Adult Education is presented now in tabled form to facilitate referencing.
CHAPTER IX:
SUMMARY STATEMENTS, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This concluding chapter is more than a summary. Many questions formed the basis of the study. Most of these have now been answered. All are restated for summary and review purposes. The important fact of popular acceptance of the term marginality amid conceptual chaos is also addressed. The methodology and data analysis are reviewed and principal findings from the literature review are restated. Because proposed definitions for each of the seven basic concepts of marginality have been presented in Chapter VIII, the process will not be repeated in this chapter. The consequences of terminological and conceptual imprecision will be reviewed, a distinction drawn between operationalization and instrumentation of concepts, and some definitional clarifications made. Limitations of the study will be addressed and, in conclusion, implications for future research, development, and reporting will be made.

This thesis is multipurpose. First, it is an historical examination of the coining of a term and the tracing of Burton R. Clark's usages of the term marginality in his Dissertation
Second, the concepts of marginality identified in the field of adult education have been developed. This identification has been accomplished by distinguishing among the concepts, defining the concepts, linking the concepts of marginality to standard dictionary definitions and through establishment of the proposed Typology for Classification of Concepts of Marginality in Adult Education.

Clark’s Usages of the Term in Adult Education

Clark is the first author to have used the term marginality in discussing the status of adult education and its component parts. He addressed the status of adult schools in relation to the Los Angeles School System. This particular application has been identified within this thesis as organizational subunit macro-system marginality. While Clark’s focus within his Dissertation was a case study in one city, his discussion of adult education on a state level and references to adult education functions, programs, activities, positions, and status is confusing to a discriminating reader who is seeking to understand his use of terms and their possible application to and other studies.

Although his initial concept of organizational marginality was grounded in experience derived from his case study, the mixed use of varying descriptors restricted the distinguishing power of his terms and confounded the meaning of marginality.

Two major strategies used by linguists and logicians, abstraction and homonymy, were considered in an effort to determine whether the concepts of marginality are better
understood as one concept of marginality, being very general and abstract—the abstraction view; or whether different and independent concepts of marginality exist—the homonymy view. Because of the possibility of operationalizing various concepts of marginality within the adult education field and the perceived advantages of distinct definitions in application of the concepts to the field, a homonymy view was assumed for this study.

Each usage of the term marginality in Clark's Dissertation and his Monograph was examined and discussed. Consistency of usage was found to be higher within the Dissertation. Of the 16 usages of the term marginality within the Dissertation, two were coupled with the descriptors "organizational" and "relative". The term was used once to denote the "marginality of a 'function'". The term, marginal, as a descriptor of a program, position and status was used seven times to denote Clark's concept of organizational marginality.

While the Monograph was 160 pages in length and Clark's Dissertation was 233 pages, the concept of marginality was more extensively discussed in the former document. The term itself was used twenty-nine times in the Monograph. It was used with less consistency than in the Dissertation and was coupled with more descriptors and modified in more ways. Likewise, the term marginal was used more broadly to designate concepts of marginality and was used to modify not only "program", "position" and "status," but also "activity" and "existence" in addition to further modifying program when the terms "marginal
school program" were used to designate the existence of organizational marginality. The term "margin" was used once in a general sense, not as a designation of the concept. It was used twice to designate the state of organizational marginality. There are numerous examples where Clark's concept of organizational marginality is discussed or applied without use of the terms margin, marginal, and marginality. With such inconsistency one can neither count on use of a given term when a condition of marginality is discussed, nor can one count on an explicit contextual designation.

**Popular Acceptance and Conceptual Chaos**

The popularity of the concepts of marginality in adult education is puzzling. A concept was brought to the field by a sociologist, Burton R. Clark. Evidenced by the preceding review of Clark's use of the term marginality, several of his generalizations from his case-study-in-depth to other contexts in the field of adult education appear to have exceptions. This may be partially explained by his limited exposure to the field. Some contradictions are explained by Clark's use of distinct concepts, all labeled with the common term marginality.

Still Clark's insights were attractive to the leaders of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
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64 A defunct organization, as of the 1970s which was established by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education and was supported by the Ford Foundation to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults. The Center's location was 4819 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois. It was moved to Boston University and finally to Syracuse University.
(CSLEA) \(^{64a}\) and he was invited repeatedly to the Center and elsewhere for presentations to leaders in the field of adult education, including national conference presentations. \(^{64a5}\) His dynamic presentations were apparently well received and the popularity of the term seems to have been spread by these leaders to their associates and to graduate schools where many of them serve in academic positions. Clark's publications which used the term marginality seem to be the source of the term and instrumental in popularizing the concept in the field of adult education.

It seems odd that such popular concepts as those of marginality have not been refined. While Clark identified several sources and indices of marginality within his Dissertation and the publications which followed, each group affording status, both internal and external to organizations, tended to select different indices on which to assess organizational system marginality. It is assumed that most individuals conceived organizational system marginality as directly reflecting variable values for the adult education subunit and its parental organization.

No one seems to have developed the concept of marginality to the point where empirical quantitative comparisons could be made between the adult education subunit and what would be considered to be primary units of the organization. There has

\(^{64a5}\)Interview with William S. Griffith, Professor of Adult Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, 11 September 1984.
been little agreement among individuals within units, let alone across institutions as to what constitutes "sources and indices of marginality,"\textsuperscript{646} as Clark has identified them. No one seems to have taken the step to quantify "sources and indices of marginality,"\textsuperscript{647} or to mathematically compare relevant variable values of the adult education subunit among values of other subunits within a common parental organization, or other units within the organization.

It appears that in the field of adult education, individuals have many different definitions for marginality. The superficial understanding and interpretation of such a popular concept may be indicative of a field in an early stage of conceptual development. Confusion seems to abound in that individuals think they understand Clark's concept and agree with his application. Furthermore, individuals seem to believe their perceptions are in agreement with others. Comparisons of perceptions among individuals in the field tend not to be made. Hence, authors of adult education literature continue to discuss and apply their concepts of marginality without realizing the conceptual problems, appreciating their superficial usage, or sensing the degree of misinterpretation among them. Applications continue to be made at various organizational levels without precise specification, and as the term is applied societally, new and distinct concepts are sometimes created,

\textsuperscript{646}Clark, Dissertation, p. 26.

\textsuperscript{647}Ibid.
often unknowingly. Authors continue to apply the term marginality and are still under the mistaken impression that they are applying a common understanding of a concept of marginality. Clark's warning that "the amount of state aid" was an "ambiguous index of program marginality," and his difficulty in identifying indices, sources, effects, symptoms, bases, evidences, contributing factors, and conditions of marginality, and distinguishing among them, should have alerted researchers to conceptual weaknesses. Despite Clark's acknowledgment of problems of definition for marginality, the warning does not appear to have received much attention from authors who have used the term.

How the term marginality having never been developed or considered in any of the mentioned ways could, nevertheless, have found such wide acceptance in the field of adult education is puzzling. Nevertheless, it is not too late to clarify its past uses and influence its future application. A primary purpose of this thesis is to furnish precise definitions for concepts of marginality to guide both the interpretation of present uses of the term and its future application. Proposed definitions are intended to guide the identification and labeling of concepts of marginality and their associated adult education and comparative elements, as well as their parental systems or contexts.

648 Idem, Monograph, page 60.
Findings from the Literature Review

Terminological and conceptual imprecision became evident through the passage by passage analysis of term use. The terms margin, marginal, and marginality were used interchangably to denote several of the concepts of marginality defined in this thesis. Clark has been shown to have used several concepts, yet labeled all with the same term. He coupled the words margin, marginal, and marginality with other terms to designate his concept. He applied his initial concept, which has been labeled as organizational system marginality within this thesis, to various organizational levels. These organizational levels were differentiated within this thesis as micro and organizational macro-system marginality. Clark used the term marginality to modify program, position, status, activity, and existence. From the literature it was difficult to identify the element said to be experiencing marginality, yet alone describe it, identify its indices, and evaluate its severity and utility.

Through review of usages of the term, seven distinct concepts of marginality were defined. These definitions permitted the classification of concepts of marginality found within selected publications in the adult education literature. They also led to the identification of inter-system marginality in which an adult education element is considered to be, and functions as, part of more than one parental organization or system.

Perhaps one of the most significant findings of this thesis has been the identification of the casual use of technical terms
and concepts. An awareness of the confusion in term and concept usage is a prerequisite for investing efforts in clarifying definitions of concepts, and using these definitions to both classify concept usage from the literature and to guide future applications. Although Clark apparently used the terms source, index, base, symptom, evidence, and effect of marginality synonymously, it is now important to distinguish among them to advance the development of the concepts and their subsequent use in rigorous research.

Consequences of Terminological and Conceptual Imprecision

The proposed definitions for values marginality, practice marginality, autonomous extra-organizational marginality, autonomous organizational marginality appear to resolve many of the problems concerned with inadequate definition of the terms that had been identified in the examination of the Dissertation and the Monograph. The definitions also constitute a foundation for operationalizing and constructing instruments to measure the concepts of marginality.

When terms cannot be used to convey precise meaning between individuals, their scientific worth is limited. Basic terms and concepts form the foundation or framework for a discipline of study. If the foundation is weak—in this instance, if the terms and concepts are not well defined—it is difficult to expand the field of study while still maintaining clarity. Conceptually integrating concepts is one step in the growth pattern of fields of study, but when the terms are conceptually
weak the resultant confusion becomes endemic. Conceptual integration of concepts within a field of study is one method for testing conceptual clarity and usefulness and its results may constitute a foundation for further definition and application of concepts. Some authors have provided an adequate description of their application and consistently use only a single concept of marginality. It is a challenge to determine the consistency of individual authors. In brief, conceptual confusion persists for the casual reader of adult education literature who wishes to understand marginality, its contexts and implications. If the terminological and conceptual imprecision in usage of the term and concepts of marginality is indicative of other term and concept usage in the field of adult education, that would constitute a major obstacle in the development of a field of rigorous study.

Unless terms and concepts are more consistently applied across the field of adult education than has been the case with Clark's concept of marginality, the advancement of the field will be seriously impaired.

**Distinction Drawn Between Operationalization and Instrumentation**

The processes of operationalizing and of developing instruments to measure concepts are distinct. Each of the seven major concepts of marginality requires a separate operational definition. Each concept of marginality has its own variables and the importance of shared variables may be different for each concept. Marginality is less than full status, but only with regard to some specific context. The relationship of the adult
education element to comparative elements in a given context is denoted through various concepts of marginality. With the organizational system marginality concept, status is afforded by groups internal and external to the parental organization. The relationship of the adult education subunit to primary subunits within the parental organization affects the level of this afforded status. With the autonomous extra-organizational and autonomous organizational marginality concepts, status is afforded by societal groups, and the relationship of the adult education element to society affects the level of afforded status.

Operational definitions must state the contextual and relevant relationships described earlier in this thesis for each concept of marginality, identify the variables of these relationships which affect afforded status, and describe the process of identifying the variables. Groups may be weighted to reflect their importance in the calculation of the total status experienced by an adult education element. Specific indices may be necessary in the operationalized definitions for the concepts of marginality. While the several concepts of marginality may have some common indices, each will also have some unique aspects. It is anticipated that weighting of the common indices will be different for each concept.

Through operationalization, a conceptual tool is created. Operationalizing of a concept goes beyond a rational definition. Operationalization of a concept requires identification of an element that can be measured and evaluated. The act of
operationalizing a concept links the concept to reality. Instrumentation of the concept occurs when the standard of measurement is set. Variables of the concept may defy direct measurement. Instrumenting the concept sets the standard and method for measurement of the indices of the condition. With each concept of marginality, there are numerous sources of afforded status. These sources or groups must be identified.

**Implications of the Study**

In a sense, this thesis is a case study of a conceptual development in adult education. Therefore, drawing generalizations concerning conceptual development in the field or elsewhere is not statistically justifiable. Conclusions concerning the applicability of the concepts of marginality have been made concerning specific references; however, generalizations to adult education as a whole or to disciplines other than adult education have not been proposed. Case studies such as the examination of Clark's term and concept development have a limited potential for yielding categories for classifying data.

By approaching the analysis of Clark's use of the term marginality from the homonymy strategy where different and independent concepts of marginality were perceived, contextual distinctions were detected. These distinctions were the enabling factors for development of definitions. Had the abstraction view instead been adopted, the approach would have been to establish one definition of marginality and then to set out to identify variations in application of the concept.
Environmental and contextual distinctions would have been sought.

While an effort was made to identify concepts of marginality in other disciplines, it was not a primary purpose of this study and as a result of the unsystematic and limited search outside the adult education literature, few usages of the term were identified.

While the literature search has been extensive, it is not all-inclusive. Personal contact with Clark and other authors who used the term and concepts of marginality would have contributed to interpretation of passages in which the term or concepts of marginality were used.

Within case study analysis, much is dependent upon the observations of the researcher. Definitions were proposed and have been used as analytical tools for analyses performed within this thesis. Based upon the data, observations were, nevertheless, individualistic and might have resulted in various formulations and interpretations. Descriptive content analyses such as that pursued with this thesis may be idiosyncratic and consequently testing for reliability is difficult. No independent judges or panels were used to confirm the author's interpretations of the passages quoted from Clark's writings.

**Recommendations for Future Research, Development, and Reporting**

Now that concepts of marginality used within the adult education literature have been identified, defined, and labeled, it seems appropriate to communicate such a conceptual advancement to the field. This thesis serves as one such
communication. More popular avenues of information dissemination seem desirable and are expected to follow. Conceptual clarity and development in the field of adult education may be enhanced as authors apply the concepts of marginality proposed within this thesis and their assigned labels.

It is important to note that marginality is not simply a relationship. It is not a transition of an adult education subunit, unit or the field itself. It is not necessarily a growth state, although some organizational growth patterns define states which might also be appropriately described as system marginality. Marginality is a state of existence dependent upon the degree of status afforded the adult education subunit, unit, or field. With organizational system marginality, sources of afforded status are both internal to the organization and external to it.

The Typology for Classification of Usages of Concepts of Marginality in Adult Education is a tool for authors who wish to distinguish among concepts of marginality where the term, marginality, has been used. It may serve as a reference for future researchers who have an interest in phenomena associated with marginality in adult education.

Several studies using the concepts of marginality defined within this thesis would contribute to the development of the discipline of adult education. Operationalization and instrumentation of the organizational system marginality concept would constitute a study in and of itself. Instrumenting the
concept of organizational system marginality permits the tracing of the development of an adult education subunit through repeated measurements. The transition of an adult education subunit through various states of marginality and under various environmental conditions could be traced through measurement of organizational system marginality over time. Measurement of organizational system marginality across institutional types may reveal inherent levels of marginality for certain institutional types. Such studies could clarify the relationship between ages of institutions and their degrees of marginality.

Once a particular concept of marginality is well defined, identified and measured, the causes and effects of organizational system marginality may be studied. Causes and effects of organizational marginality which were discussed by Clark can then be tested.

A study focusing on the identification of common indices of marginality for various relevant groups is suggested. Relevant groups are those which significantly influence the status of an adult education subunit, be they internal or external to the parental organization. It has been illustrated in this thesis how concepts of marginality may be negatively correlated. Clark maintained that the adult schools experienced marginality, evidenced by the limited local support and funding of the subunits. The adult schools, however, received higher rates of funding from the state than that received by the secondary schools. They were afforded a preferred status as evidenced by a higher rate of funding. Evidently various groups afford
status based on different variables. An understanding of who affords status and on what basis may enable administrators to alter variable values to more regularly achieve desired outcomes while avoiding undesirable outcomes.

The designation of the level of intensity of marginality is a representation of a state of existence. The ability to determine and report this state with validity and reliability is prerequisite to tracing patterns of organizational movement. Whether the focus is on movement of individual adult education units or to establish patterns of movement for various categories of units, the ability to measure the initial state of marginality may be considered to be an early step. The measurement of movement might be considered for rate, direction, magnitude, and comparative patterns of movement. Measurement of marginality may be used as administrative tools for prediction of effects, thus enabling management. The ability to chart organizational movement may increase such predictive power as observations concerning growth cycles and management alternatives are recorded and validated.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this thesis has been an exercise in concept clarification. Whenever a concept of marginality is applied, questions must be asked. What is the nature of the marginal adult education element? Is it an independent adult education unit, an adult education subunit, collectives of these organizational units, or adult education programs, activities, or functions which occur outside of formal organizations? Once
the element is identified, the question must be asked: To what
is it marginal? Definitions proposed in this thesis are guides
to question building concerning marginality. While the proposed
definitions may be considered by some to be hair-splitting, they
are considered to be essential for increasing the precision in
the use of concepts of marginality within adult education.

This thesis has focused on the precise defining and
clarification of the concepts of marginality, as used in adult
education. It has been a search for patterns of usage, the
basis for establishment of a typology to guide future use of the
term and for the classification of the several concepts of
marginality found in the literature of adult education.

The various concepts of marginality found within the
literature may prove to be useful conceptual tools for
understanding the status of adult education and for management
of adult education subunits. It is possible that through
manipulation of various indices of marginality that the relative
position of adult education within society and adult education
elements within parental organizations may be altered. This
thesis does not create an instrument for measurement of
marginality. It does, however, set the definitional and
conceptual frameworks upon which to proceed.

Whereas many reports and studies have equated marginality
with an undesirable status, certain benefits may be accrued
through anticipation of change and societal demand, and through
administrative leadership for purposes of altering the state of
marginality of an adult education subunit for maximum benefit.
Operationalization of the concepts of marginality may make it possible to use them as management tools. Once operationalized definitions of marginality are available, states of existence of adult education units and the units' relationship can be explored to enhance understanding of organizational dynamics. Understanding of organizational action and movement implies an ability to affect it. The provision of knowledge and insights that increase an administrator's ability to manage adult education subunits is considered to be a useful contribution to the development of the adult education field. This thesis is but a short step toward such provision.
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