

0-315-08261-5

National Library  
of CanadaBibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Division

Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

56181

**PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER**

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

MICHAEL JOHN MARRIOTT

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

2 AUGUST 1941

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

ENGLAND

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

R.R.1, OLD BARN ROAD,  
TRURO,  
NOVA SCOTIA B2N 5A9

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN SUPPORT  
OF THE EDUCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

University — Université

SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

MASTER OF ARTS

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1983

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

DR. F.R. PHILLIPS

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF  
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of  
the film.The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the  
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-  
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHE-  
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de  
prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication, ni la thèse  
ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou  
autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

5 May 1983

Signature

M. J. Marriott

COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF  
THE EDUCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS



Michael J. Marriott

April 1983

SIGNATURE PAGE

APPROVED

---

Dr. L. R. La Millan

May 5, 1983

*Francis R. Phillips*

1

*[Signature]*

5

}

ABSTRACT

COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF  
THE EDUCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Michael J. Marriott

April 1983

This study begins with a rationale, grounded in the literature, of the relevance of community-based secondary education, followed by descriptions of some exemplary high school programs which make use of community resources in their teaching strategies; the Social Education Project, the Parkway Program, Foxfire, and Bridging The Gap, are shown to make various uses of community resources, while maintaining some common threads in their aims and strategies. Other programs are briefly mentioned. An in-depth descriptive analysis of one other such program, Developing Unusual Opportunities, is presented, followed by the results of the first evaluation of it, which was undertaken in 1983. Conclusions are then drawn about this program's value.

The attitudes of students, community members, and teachers towards community-based school programs are then examined, leading to a suggestion for further

professional development. The reason for teacher resistance in particular is examined in relation to the common aims and teaching strategies of these programs.

A brief, speculative look at future developments in such programs is finally presented.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
CHAPTER ONE	4
CHAPTER TWO	21
CHAPTER THREE	46
CHAPTER FOUR	65
APPENDIX A	75
APPENDIX B	78
REFERENCES	84

## PREFACE

At the outset, I would like to acknowledge two events which have had a profound effect on my professional interests, and thus on the development of this study. Both occurred in Pugwash, a small village in Nova Scotia; and both occurred at the beginning of the 1970's, while I was a teacher at the High School there.

First, I met John Bremer. He and his family were moving to Pugwash from Philadelphia, where he was Director of the Parkway Program. Over time, we had many conversations, not a few about Parkway. I remember one evening when I eventually said, "You have so many resources available to you in Philadelphia, along the Parkway. Do you think that your program can only work in large city environments? Do you think it could work in a small village like Pugwash?"

"I think so," he said. "Why don't you do it, and let me know how you get on?"

I have taken up that challenge, and am pleased to incorporate the results into this study.

The second event I must mention also had a direct

bearing on my personal development. During the early 1970's, an issue arose about schooling in Pugwash which divided the community, at times bitterly. Positions verging on hysteria were adopted, and some of the wounds inflicted then have yet to heal.

There were several points at issue; but one charge by a number of parents, directed at members of the teaching staff, struck closest to home. These parents complained that we were preparing their children to send them "down the road", to life in the cities. Our school emphasized that their children would have to leave Pugwash to find a fulfilling life, they said, which showed what little understanding we had of the values of that particular community. And much of what they said was right. Most teachers were from other places, and were saying just that. It is all too easy for a city-bred person to see little of educational value in a rural area; and it is all too easy to speak of an absence of opportunities, and of resources. But in truth there is a wealth of resources in any rural area. They are different from those of the city; but they hold no less educational potential.



The people among whom I have lived for several years have showed me that. John Bremer was right: once I had come to appreciate the wealth of readily available resources, I had little recourse but to try to develop a community-based learning program for a rural area.

What follows is a descriptive account of the D.U.O. Program in Nova Scotia, and a first evaluation of it. A brief examination of companion programs like the Parkway Program, Foxfire, and others, adds weight to the premise that there is value in community-based education, and allows conclusions to be drawn about avenues for the further development of such programs.

## CHAPTER ONE

Progress within schools themselves goes hand in hand with improved practical links between schools and society. In the last resort, it is through his natural environment that man has educated himself down the ages. Everything seems to show that this natural education, through the combined effects of the biological and social environment, has been the major instrument in the growth of man's awareness and intelligence.  
Learning to be. (Faure, 1971, p. 137)

With this sweeping summary of the importance of making use of the resources surrounding us, the UNESCO International Commission on the Development of Education added prestigious weight to the claim that at least a portion of the students' formal schooling should be based outside the traditionally closeted school walls.

In Learning to be, Faure built the case that it is globally desirable to develop a whole learning society. This same belief has been strongly argued by organizations such as the National Center for Community Education in the United States, the Community Education Development Centre in England, and by leading educators like Olsen & Clark (1977), and Schwartz (1972).

Others add that only by making use of community

resources is it possible to inject the necessary relevance into learning experiences which will make students socially conscious of their responsibilities to be learners. In the introduction to The school without walls, Bremer & von Moschzisker (1971) argued that this position was fundamental in establishing the Parkway Program; and it was a founding principle in the establishment of the Social Education Project in England, as described by Rennie, Lunzer, & Williams (1974).

Some have stressed the necessity to forge stronger links between school and community (Gibbons, 1976; National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1973); while others have seen in this trend the possibility of making new uses of buildings in the community (Bremer, 1971; Coates, 1974). Another group would argue that only by removing the school system altogether could one begin to provide any relevant learning experiences (Friere, 1970; Illich, 1971); and yet another would argue that only by providing experiential learning in the community can new relevance be transferred to the school setting (Brown, 1972, 1973; McClure, 1977; Williams, 1975).

In a recent article by Keith Watson (1980), an attempt was made to synthesize all these positions. Watson discussed six developing trends: the increasing use of community based education which will have implications for rethinking the best use to be made of school buildings; the search for a more relevant curriculum; the need for parental participation in their childrens' education; the development of life-long education; to satisfy the social needs of a community; and finally, the changing role of the teachers.

What use is being made of community resources at present? The answer is, myriad uses. It is possible, though, to provide some broad categories of use. In Beyond coping. Some approaches to social education, the Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit (1980, p. 49) identified seven categories of use: the approach might be information-based, enquiry-based, creative, experiential, awareness-raising, skills-training, or modelling. While recognizing the validity of these categories, however, only two broad categories are used in this study: terminal, and integral.

Terminal use of community resources would include all those programs where it was the intent of the educationists to expose students to facets of the community which might prove useful in their transition from school to the world of work: the implication being that the school views the provision of this exposure as its terminal responsibility. Examples of this type of program would be the many Work Experience classes in schools throughout North America, and the recent widespread development of Youth Opportunities Programmes in England. These types of programs will not be examined further in this study.

Integral use of community resources would include all those programs where it was the intent of the educationists to expose students to facets of the community which would add a new dimension of understanding to their continued learning. It is this type of program which will be the focus here. From among the programs of this type, the following descriptions will serve as an indication of various uses of community resources which all fit within this broad category.

In England, during the mid-1960's, it became apparent that the Government intended shortly to raise the legal school-leaving age. Among concerned teachers, most of whom were teaching the older age groups, it was well known that there was a sizable population of students already dissatisfied with school; they were attending only until they could legitimately leave. What was to be done when they were forced to attend school for an extra year? Since their greatest common desire was to get out of school, it seemed sensible to design programs for a further year which would take them out of school. Consequently, a variety of programs began to develop, which all had the common thrust of finding useful ways of learning, outside the school walls. The assumption, though, was not to take advantage of the time to provide job training, but rather to develop and foster the understanding of the student in relation to the community at large.

At Fosse Secondary School in Leicester, for example, where the author was then a member of staff, a group of teachers was encouraged to develop a program which had two related thrusts: one was

recreational, and the other was to develop general knowledge about the resources of the community.

Once a week for a half-day, students were to be involved in a series of outdoor recreational experiences such as camping, canoeing, and orienteering, at a nearby outdoor education centre. For another whole day and a half, students were to pursue integrated studies about the cultural, historical, and industrial settings in the city and surroundings, as much as possible by on-the-site visitations. This author became a member of that teaching team, responsible for instruction in camping skills every Friday afternoon, and in addition for a wide ranging study entitled "Communications media in the community."

Student reaction to this new type of program was judged to be gratifyingly supportive, as was the general reaction of involved members of the community. Similar programs for the education of potential school leavers were initiated in other secondary schools in the area.

It followed, then, that if students could usefully learn from the community, they might also make some useful contributions to it. Out of this

notion grew the Schools Council Social Education Project. As described in Social education: an experiment in four secondary schools (Rennie et al., 1974), its principal aim was:

to provide an enabling process through which children will achieve a sense of identification with their community, become sensitive to its shortcomings and develop methods of participation in those activities needed for the solution of social problems (p. 130).

Through a series of directed exercises, students were invited to draw up in-depth profiles of the components and structures of their communities, by interviews, visits, and other out-of-school exploratory methods; they then identified areas of concern within the community in which they would like to become involved.

The project was actively monitored in four secondary schools, and was by and large judged a success (Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit, 1980; Rennie et al., 1974). It was short lived, however. In recent conversation with this author, John Rennie explained that this was primarily because many teachers found it difficult, sometimes impossible, to incorporate the work involved in a Social Education program into an already crowded, academic, subject-based, school



curriculum.

This project is cited here not so much because it presents a unique use of community resources, but because it presents a particular viewpoint about the underlying benefits to be derived from student exposure to their communities. The stated aim, of developing awareness in order to develop participation in problem-solving of social issues, has a strong connection with the view expressed by Paulo Friere in Pedagogy of the oppressed (1970), that education can have an active political arm, in which youth should participate.

When the Parkway Program in Philadelphia was initiated in 1969, it was hailed as a radical and fundamental departure from normal American schooling. The reader can find extensive details of this program particularly in The school without walls (Bremer, 1971), and in The city as a schoolhouse (Cox, 1972). Perhaps the most publicized of the recent "schools without walls", the Parkway Program sought to use the resources of central Philadelphia to educate its students. It was not designed to introduce the student to the workplace for career exploration, but rather to make

use of the many resources to break down barriers between students and community. Its first Director, John Bremer, noted (Bremer, 1971) that fundamentally it was intended that using the community would have a profound effect upon the social fabric of education.

If this idea appears to have some connection with the previously mentioned Social Education Project, it is because John Bremer had expressed similar views in the middle 1960's, while he was at the University of Leicester, in England. While Bremer was building the Parkway Program in Philadelphia, his ideas and progress were being examined with interest by John Rennie, who was then directing the embryo form of the Social Education Project in the North of England.

Most basically, for students in the Parkway Program, the city was their classroom. There was no central teaching building, though there was a facility for once a week school meetings. An initial challenge for the teachers was to find somewhere relevant to teach. Nor were all courses taught by the professional Parkway staff: community organizations and individuals offered courses too, in response to student interest. Thus, courses were offered in both the traditional

academic subjects, and in a host of ancillary subjects brought up because somebody felt he had something interesting to say, which somebody else wanted to hear.

If Parkway was hailed for bringing new relevance to schooling, it should also not be ignored that it was documented (Bremer, 1971, Ch. 6) to be financially less expensive to operate than the conventional High School, a fact still true today.

As reported by its Director, James Lytle (1981), the Parkway Program has flourished into the 1980's. From its initial population in 1969 of one hundred and fifty students, it had grown to one thousand two hundred students in 1981. Its basis is still to use community resources, which by 1981 had grown to include use of the new, nearby magnet schools, with their specialized curricular offerings. It has continued to outperform other Philadelphia schools with similar populations, having a recorded twenty per cent better attendance rate, and a fifty per cent lower dropout rate than comparable schools. Ninety five per cent of its students expressed plans for further education following their Parkway experiences;

and the Program was ranked third among all Philadelphia High Schools, for the actual rate of college placements of its students.

The next program described is known as Foxfire. It was conceived in 1966 by Elliot Wigginton, at Rabun Gap-Nacoochee School in Rabun Gap, Georgia, when he perceived that his traditional methods of teaching English held little appeal for students. With \$440 in donations, Wigginton proposed to his one hundred and forty Grades Nine and Ten students that they write a magazine. He proposed that his students involve themselves with local people, outside school time initially, talking about topics of interest, and developing a magazine based on local folklore. The idea of a literary, poetry magazine was rejected, primarily on financial grounds: whatever magazine was produced had to sell, to meet its production costs, and poetry magazines had a notorious record as commercial ventures.

As a teacher of English, Wigginton defended his scheme in his introduction to Foxfire 1 (1972), by pointing out the many ways in which the critical skills of correct writing, reading, and general

communication would be practised by all involved students. He was also able to point out that, once launched on the scheme, these students demonstrated that they were motivated as never before.

Initially, Wigginton and his students agreed to produce one issue of a magazine. Its first run sold out in a week, and more copies of that first issue were printed. Subsequently, new issues of the magazine continue to appear.

Eliot Wigginton is still in Rabun Gap, helping to administer a community based program which has grown well beyond the publication of a magazine. There are now also books, written by high school students and published by Foxfire Press. As well, there are Foxfire video programs seen on cable television, Foxfire records, environmental studies and outdoor education, a creative photography course, and a large bookkeeping and circulation department. In all of these activities, Wigginton notes, "from the dramatic to the mundane, students infuse and guide every phase of our work (Foxfire brochure, undated)."

Also noted is the intention to create a Community Development Corporation - "an entity that will provide

economic solutions to some of the area problems such as unemployment, lack of job variety, and inconsistent year round employment." There is a detectable echo here with the previously described programs.

In the strictest sense, Wigginton began his Foxfire program in 1966 by using available community people to make his teaching of English more relevant and palatable to his students. But even then, he was clearly aware that larger social advantages could accrue from students becoming actively involved in exploring the traditions and memories of their community elders. He expected that Foxfire would benefit students by teaching them that "they can be forces for constructive change; knowing that they can act responsibly and effectively rather than being always acted upon (Wigginton, 1972, p. 12)."

In Kingston, Ontario, Bridging The Gap is one of the alternative and ancillary programs administered by the Frontenac County Board of Education. This program is noted here because it makes use of similar community resources in an opposite way to Foxfire. Where students working in Foxfire went out into the community to mingle with their elders, at High Schools

in Kingston, like Loyalist Collegiate and Vocational Institute, senior citizens are invited to the school to be students themselves. The benefits appear to be twofold: senior citizens are given renewed access to centralized learning facilities, and "normal school age" students have the opportunity to intermingle, within a learning environment, with their elders.

This program has been widely acclaimed in Ontario in newspapers (The Citizen, 1982; Whig-Standard, 1980, 1981, 1982), as well as on television (Kingston Cablecast, 1979; CKWS, 1980; T.V. Ontario, 1981; CJOH, 1982). This author had a conversation in March, 1983, with Susan Folkins, a student from a Kingston school. She confirmed that senior citizens made up about half of the members of her classes; and she explained that she felt that the major advantages of the program were changes in classroom climate, new insights derived from the first hand experiences of the senior citizens, and a new awareness of being part of a larger social fabric.

In Vermont, Do Unto Others - DUO for short - has been a State approved credit program for high school students since 1969. In a coordinated effort of school,

community, and student, individual students are given the chance to explore resources in their communities which might assist in developing a talent or career, might provide a community service, or simply be of particular interest to the participants.

The greater Burlington area alone now boasts over five hundred participating community agencies, attracting, for example, at Champlain Valley High School, approximately two hundred and seventy five students out of a student body of nine hundred and fifty.

An undated, accompanying information package about the program lists a number of attitudinal concepts.

A unique approach fosters better understandings between school and community in Los Angeles. Adopt-A-School, nurtured by the Los Angeles Unified School District, with one hundred and twenty participating organizations as of December 1982, according to correspondence received, sees Los Angeles' corporations officially adopting a specific school, and then working with it to develop an educational program making use of the skills and resources of the corporation.



In examining all the preceding programs, two common threads emerge, which should be clearly borne in mind. The first is that one can discern a recognition that part of the expected outcome will be an increase in the social consciousness of the students. An objective in some programs, like the Social Education Project, and Foxfire, is for the students then to actively participate in solving social dilemmas, as part of their schooling. In other programs, like Bridging The Gap, and Parkway, the raising of the social consciousness is viewed more as the end of the school's responsibility, leading hopefully to students becoming better citizens after they have left school. To whichever degree, though, all these programs have an underlying social context.

The second common thread is that each of these programs changes the traditional role of the teacher. Sir Alec Clegg, Education Officer in the West Riding of Yorkshire, England, once remarked that he felt that many teachers were "more interested in pot filling than fire lighting (Kelly, 1975, p. 34)." Involvement in community based education appears to require the teacher to be a fire lighter, facilitating learning

opportunities for the student, while stepping aside from his trained role as expert repository of knowledge. This is an important point in designing implementation strategies for such programs.

With those points in mind, it is now time to present an in depth analysis of another community based program, which has been in operation in a rural area of Nova Scotia for the past five years.

## CHAPTER TWO

Developing Unusual Opportunities, the D.U.O. Program, was initiated by the author in 1977, at Hants East Rural High School, in Nova Scotia. It was an optional, year-long program, available to the school's Grade Nine students; it continued in operation until the 1982-1983 school year, when the author left for a year's sabbatical study. What follows is a descriptive analysis, supported largely by anecdotal material.

Developing Unusual Opportunities was created in response to the perceived needs of at least one segment of the school population. As in previous years, in 1977 it was again noted that many students in the Junior High School grades neither cared much about school, nor achieved their academic potential. These students expressed the prevailing attitudes of not understanding the purpose or usefulness of school: consequently they were resentful, apathetic, and anxious to leave school altogether. In short, they had stopped learning. In discussions with the School Board's administrative staff, a consensus was

reached that these students constituted approximately one third of the Junior High Schools' student population.

A number of teachers had first suggested that, since these students were such poor academic achievers, they should be compelled to spend extra time mastering their basic Mathematics and English skills. But while it was agreed that this might be beneficial for students in Grade Seven, fresh from Elementary School, it did not seem to be the complete answer for the older students who had already experienced numerous failures over several years already spent in the school. These students, it was argued, needed an overall approach which would not only teach them the basic skills they needed, but would also instill in them a new sense of purpose as functioning learners.

It was further recognized that, within the social context of the school, many of these same students exhibited disruptive or inappropriate behaviour which could be attributed to their misunderstanding, abusing, or rebelling against their place in the school's prescribed social hierarchy. Thus, it was felt essential that any remedial program should incorporate strategies to address this problem.

In summary, it was decided that an alternative program was needed which would attempt to correct the perceived problems. Essentially, it would be transitional, attempting eventually to return the involved students to the normal school routine.

Against this background, the D.U.O. Program was designed. It had three stated broad objectives: to develop a renewed sense of competency in each student as a learner; to provide opportunities and an atmosphere which would increase each student's general sense of self-esteem; and to provide each student with the skills needed to proceed in school, after the program.

In order to meet these objectives, the program was designed with two major components. Part of the time would be spent in school, under the direction of one teacher, pursuing the required academic curriculum; and the remainder of the time would be spent outside the school, still under the direction of the same one teacher, but in a variety of community based learning environments.

The program was to be initiated with Grade Nine students. Therefore it was agreed that mastery of the

basic skills would have to be combined with the regular content, so that successful students could proceed into Grade Ten without jeopardy.

It was also assumed that many students disliked not knowing what was expected of them overall. Hence the students were given an integrated course outline at the beginning of the school year, outlining the topics to be covered during the whole year. The 1981-1982 outline is attached to this document as Appendix A. Learning activity packages, and a system of individualized contracts were also made a part of the program.

Integration of the studies was simplified by having one teacher in control. Since the same teacher would control both in and out of school activities, there could be a maximum amount of coordination and carry-over between them; and practically, there would be no conflicts with the schedules and plans of other teachers.

Yet, considerable initial skepticism was expressed about the wisdom of having one teacher attempt to meet all the academic needs of these Grade Nine students. Certain teachers pointed out that they would feel

incapable of doing so, because they had neither the depth of knowledge, nor the formal training for such an undertaking. On the other hand, the point was made that these were students who felt that no teacher really knew them, or cared about what they did; they would benefit from the personal attention they would receive if they came solely under the direction of one knowledgeable teacher.

The proposition that students could usefully spend a portion of their school time outside the school brought the greatest resistance from other teachers. In many staff room discussions, teachers worried that their status as experts in a field of knowledge was in danger of being eroded by such a program; that students would be undisciplined if given individualized, and perhaps unsupervised assignments; and that the proposed activities would be largely an inappropriate use of school time. Equally, it was obvious that the idea of being able to spend some accredited time out of school was the most appealing portion of the program to the students, and would indeed be the program's chief drawing card.

Few restrictions were proposed in designing the

community based activities. Some would be chosen by the teacher, and undertaken by the whole group; others were to be individualized. To establish the individual activities, students were asked at the beginning of the program to identify areas of interest that they would like to learn about, which were not covered in school. The D.U.O. Program then matched the student with an appropriate resource, and arranged the time for the out of school activity. The only restriction imposed was that students would not be placed in a situation which was an obvious part-time teenage job, or where there was no potential for learning. Students would not be allowed, for example, to work a shift in a fast-food outlet, to shovel manure, or to learn how to pump gas.

These out of school experiences were not intended foremost to provide specific skill building. Primarily, they were intended to be a developmental process to bolster the students' self-image. They would enter a situation of their own choosing, where they would be treated as individuals. They would contract to learn because of a personal choice to learn. It was presumed, in turn, that this would have a positive effect on each



student's sense of purpose; the opportunity to study something personally appealing might enhance the student's whole outlook as a capable decision maker and learner, and perhaps carry over to enable the student to cope better with the routine of normal school work.

Apart from trying to answer the need of students who felt alienated from the school, the proposal to spend part of the time learning outside the school walls was grounded in two general premises. The first was the assertion that experiential education is a valuable part of the learning process: that at certain points, practical experiences are more relevant to the student than theoretical studies. This premise is amply supported not only by the in-school curricular changes toward activity-centered learning, but also by the growth of cooperative, or work experience programs, as well as the long established tradition of apprenticeship learning. In order to take full advantage of experiential opportunities, one can turn to the many valuable learning resources which are available to each person throughout the community.

The second premise was that education must foster

skills which reinforce the individual student's ability to be an adaptable and continuous learner, as a member of an ever-changing society. This demands that each student develop the ability and confidence to make choices about his or her continued learning. In going out of school, the D.U.O. Program, expecting each student to take responsibility for his or her own learning, demanded that students decide what knowledge they should acquire for their own interests and benefits.

It was argued finally that, in studying the structures and resources of the community, students might begin to perceive themselves as valuable members of society, able to make some active contributions towards its good.

Nothing in this was meant to threaten the established school routine. It was acknowledged that there would be a defined academic continuum as a student moved through the school grades: the D.U.O. Program would fit into that continuum. But it would provide a different approach to enriching a student's knowledge beyond the basics.

In explaining the D.U.O. Program to interested

groups, it often became necessary to distinguish it from other school programs in the area which used community resources, and were termed Work Experience Programs.

In these, students are placed in situations where they receive specific training which may be useful to them as future members of the work force. In a strong sense, these are terminal programs, in that they prepare students to leave school, in order to fend for themselves.

While students in the D.U.O. Program may have acquired some useful future skills, it was emphasized that this was not at all an important ingredient of the students' time spent learning in the community.

The essential ingredient of the D.U.O. Program, in this regard, was to allow students time to explore something in the community about which they were personally curious. It did not matter whether or not this had any practical application, because the point was not to offer training, but to use the community as a catalyst for spurring curiosity, which in turn could enhance the students' views of themselves as active learners. In this sense, although some of the same resources may have been used, the D.U.O. Program

was unrelated to work experience programs. Where they were terminal, the O.U.O. Program was transitional, presenting a new beginning to the student as a functioning learner.

This idea also had major advantages in terms of the availability of community resources. A work experience program is generally restricted to providing settings within the work place, typically in industrial and service agency locales. But the O.U.O. Program allowed the students to use any available resource, be it in the work place, or with any interesting person, provided it could be justified. Some community based programs have foundered because of the lack of a range of industrial settings in small, or rural communities. This was not a concern of the O.U.O. Program.

By November 1977, agreement had been reached within the school and with the School Board administration about the broad objectives and design of the program. But with the school year already well under way, it was agreed to implement only the out of school aspect for the remainder of that year, and to aim for full implementation at the beginning of the 1978-1979 school

year. Two Grade Nine classes were selected, and with a minimal amount of timetable rearranging, they were given the opportunity to spend a day from each school cycle learning individually in surrounding communities. Sixty five students were actively involved that year.

In the following May, after a positive initial report was submitted to the School Board, preparations were begun for full implementation. The whole year's curriculum was discussed with each academic department, and the teacher began filling in curricular details and teaching strategies.

Hants East Rural High School operates on a six day timetable. Therefore, the D.U.O. Program was initially scheduled in the same way. One day on the timetable was set aside for the pursuit of individual interests in the community; another day was set aside for the pursuit of group learning activities using community resources; and during the remaining four days, it was presumed that the class would normally be in the school building working on the regular academic curriculum.

It was pointed out to the students that this type of schedule would imply working at the academic

content in a dedicated way, since less time was being devoted to it than in other Grade Nine classes. One curricular restriction was pointed out: because of the time elements involved, no French would be formally taught in this class, though students were at liberty to pursue this during their individualized time, if they were particularly interested. Overall, it was emphasized that a normal year's academic work was going to be completed, so that the students' future plans would not be jeopardized if they enrolled in the D.U.O. Program for a year.

All Grade Eight classes were visited by the teacher, who explained the objectives and workings of the program. It was pointed out that the program was potentially open to any student entering Grade Nine who wished to apply, and could secure parental permission to do so. It was made clear that there would be only one class, of about twenty five students, who would be chosen by random draw from all the applications. The curricular requirements were particularly emphasized, so that the students should not initially label this as a class for students of below average ability only. A pamphlet describing

the program was printed, so that interested students could share it with their parents, to seek the needed permission for application.

It was considered important to invite applications, because it would then follow that all members of the class had chosen to be there, and would presumably begin the year with a positive attitude. It was also considered to be essential that the class members be selected at random, so that all students should have an equal chance of admission without consideration for their past records of achievement or behaviour.

Two distinct attitudes quickly emerged. There was overwhelming interest from all segments of the student population, and during the week following the initial presentations, a constant procession of students asked for more detailed information and application forms. On the other hand, many teachers continued to insist that this could only be a Special Education class: they began actively to discourage any student from applying who they considered had the potential, if not the desire, to continue in an ordinary class.

Nevertheless, from a total Grade Eight population

of approximately two hundred students, one hundred and twenty forms were given to students, and eighty nine of these were returned, complete with parental approval..

A random draw was then held, and the successful applicants were informed before the end of the school year in June. Unsuccessful applicants were told that their names were placed on a waiting list, but that meantime they were being assigned to normal classes.

When the O.U.D. class first met the following September, both teacher and students had a clear understanding of what was required of them. The teacher had prepared a full-year plan of curricular activities, which was shared and discussed with the students. Following this, first term contracts were drawn up and signed.

A busy pattern of school work was established, and attention turned to matching the twenty five students' individual curiosities with available community resources. Thus, the teacher began to approach people in the community, explaining the program, and asking for their help in spending some time teaching an interested student.



The response in the community was overwhelmingly courteous and supportive. Usually, it was a straightforward matter to arrange to meet a student's learning needs. People, indeed, were surprised, and pleased, to discover that someone in school considered that they had something significant to contribute. They applauded the idea. There were a few instances when regulations would not allow participation in the scheme: union and safety regulations would not permit student participation in the servicing of commercial airliners; and the rules of confidentiality would preclude a student from active participation in a doctor's or lawyer's practice. But on the whole, people responded by viewing the time they could spend teaching something to an interested student as viable and justifiable.

One student wanted to learn about taxidermy, and spent some time first at a museum, and then with a professional taxidermist. Another student wanted to learn about horse care, and was able to fit partly into an equestrian program administered by the Agricultural College. Later that year, realizing that she only had one year in the program, she asked

to learn something about radio, and then about newspapers, and was able to go to the local radio station, and then to the newspaper offices. Other students learned about nursing, child care, teaching, veterinary practice, wildlife management, baking, meat cutting, computer programming, retailing, dentistry, police work, motorcycle sales and repairs, secretarial work, oil furnace repairs, librarianship, care of the aged, and wildlife art. It was possible to arrange appropriate resources for all of these situations: and once every six school days, the students spent the whole school day, and often the whole working day, in these situations of their own choosing.

Other out of school group activities were also initiated. A monthly, comparative review of grocery prices was conducted in area stores; factories, parks, and museums were visited; and the community at large was used for the practical applications of problems posed in all subjects of the academic curriculum. This type of activity, as had been planned, took up another day of each school cycle.

By the end of the first full year, a number of

factors had emerged. The students had enjoyed a fruitful, and successful year, in both their community activities and their academic achievements. All of the community people who had been actively involved endorsed the concepts of the program, and expressed their willingness to participate again, if the opportunity arose. And the school administration, praising particularly the newly acquired positive attitudes displayed by some of the involved students, agreed that the program should continue. From the teacher's point of view, it did appear that the objectives were being met.

At this point, there arose two specific operational issues which needed modification: timetabling the out of school activities, and transportation. During this first year, the students had pursued their individual interests on one specific day of the school's six day timetable. In effect, this meant that one week they went out on a Monday, the next week on a Tuesday, then a Wednesday, eventually missing a week altogether. Community participants explained that they were never quite sure when their student was coming, and consequently they found it difficult to

plan activities. It was obvious that in this case the school had to adapt to the rest of the community, and it was agreed, the school timetable notwithstanding, that future students would go out on the same day each week: after consultations, Wednesday was chosen as the most suitable day.

During the first year, the students had relied on public transportation, parents, friends, and the established school bus routes to reach their community destinations. Hants East Rural High School is in the middle of a rural area, and this had led to the exclusion of some worthwhile opportunities, when there was no transportation system passing close by, and the student was unable to arrange independent transportation. Therefore, a school bus was requested for the use of this class, one day a week. A year later, specifying a route that would indeed pass the majority of useful destinations, the School Board granted this request.

A number of other points, gathered from the first year's experiences, also became clear. It was particularly important to restrict the number of students involved with any particular resource person.

One, or two, was optimum; if more students than this were present, the experience began to take on the structures of the traditional class, with which all participants were uncomfortable. Therefore a guideline was adopted stating that no more than two students at a time might learn in any particular place, although more students might certainly pursue the same interest if further resource people and places were available.

It was also essential to explain clearly the purposes and constraints applying to each situation. The program was deliberately open-ended in not placing time limits on how long a student might continue to visit a particular resource; it was left to the student and the resource person to determine when curiosity was sated, or available tasks accomplished. Beyond that, it was established that no student should be paid for anything done in the community, just as the school could not pay community volunteers for their time and expertise.

It was important for the teacher to maintain contact with each individual's community activities, for two reasons. First, the teacher could not only monitor the progress, and be available in the event

of any question or problem, but he could also offer encouragement to the community participants, and make them aware of being part of a larger network by bringing news of other activities. It was essential not so much that the teacher make visits around the community sites to perform an evaluative function, as it was that he make those visits to build and strengthen public relations.

Secondly, the visits were important for the links they forged between teacher and student. Not only was the teacher appreciated for having arranged the opportunity for the student in the first place, but by continuing to visit the student in the community, the teacher was maintaining a visible interest in the student's activities, which they could share, and which had an important carry-over of bond and attitude back in the classroom, when the less desirable academic work was tackled.

The curricular content had been completed by the end of the school year: but although the students had met the standards of their teacher, it remained to be seen whether they had been adequately prepared for the next grade. Since they all elected to proceed

with their formal schooling, it was simply a matter of scrutinizing their future progress, which did indeed show that the majority experienced continued success as they went through the high school grades eventually to graduate.

Over time, some interesting remarks were made by high school teachers who unknowingly encountered these students. Some students stood out, it was reported in staff meetings, because they demanded to know what was expected of them in a course, so that they could progress through their work. One teacher reported that she was having to slow some students down, because they were successfully working independently at such a rapid rate that they would obviously have completed her year-long course before Christmas. These students, it was subsequently discovered, were former members of the D.U.O. class, who had been classified as disinterested students by their earlier junior high grade teachers.

Many other instances were reported in staff meetings which indicated a marked change in attitude and success rate among former D.U.O. students. Although it might be argued that there is a general

trend of change in students' attitudes as they enter senior high school, because these changes were so marked, and had appeared following a year in the D.U.O. Program, they were generally attributed to the influences of the program. Students' remarks, some of which form Appendix B of this document, also tended to support this premise. But no formal evaluation was undertaken at that point. A first evaluation has since been completed, and forms Chapter Three.

The D.U.O. Program has been the topic of several meetings and in-services of teachers and interested administrators in Nova Scotia. From these gatherings, four questions have most frequently been raised. How much does the program cost? How large could it get before exhausting all available resources? Are there other teachers who would be interested in administering such a program? And, would the original designers ever do it again?

Financial constraints in the design of any new school program were considered of primary importance when the program was first formulated. The D.U.O. Program required no additional staffing, or special



supplies. It presented a small, cost-shareable addition to the overall school budget, in the form of the weekly bus run; but that was all.

All groups who have completed the D.U.O. Program have been made up of students with a wide range of abilities, and the program appeared to be beneficial for all types of students who wanted to be there. Therefore, it seemed that the program might expand to cater to more of the interested students. In terms of community involvement, it would be difficult to estimate how large such a program might get: it deliberately viewed all people and places as potential resources; and it became progressively easier to involve more people as they became aware of the activities of the program.

The question of teachers' attitudes was mentioned briefly earlier in this chapter. Teachers expressed mixed reactions to becoming involved in the D.U.O. Program. Some were reluctant to become involved because, in their view, it would be too much work; others expressed keen interest. Most pointed out that they would need some prior training, and felt that it would then be a rewarding experience.

The fourth question is probably self-evident. This teacher found an immense measure of satisfaction associated with seeing the growth of new attitudes and capabilities of the students enrolled in the O.U.O. Program. Each year presented new challenges, and new satisfactions at its end. The chance to work with a small number of students for a whole year led to an unusual degree of closeness, respect, and understanding, which made it a pleasure to work with these students.

In presenting an outline of the O.U.O. Program at these meetings, a number of major educational studies were usually cited, giving support to the idea of learning in the community. Faure (1972) had emphasized the need to strengthen the links between school and community, as had the Kettering Foundation's National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education (Brown, 1973); both Silberman (1970), and Phi Delta Kappa's Report on the New Secondary Education (Gibbons, 1976) had singled out several prominent exemplary programs which made use of community resources. In retrospect, it seemed that the mention of these studies not only provided

sufficient justification to the audiences for the creation of the O.U.O. Program, but also precluded demands from them for the results of any evaluation of the program's actual workings. The question of evaluation, in fact, never arose at any of these meetings. It is, however, now pursued in the next chapter.

### CHAPTER THREE

Until 1983, Developing Unusual Opportunities had undergone only informal evaluation into its effectiveness in meeting its stated aims. Occasional classroom visits by the school administration and by supervisors from the local Colchester-East Hants District School Board had apparently satisfied any concerns. A kind letter from the Superintendent of Schools had offered encouragement and wishes for continued success; but no formal request for an evaluation was received from any quarter.

It had often been stated by members of the school staff, and by parents, that members of the D.U.O. class seemed to benefit from a year's exposure to the D.U.O. atmosphere and activities. A yearly glance at school cumulative record cards had indicated that the majority of former D.U.O. students had continued with formal schooling, either by proceeding into the normal senior high school courses, or by gaining entry to Vocational School programs. But both of these criteria, of having benefited from the previous year's schooling, and consequently of proceeding to more

schooling, were equally true of the majority of grade nine students in the school. One might therefore conclude that the D.U.O. Program was having the same effect on students as the rest of the school programs. Yet one of the underlying assumptions in the creation of the D.U.O. Program was that it would have a beneficial effect on the students who enrolled in it, above what might be achieved in the normal school programs. In order to measure this, a comparative base was necessary, and was incorporated into these present evaluation procedures.

The stated aims of the D.U.O. Program were threefold: to develop a renewed sense of competency in each student as a learner; to provide opportunities and an atmosphere which would increase each student's general sense of self-esteem; and to provide each student with the skills needed to proceed in school.

The first two aims were attitudinal, while the third expressed a concern with maintaining an academic standard which would not penalize the student who later wished to continue normal academic schooling. Therefore it was decided to determine to what extent the program had met its stated aims by devising two

3

separate measures, one attitudinal, and one academic.

Additionally, the students' written comments on their participation in the D.U.O. Program, extracts from which form Appendix B, would provide an anecdotal backdrop.

It was also felt that other viewpoints than just those of the students should form an integral portion of this first evaluation. It had been noted in conversation with other teachers in the school that there were elements of the D.U.O. Program which they would commend. But it was felt important that more than anecdotal material should be solicited from teachers, and therefore an attitudinal survey was devised to seek a more precise definition of teachers' attitudes.

The attitudes of community participants, obviously crucial to the workings of the program, had been constantly monitored by the teacher over the total working period of the program. At the conclusion of each working arrangement, the community participants had been asked if they felt that the encounter had been sufficiently successful for them to agree to further participation at an appropriate time. The

teacher's records of these conversations indicated that only two of sixty five community participants had serious reservations about future participation. Thus, ninety seven per cent of the participants expressed continued interest in the D.U.O. Program. It was felt that this clearly revealed such a positive attitude towards the D.U.O. Program among community participants, that no further evaluation of their attitudes was thought necessary at this time.

In examining the evaluation procedures undertaken by previously described programs with similar designs, it appears that they have devised similar approaches to those suggested here.

Bremer (1971, Ch. 5) indicated that during the earliest years of the Parkway Program, informal evaluation was conducted by conversation and testimonial from all segments of the involved population. Cox (1972) described evaluation at Parkway at that time as an ongoing process in which everybody took part continuously. He comments that "evaluation is one of the central courses of study at the Parkway (p. 121)."

An internal evaluation system was indeed instituted by Bremer, to assess managerial and organizational

attitudes, as well as to measure the academic abilities of the students. At the same time, basic numerical records were kept about attendance, dropout rates, and the destinations of students graduating from the program.

The first outside evaluation, conducted by members of staff of the University of Pennsylvania in 1970, focused mainly on discovering the aims and structures of the Parkway Program (Cox, 1972, Ch. 11). More recent evaluation data about the Parkway Program was written by its current Director, and focuses on the continued successes of the Parkway Program compared to other Philadelphia high schools, in terms of attendance, dropout rates, and the percentages of students continuing to a college education (Lytle, 1981).

Available data from the Bridging the Gap Program in Kingston is basically anecdotal. It relies strongly on published reports of visits by various media groups for evidence from impartial outside observers that the program has merit (The Citizen, 1982; Whig-Standard, 1980, 1981, 1982).

An evaluation of the Social Education Project in



England was also carried out. Defining the project's basic objectives as largely attitudinal, Rennie et al. (1974) explained that evaluation of this type of program is "necessarily a limited one (p. 89)." They contended that it would not be possible to draw valid comparisons between this project, with its specific aims, and other school programs which would have different aims, since "there are no objective methods of evaluating one set of aims against another (p. 89)." Thus, the evaluation of the Social Education Project had to be restricted to measuring the acceptability and perceived relevance of the project's aims, together with an attempt to discern to what extent these aims had been achieved.

Interviews with parents, teachers, community members, and students were used to determine attitudes to the Social Education Project. A questionnaire was also administered to the involved students, to measure their attitudes towards school. In this respect, the authors note (p. 71) that their team was unable to find a completely suitable questionnaire already designed which could be used as a reference for validation. Eventually, the project's evaluation

team designed its own.

Several other community oriented programs have made use of anecdotal reports and individually designed questionnaires, to measure the attitudes of their students to learning, and their feelings of self-esteem (Etobicoke community involvement, 1977; Johnston & Parker, 1975; Lowe, 1981; Otte & Sharpe, 1979; Ratliff, 1972; Renfrewshire, 1973).

On examination, there were inappropriate portions in all of the preceding evaluation techniques, when applied to the D.U.O. Program. Buros (1978) lists standard attitudinal measurement scales which, when examined, turned up Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967) as the most promising; but even this, because of its targeted younger age group, was not entirely appropriate. Thus, like the other programs which have been noted, the attitudinal questionnaire used in this evaluation of the D.U.O. Program had to be specifically designed.

The evaluation presented here answered some elementary questions, but raised at least as many more. It is therefore presented as a preliminary evaluation, which probed as far as the present

situation would allow, and poses a challenge for future experimentation and further evaluation.

The evaluation procedures outlined here were administered to students and teachers at Hants East Rural High School during February 1983. It was considered necessary to wait until this point in the school year, so that student progress in the current school year could be monitored over a sufficient period.

Two specific groups of students were targeted to form the basis of the student portion of this evaluation. The first group comprised nineteen students who had applied, and were successful, by random draw, in becoming members of the 1981-1982 D.U.O. class. The second group comprised twenty students who had also applied, but through the random draw procedure were not selected to become members of that D.U.O. class, and consequently had attended other grade nine classes in the same school. These two groups were not randomly selected for this evaluation. They were the total members of each group, except as noted below.

The 1981-1982 D.U.O. class had, at the beginning of the year, a total of twenty two members. Three of

these students had not themselves applied for admission, but had been placed in the class at the insistence of the school's principal because he was unable to place them in any other class. These same three students did not complete the whole school year: they had all ceased to attend school by the halfway point in the school year. It may be noted that this was a pattern of events which repeated itself in each year of the D.U.O. Program's functioning. It was felt that these three students should be excluded from these evaluation procedures, however, because they did not fit the common criterion of all other members of both groups, of having applied to be members of the D.U.O. class.

The first phase of the evaluation consisted of an examination of the academic levels of achievement of these students, as documented on the cumulative record cards kept by the school. The history of each student in Grades Seven and Eight was first examined, to validate the assumption that these two groups of students did not show a wide variance of ability from each other. This revealed indeed that the members of the two groups were reasonably indistinguishable from each other: students from all the grade eight

classes except the top academic class had applied; they showed a wide range of academic strengths and weaknesses; approximately half the members of each group had spent at least one extra year in the junior high school grades; and they had all achieved enough to qualify for entry into Grade Nine at the beginning of the 1981-1982 school year.

The academic progress of each of these students in Grade Nine during 1981-1982 was then tabulated; their year-end destinations were noted; and finally, the available school marks of the same students for the 1982-1983 school year were scrutinized. A comparison was then drawn between the two specified groups, to attempt to determine if there was any difference in progress between them.

The second phase of the evaluation was a brief questionnaire, administered to the same two groups, to determine their attitudes towards school, and their feelings of self-esteem. This questionnaire, which was modified following pre-testing, consisted of eight statements about the two topics, to which students were invited to respond. The questionnaire was administered simultaneously to members of both groups

by the author, in a normal classroom in the school. It had been unannounced, and consequently some students from each group were unavailable due to absence or other commitments. Those absent were not invited to participate later.

The third phase of this evaluation was another questionnaire, which was given to all current members of staff at Hants East Rural High School who had also been members of staff when the D.U.O. Program was first introduced to the school. Forty eight teachers were given questionnaires, and twenty four responded. This questionnaire invited teachers first to identify their attitude, on a five point scale, when D.U.O. was first introduced. It then asked two open questions, asking for an explanation of that initial attitude, and for an assessment of whether and how their attitude had changed in the intervening period until the present.

Table 1 indicates the difference in academic progress which was discovered between the two student groups, on completion of the first phase of the evaluation.

Table 1. Academic Progress, 1981-1983.

Measures	D.U.O. Students	Unselected Applicants
Number of students September 1981	19	20
Number of students June 1982	18	17
Number of students completing Gr. 9	18 (100%)	4 (23.5%)
Number of students failing Gr. 9	0 (0%)	13 (76.4%)
Number returning to school for 1982-1983 year	16 (88.9%)	9 (52.9%)
Dispositions of students for 1982-1983 year	16 in Gr. 10	4 in Gr. 10 5 in Gr. 9

Noting that one student left the D.U.O. class before completing the school year, and that three students had left the other group, there is a marked difference between the Grade Nine success rates of these two groups, as there is consequently in the percentages of each group continuing to be members of the school population.

The discovery of these statistics presented a new problem in proceeding with the second phase of the evaluation, the attitudes questionnaire. Since only nine of the original twenty unselected applicants

were still attending school, it might be difficult to draw any valid comparisons of attitude towards school between the two groups. One would be tempted to conclude that the members of the second group who had ceased to attend school would display a negative attitude towards it, since it had judged them to be failures; however, it was not possible to substantiate this, because they could no longer be contacted. It was decided to proceed with this second phase, though, since it would still reveal a measure of attitudes which could be judged against the stated aims of the D.U.O. Program. Table 2 presents a summary of the results of this questionnaire.

Table 2. Students' Attitudes to School and Self-Esteem.

1 indicates strong agreement with a statement.			
2 indicates mild agreement with a statement.			
3 indicates no opinion about a statement.			
4 indicates mild disagreement with a statement.			
5 indicates strong disagreement with a statement.			
Scale Number	D.U.O. Students	Unselected Applicants	Statement
1	9 (90%)		Grade 9 was much more interesting to me than my other high school grades.
2	1 (10%)	4 (66.6%)	
3		2 (33.3%)	
4			
5			



Scale Number	D.U.O. Students	Unselected Applicants	Statement
1 2 3 4 5	10 (100%)	2 (33.3%) 2 (33.3%) 2 (33.3%)	I was able to learn about some interesting things in Grade 9.
1 2 3 4 5	10 (100%)	1 (16.6%) 1 (16.6%) 4 (66.6%)	Grade 9 was as much a waste of time as any other grade.
1 2 3 4 5	9 (90%) 1 (10%)	3 (50%) 2 (33.3%) 1 (16.6%)	I wish more of school was like my Grade 9 class.
1 2 3 4 5	2 (20%) 8 (80%)	2 (33.3%) 2 (33.3%) 1 (16.6%) 1 (16.6%)	I think I'm a better learner now, because of my experiences in Grade 9.
1 2 3 4 5	10 (100%)	3 (50%) 2 (33.3%) 1 (16.6%)	I was pleased to be a member of my Grade 9 class.
1 2 3 4 5	10 (100%)	2 (33.3%) 4 (66.6%)	My Grade 9 teachers made me feel that I could be a good student.
1 2 3 4 5	9 (90%) 1 (10%)	1 (16.6%) 1 (16.6%) 2 (33.3%) 2 (33.3%)	I Found things easier to learn about in Grade 9.

Comparatively, the results of Table 2 clearly indicate that the members of the D.U.O. class had a more positive attitude towards school and towards themselves than did members of the other group.

Table 3. Teachers' Attitudes to the D.U.O. Program.

Attitudes in 1977	Attitudes in 1983
7 strongly supportive	7 remained strongly supportive
13 mildly supportive	14 increased their support
3 indifferent	3 maintained the same attitude
1 mildly opposed	0 decreased their support

Table 3 revealed a fifty eight per cent change in teachers' attitudes towards increasing their support for the D.U.O. Program. An examination of their answers to the open questions also revealed a consensus. In explaining their attitude in 1977, the majority of the teachers stated either that they knew little about the program when it began, or that they had little contact with it. The majority explained their change in attitude in 1983 by stating that they had now had the opportunity to observe the positive benefits that D.U.O. students got from the program; and they therefore now felt that there was a definite place for such a program in the school.

Perhaps the most startling of these results is the set in Table 1, reflecting the academic progress of the students. One must question if this was perhaps due to different teachers' standards, rather than anything directly to do with the experiences of the D.U.O. Program. Did the D.U.O. teacher employ an easier marking system, passing students when others would have failed them? At this point, it is difficult to dismiss this charge completely; and it would be impossible, were it not for the documented, successful record of former D.U.O. students in high school over previous years, and for the examination conducted again this year of the students' grade ten marks. It must be stressed that the D.U.O. students who are presently enrolled in Grade Ten are attaining a reasonable academic standard there, indistinguishable from other average students. Individual students are having difficulties in specific subject areas, which reflect previously recognized weaknesses; but on the whole, they are meeting with continued success. An examination of the curricular content of the D.U.O. class revealed that the same material was taught as in other grade nine classes in the school. It would

seem, then, that the academic standard set in the D.U.O. class was adequate preparation for the grade ten level.

One can conclude, from an examination of the end-of-year success rates, that there was a benefit derived by members of the D.U.O. class, which was not made available to students who had wished to be in D.U.O. but had remained in regular classes. It remains difficult to pinpoint the origins of that benefit.

It is unfortunately difficult to assess accurately to what extent this comparative success rate was an unusual phenomenon of the 1981-1982 school year. The teacher was not aware that it was different from previous years. School records revealed that almost all D.U.O. students had successfully completed that course of studies in previous years: one hundred per cent in 1978-1979, ninety six per cent in 1979-1980, and eighty seven per cent in 1980-1981. However, complete records were not kept of the names of all the students who had been unselected applicants to the D.U.O. Program during these same years. Therefore, comparisons of rates of progress could not be drawn between these sets of students and the groups involved.

in this evaluation. Records will be maintained for future years.

The same charge of different teachers' standards might be laid against the results of Table 2. Did the D.U.O. activities have any direct bearing on the positive attitudes shown, or was the teacher's personality the factor, which would have brought equal results in any classroom? The best answer, though not conclusive, can be found in the students' comments in Appendix B: these statements support the argument that there were other components than the teacher which bolstered the students' attitudes.

The revelation of the change in attitude among teachers at the school, as shown in Table 3, was significant. It had been recognized that early support for the program was only mild: the few teachers who were strong supporters of it were also those most closely involved in continuing discussions about it, or who happened to be teaching in nearby classrooms.

The D.U.O. Program has been described to other groups of teachers, but within Hants East Rural High School, no further explanation was requested after the program was initiated. Individual examples were

noted of specific senior high school teachers indicating that they were impressed with former D.U.O. students in the senior high grades. But there was little overt indication of increased support among most teachers. There had been indications of peripheral interest, but these were generally coupled with the desire of not wanting to be professionally actively involved in such a program. This lack of understanding, however, of the true degree of support from colleagues, is perhaps an indication of the isolation in which most teachers still tend to work.

In conclusion, there is enough evidence from this first evaluation to suggest that the D.U.O. Program has made a valuable contribution to the academic life of the school, that it should continue to function, and that it is deserving of strong support from staff and administration.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

From the administrative point of view, two issues must now be faced: Financing of programs such as D.U.O.; and their staffing requirements. Financially, Bremer (1971, Ch. 6) contended that the Parkway Program was cheaper to operate than the normal school, because the capital and maintenance costs of a large school building were removed. Lytle (1981) substantiated that this was still so.

The Foxfire program, in its early days, was supported by foundation and individual grants. The Foxfire Fund now manages these monies, which together with the revenues from ongoing activities, provide the necessary budget to administer their programs. No significantly additional burden was placed on the school board.

When students go out on Do Unto Others projects in Vermont, no financial burden is incurred, apart from that of students using their own cars for transportation, instead of riding on an existing school bus. The author's D.U.O. Program made use of one school bus trip per week, a small additional expense

which the school board cost shared with the Province's Department of Education. The point to be made is that community based programs need not cost any more than traditional school programs, and sometimes cost less.

Then what of staffing? The Parkway Program has always reportedly maintained a lower pupil-teacher ratio than other Philadelphia schools: this has been so because many community volunteers have been teaching groups of students, in addition to the teaching of the full-time professional Parkway staff. A Parkway group consists of two hundred and fifty students, and ten professional teachers. It is only because these students divide themselves among more than ten available courses that the lower pupil-teacher ratio is possible.

Eliot Wigginton was teaching one hundred and forty students when he started the Foxfire activities. Do Unto Others at Champlain Valley Union High School caters to two hundred and seventy five students, and is run by two full-time and two part-time staff members. The D.U.O. Program at Hafts East Rural High School consisted on average of a class of twenty five students, taught by one teacher. These would all appear to be



reasonable staffing loads.

Eliot Wigginton summarizes the hopes of those who work in community based programs, when he states in his brochure that it is his goal to see solid, experiential courses offered in every department of his whole school. But these programs are few. One is led to ask, then, if so many support the idea of such programs, and if they are feasible in terms of finance and staffing, why there are not more of them? The answer may well be in the attitudes of people when first encountering a new idea.

In order to test this, the author had conversations with administrators of some community based programs, and sent a brief questionnaire to some others with whom there was not opportunity for personal contact. In both conversation and written questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify the apparent attitudes of students, members of the community, and other teachers, when they first began their programs. They were then asked to comment on whether, and how, any of these attitudes had changed substantially since the programs' beginnings. These questions were deliberately similar to those in the teacher questionnaire

about the O.U.O. Program which was documented in Table 3 in the previous chapter. The results of this survey are summarized below, in Table 4.

Table 4. Degrees of Support  
For Community Based Programs.

Program	1.	2.	3.
Students: Initially	Strong	Strong	Strong
Now	Strong	Strong	Strong
Community: Initially	Strong	Mild	Strong
Now	Strong	Strong	Strong
Teachers: Initially	Mild	Mild	Mild
Now	Increased	Increased	Increased
Program	4.	5.	6.
Students: Initially	Strong	Mild	Strong
Now	Strong	Strong	Strong
Community: Initially	Strong	Strong	Strong
Now	Strong	Strong	Strong
Teachers: Initially	Mild	Strong	Mild
Now	Mild	Strong	Mild

It is apparent from this table that the least amount of support for the introduction of community based programs comes from teachers. In written elaborations on the questionnaires, and in conversations,

respondents further revealed that, although there is a marked increase in support from the teacher group after a program has been in operation for some time, there remains a distinct hesitancy among teachers to become actively involved.

A general trend of resistance among teachers to innovation in general was documented by Moore & Hunt (1980). In examining the resistance of teachers to community based programs in particular, some specifics are identified. In speaking directly to many teachers about why they would not wish to work in community based programs, the following general reasons have been given. Some feel inadequate, in knowledge and training, to perform an acceptable job in such a setting; others view the change it would make in their routines as causing too much hard work for themselves; and others simply prefer their present teaching assignments.

In Chapter One of this study, two common threads were identified which were present in all described programs. They were the intent to raise students' social consciousness, and the change in the teacher's role. If one now compares these common threads to

the causes of teacher resistance to involvement, one can form a link.

The programs, which have been described in this study have all functioned at the secondary school level. Teachers here, who express resistance, have been trained to be experts within a specified subject field, and to be proficient at teaching the content therein. The aim of raising social consciousness cuts across subject boundaries, and has something more to do with the development of the child, rather than with an increase in knowledge in a particular subject. This may be the basis for a dichotomy, leading to a feeling of uneasiness, or inadequacy, among subject-trained teachers. Clearly also, as has been previously mentioned, the change in the teacher's role to facilitator of the students' learning from other people is threatening to those teachers trained to be the expert conveyors of knowledge themselves.

Thus, the two common threads of community based programs can be seen to be at variance with the teaching practices, and roles, of most teachers in secondary schools, where such programs operate. And

that variance, but a prejudiced animosity, may be a major factor in teachers' resistance. It would then follow that community based programs are not likely to become more widespread, until there are training programs in community based education for aspiring teachers.

With this caution in mind, one must finally ask whether the foregoing programs represent fully developed approaches to the use of community resources. Are these programs as large as they might be, considering the availability of resources; and might further program development be expected of them?

The answer to the question of size seems debatable. If the use of resources is restricted to industrial settings, the programs will be relatively small, unless situated in an exceptionally major industrial area. But if programs are able to involve whole segments of the population, like senior citizens, the program's size would seem to be potentially larger, able perhaps to involve the whole school population in some activities.

There is a caveat. It would be unrealistic to expect any industrial setting to allow itself to be

overrun by hordes of exploring students. As the D.U.O. Program showed, it is only possible to place a few students, occasionally, in such settings. The same is true of individual community members. It would be unrealistic to expect a senior citizen to undertake the constant teaching of class-size groups of students. The opportunity has been demonstrated to be at its best when only a few interested students spend time learning with such a person.

The expansion in size of such programs, then, does not depend on persuading more community members to accept greater numbers of students. In developing community based education, the school cannot abnegate its traditional responsibilities: expansion hinges on maintaining individualized contact with community members, while making further use of other available community resources for larger groups of students, over whom the school's teachers maintain supervision and direction.

There is also room for further program development. The programs which have been described in this study only represent beginnings. Programs like D.U.O., and Bridging The Gap, have illustrated exemplary uses

of community resources which might be employed when students first begin to learn in their communities. Their educational intent is largely attitudinal, without making many rigid academic demands of that learning in the community. In this sense they might be classified as elementary programs. As one can define an increasing academic component in the progress of traditional schooling, programs like Foxfire, and Parkway are more advanced, and might be termed secondary. While they acknowledge the attitudinal intent, they do make more specific academic demands of the activities of their students in the community. And while they make allowances for the individual students to pursue a topic of some interest, they tend to view these community activities as vital and relevant adjuncts to academic topics and skills being normally taught in school.

It is here that there is a challenge yet to be widely met. There are many topics taught in school which might be more vitally learned through the use of community resources. These include topics which are currently included in the standard school curriculum, as well as topics of specific interest

or relevance to a particular community, and which might be best taught both in and by it.

And if students begin to learn in and with the community, one might expect to witness one further developmental stage from such programs: the active involvement of students in community development, given their greater social consciousness. This not only seems to be a natural consequence of the educational process, but one to be lauded, for in it one finally glimpses an answer to the concern of the people of Pugwash, who influenced the beginnings of this search many years ago. Students are surely less likely to leave their communities if they are actively involved as respected members of them.



## APPENDIX A

### THE D.U.O. CLASS

#### GRADE 9 - HANTS EAST RURAL HIGH SCHOOL

You are probably going to be told by someone who doesn't know, that the D.U.O. class just plays at schoolwork. Don't believe them! This basic outline is meant to provide you with enough information to understand that a normal grade level of achievement is expected of all enrolled students. The topics are taught to the same depth as any grade nine class. Normally available grade nine textbooks are used. Just maybe we can enjoy learning about this stuff together. Good luck!

#### TERM 1 TO FIND OURSELVES

- English - Watch, discuss, and write about "Roots."  
Read, for comprehension, selections from "Who am I."  
Develop notetaking skills using the DRILL kit.  
Produce a complete autobiography.
- Social - Develop mapping skills using the Map kit.
- Studies - Take part in orienteering exercises.  
Trace British history from B.C. to the 1400's.  
Produce a project on one aspect of feudalism.
- Science - Review all body systems.  
Examine causes, effects, and treatments of common diseases.  
Examine physical effects of various drugs.  
Participate in a basic First Aid course.

- Math - Review decimals, fractions, and metric scales,  
or, complete problems in counting and two-  
dimensional numbers.  
Complete consumer pricing surveys.

TERM 2. DISCOVERING FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- English - Read, and write, a variety of poetry.  
Write, and participate in a variety of short plays.  
Practice basic filmmaking techniques.

- Social - Examine physical, geological, and climatic  
Studies geography of Europe.  
Survey Tudor rulers, and their effects on  
religion.

- Science - Survey cell theory, basic genetics, and heredity.  
Study human sexuality.

- Math - Learn about percents, banking systems, and  
investments,  
or, complete chapters on number problems,  
formula problems, and polynomials.  
Complete consumer pricing surveys.

TERM 3. A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

- English - Read, discuss, and write about a selection  
of science fiction.  
Develop basic grammar and spelling skills.

- Social - Study European countries, peoples, traditions.  
Studies Examine the Stuart rulers.  
Produce an historically accurate newspaper.

- Science - Study basic astronomy and space science.  
Examine the physics of motion.  
Produce a time measuring device.

- Math - Complete chapters on buying, selling, taxes,  
or, chapters on linear equations, products  
and factors.  
Complete consumer pricing surveys.

TERM 4 WHERE ARE WE NOW

- English - Read, discuss, and write about "Striving."  
Examine techniques and influences of advertising.
- Social Studies - Survey the resources and commerce of modern Europe.  
Survey British society of the 20th. century.
- Science - Review the current major uses of energy.  
Study alternative energy sources and systems.  
Produce a demonstration project using alternative energy.
- Math - Complete chapters on owning cars and homes,  
or, chapters on quadratic equations and modern problems.  
Complete consumer pricing surveys.

In addition to these activities, all students enrolled in the D.U.O. Program will spend every Wednesday pursuing individualized learning opportunities within the community. They will also take part in a series of scheduled group visits to industrial, historical, and cultural sites of general interest.

APPENDIX B

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ABOUT THE C.U.O. PROGRAM

At the end of each year, students have been invited to put into writing thoughts about their experiences, and advice about changes that would improve the program. These are extracts from some of their responses.

"Being in this class this year I feel has been a really great experience for me. I found out that school is not always a drag and also that I can learn many things.... The atmosphere was really great. I learned a lot. I liked most of the other students and teacher. I think that maybe, the next group should be forced to work harder, I don't think we were pushed hard enough to work to our ability, not me anyway (Stephen)."

"If it wasn't for this class I wouldn't have learnt about what happens like in the hospital or the K-Mart. Another things is that we can take our time and stop to learn and not to just rush to finish a

book or subject. Our teacher this year gave us the understanding of learning and working (Carol)."

"It is a lot easier to work in this class than any other class because when the bell rings to change class we can sit and work while the other classes have to get up and go to the next class. For next year the people should be split up into two groups because some people work faster than others (Victor)."

"Our class has grown into a sort of family. We do things together and get better acquainted with our surroundings. My days out were the most exciting for me. I think I do most things well there.... I have found out what a vet does, and although I may not be one it's good to know where I can take my dog (Sharon)."

"This year at school has been one of the best for me because of you and D.U.O. At work I have learned to do things on our own, and to give suggestions. Also we have learned to prepare for the public. This year there were times when I felt like giving up, but I always knew that if I did it was a chance of a lifetime. I want you to know that this year has been the greatest (Larry)."

"I truly think that this year has been the most

enjoyable year I have spent in this school. I think that I have done a substantial amount of work, and done it very well (Gary)."

"I enjoy going away very much. I enjoyed working at the Teachers' College, but I just wanted a change and to do something different so I went to the K-Mart. They really work you hard there but I enjoy doing it (Bonnie)."

"It is more exciting to visit around your province. You learn more than you do in school because you are interested in what you are doing (Joel)."

"Well I don't know too much advice, but this is rather a good way now. D.U.O. really helps you a lot; it shows you can do it on your own. And be yourself. Helps you to learn about what is outside there when you go out to work (John)."

"This class has been very useful to me in so many different ways. This class has gave me a different outlook on the attitudes of people. I have not only learnt about how the animals lived and what they were eating, but also I have learnt much about what the workers think about each other. Sometimes the men think that they have done more work than the other

guy and they give suggestions to others on what there is to do for work.

"This class makes you think about the people who want to learn and helps you notice the people who don't give a damn about the school work. There should be more of these sorts of classes not only in our school but in different schools in the province so more people have the same opportunities as we have. This class gives people that are giving up on the world a huge burst of encouragement to have a second look on life and to maybe start some interest up again for school, and give education a second chance (Dale)."

"There for a while I thought I was dumb, because last year teachers told us we were stupid and I started to believe it. I didn't feel like studying at all because of the way I felt because of the teachers. I remember hearing people say our class was dumb, but it's not true. Maybe the people who said that wished they were here. I know, and Mom knows that this class has helped me a lot (Monica)."

"It has been a very useful year for me because when I started in here I had no idea what I wanted

to do with my life and now I do (Burriel)."

"In the six years I've been in this school this has been the most enjoyable one for me.... This D.U.O. program is great, it is the same, worldwide, but it was fun to go out and do what I wanted to do for a long time. I felt I did my work a lot better this year than I've done other years (Burton)."

"In grade eight when I heard about the D.U.O. class I was very impressed. I wanted to sign the paper right away so I did. And not once this year did I regret that. If it wasn't for this class I would have quit school altogether. Good things I found happened were, I learned to work on my own to get along at a job, and I really enjoyed leaving the school to do things with the class. And I guess the bad things were about myself, sometimes I got lazy and didn't feel like doing my work.

I think we should have done more things with the class like when we went to that huge ship and to the museum. Because everyone seemed real close, like a family.

Days at the bakery were enjoyable. The people were really kind to me. Some days there was very



little to do but I usually didn't mind because the people there were so nice. I really enjoyed it there. And I want to thank you for letting me have that opportunity. I'm really going to miss the togetherness this class shared (Annette)."

REFERENCES

- Bremer, J., & von Moschzisker, M. The school without walls. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1974.
- Brown, B. F. New directions for the comprehensive high school. West Nyack, N. Y.: Parker, 1972.
- Brown, B. F. The reform of secondary education. Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Buros, O. K. The eighth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N. J.: Gryphon Press, 1978.
- The Citizen. Ottawa: The Citizen, February 2, 1982.
- Coates, G. (Ed.). Alternative learning environments. Stroudsburg, Penn.: Dowden, Hutchinson, & Ross, 1974.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.
- Cox, D. W. The city as a schoolhouse. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1972.
- Etobicoke community involvement program evaluation. Evaluation of a secondary school program involving students in community and social service activities. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1977.

Laure, P., et al. Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow. Paris: UNESCO, 1972.

Friere, P. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder & Herder, 1970.

Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit. Beyond coping. Some approaches to social education. London: FECRDU, 1980.

Gibbons, M. The new secondary education. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.

Illich, I. Deschooling society. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Johnston, D. L., & Parker, J. V. Walden III: An alternative high school survives evaluation quite nicely, thank you. Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 56, 624-628.

Kelly, A. V. (Ed.) Case studies in mixed ability teaching. London: Harper & Row, 1975.

Lowe, I. Learning in the community. London: Community Service Volunteers, 1981.

Lytle, J. H. Parkway survives decade. Changing Schools, 1981, 9(3), 1-7.

McClure, L., et al. Experience-based learning. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1977.

Moore, D. M., & Hunt, T. C. The nature of resistance to the use of educational media. British Journal of Educational Technology, 1980, 11, 141-147.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. New views of school and community. Arlington, Va.: NAESP, 1973.

Olsen, E. G., & Clark, P. A. Life-centering education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell, 1977.

Otte, F. L., & Sharpe, D. L. The effect of career exploration on self-esteem, achievement motivation, and occupational knowledge. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1979, 28, 63-70.

Ratliff, L. S. Senior seminar 1972: An evaluation of an experiential learning program at East High School, Denver, Colorado. Denver: Denver Public Schools, 1972.

Renfrewshire Education Authority. Learning in the community. Glasgow: Renfrewshire Education Authority & University of Glasgow Education Department, 1973.

Rennie, J., Lunzer, E. A., & Williams, W. T. Social education: an experiment in four secondary schools. London: Evans/Methuen Educational, 1974.

Schwartz, B. N. Affirmative education. Englewood

Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Silberman, C. E. Crisis in the classroom. New York:

Random House, 1970.

Watson, K. Community education - prospects for the

1980's. New Era, 1980, 61, pages unknown.

Whig-Standard. Kingston, Ont.: Whig-Standard, October

3, 1980.

Whig-Standard. Kingston, Ont.: Whig-Standard, July 4,

1981.

Whig-Standard. Kingston, Ont.: Whig-Standard, September

7, 1982.

Wigginton, E. (Ed.) The Foxfire Book. Garden City,

New York: Doubleday, 1972.

Williams, C. M. The community as textbook. Bloomington,

Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1975.