INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-15,328

LOGAN, III, Leonard Marion, 1922-
PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT EDUCATION RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA COMPARED WITH FOUR OTHER SELECTED INSTITUTIONS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1972
Education, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT EDUCATION RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA COMPARED WITH FOUR OTHER SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

LEONARD M. LOGAN, III

Norman, Oklahoma

1972

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT EDUCATION RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA COMPARED WITH FOUR OTHER SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

AKNOWLEDGEMENT

My sincerest appreciation is extended to the Chairman of this doctoral committee, Dr. William R. Fulton, for his constant and thoughtful direction of this study. Similarly, my gratitude goes to the committeemen: Dr. E. F. Cates, Dr. Thurman J. White and Dr. Lloyd P. Williams for their genuine interest and support. Other persons not on the committee provided invaluable guidance and assistance throughout the study. I am especially appreciative of Dr. James H. Petree and Dr. Howell W. McGee.

In addition to the above mentioned individuals a large number of specialists from several institutions, over the years, have contributed to a mass of unduplicable information. To all of them I am indebted for the only possible source from which this particular study could have been extracted.

In special ways I am grateful to my family; to my parents, Dr. & Mrs. Leonard M. Logan for an academic background and value base; and to my wife Julia and daughter Elise who constantly inspired and encouraged me to carry this study to completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables . . . . . .

List of Appendices . . . . . .

Chapter Page

I. THE PROBLEM

Introduction 1
Background and Need for the Study. 2
Statement of the Problem 3
Purpose. 4
Assumption 5
Definitions. 6
Hypothesis 7
The Data 8
Analysis 9

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Background Factors Influencing the Literature. . . . 10
A Previous Study of Program Analysis 11
Previous Efforts to Evaluate Kellogg-supported Centers. 11

III. METHODOLOGY

Pre-Survey Procedures. 14
Survey Procedures. 19
Data Analysis Procedures 19

IV. RESULTS 23

Descriptive Statistics of the Five Samples 24
Summary of Descriptive Data. 30
Results of Testing Hypotheses. 31
Summary of Hypothesis Testing. 55
Additional Findings. 57
Summary of Additional Findings 70
Synthesis of Hypothesis Testing and Additional Findings 71

----------TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)----------

V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION

Summary 73
Recommendations 77
Implications for Further Research 78
Conclusion. 78

APPENDIX 80

BIBLIOGRAPHY 138

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Programs Held at Each of the Five Universities . . .	16
2.	Areas of Program Comparison and the Questionnaire Items Chosen From Each	17
3.	Card Format Used to Enter Survey Questionnaire Data	20
4.	Characteristics of Participants from Michigan State University	25
5.	Characteristics of Participants From the University of Georgia.	26
6.	Characteristics of Participants From the University of Nebraska	27
7.	Characteristics of Participants from the University of Oklahoma	28
8.	Characteristics of Participants From the University of Chicago.	29
9.	The University of Oklahoma's Program Content as Contrasted with the Program Content of the other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers	32
10.	The University of Oklahoma's Program Content Level as Contrasted with the Program Content Level of the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers.	34
11.	The Initiators of Program Activity at the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Initiators of Program Activity in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Adult Education Centers.	35
12.	The University of Oklahoma's Program Coordination as Contrasted to the Program Coordination in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers.	38

----------LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)----------

13. The University of Oklahoma's Pre-Conference Activities as Contrasted to the Pre-Conference Activities of the Other Kellogg-Supported Centers 41

14. Methods of Instruction Used in Oklahoma's Educational Programs as Contrasted to the Instructional Methods in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers 43

15. Percent of Total Use of Instructional Methods Comparing the Data Reported by the University of Oklahoma and the Data Reported by the Other Four Learning Centers 45

16. Instructional Materials Used in Oklahoma's Educational Programs as Contrasted With the Instructional Materials Used in Other Kellogg-Supported Centers 47

17. The University of Oklahoma's Post-Conference Activities as Contrasted to the Post-Conference Activities in Other Kellogg-Supported Centers 49

18. Type of Evaluation attempted by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Types of Evaluations Attempted by Other Kellogg-Supported Adult Education Centers . . 51

19. Percentage of Time Spent Conducting the Eight Evaluation Techniques 52

20. Summary of Significant Differences Observed in Testing Hypothesis One Through Nine 56

21. The Number of Program Participants Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to Four Other University Centers 58

22. The Number of Nights in Residence of Program Participants Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Data Reported by the Other Four Centers 59

23. The Number of In-Residence Participants as Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Numbers Reported by the Other Four Centers 60

----------LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)----------

24. Number of Planned Session Days as Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted with the Number Reported by the Other Centers 61

25. Type of Conference Activity as Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted With the Type of Activity Reported by the Other Four Centers. 62

26. Nature of Program Clientele as Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted With the Program Clientele Reported by the Other Four Centers 63

27. Total Conference Fees Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Conference Fees Reported by the Other Four Centers 64

28. Comparison of the Major Fee Components Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Four Other University Centers 65

29. A Comparison of the Major Sources of Activity Financing as Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted to the Sources Reported by Four Other Learning Centers 66

30. A Comparison of the Group(s) the Programs Were Sponsored for as Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted to the Sources Reported by Four Other Learning Centers. 67

31. A Comparison of the Types of External Sponsorship Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted to the Four Other Centers. . . 68

32. Summary of Significant Additional Findings. . . 70

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A.	Data Collection Instrument Used in the Study	80
B.	Description of Occupational Categories Used in Collecting the Data	96
C.	Demographical Data Reported by the Five Universities	98
D.	Complete Data Used to Test Hypotheses One Through Nine	104
E.	Data Used in Computing Additional Findings	123

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT EDUCATION RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA COMPARED WITH FOUR OTHER SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Adult education residential programs have been offered by institutions of higher education for many years. These offerings have included the widest array of topical concern and content. They have been presented to almost every kind of group matrix with many variable program characteristics. With this magnitude and variety there has been a sparsity of analytical studies.

In the past decade much growth has taken place in adult education. Several obvious factors have contributed to this expansion since World War II and the Korean War. The post collegiate age and married student have become regular constituents in the college classroom. Concurrent to this very substantial addition to the on-campus student population there is, if not a spill over, a parallel acceleration of interest in a wide variety of resident adult education programs. Possibly this is an outgrowth of an attitude that

has developed within the recent past. The prevalent attitude seems to be that education, generally and apart from formal post graduate studies, does not become terminal with the end of either high school or the successive four years chronologically bracketed and set aside for college or some skill training. Moreover, education does not become terminal with marriage (of either partner) and/or full time occupational involvement.

Continuing education appears to be coming of age. Resident adult programming must begin to see itself in a progressive light of leadership and enormous responsibility to a broad spectrum of society rather than as satellite to an obsolete terminal concept of formal learning. A substantiating summary statement comes from Dr. Howell W. McGee: "Residential programming is the fastest growing activity in Higher Adult Education." (Howell W. McGee, From the Dean's Desk, AUEC.)

Background and Need for the Study

If the introductory comments were to apply to a transient condition of society that soon would run its course and that adult education in all of its dimensions would return to a near pre-World War I status, this proposed study probably would be less valuable. There are, however, irreversible phenomena evolving which completely obviate the likelihood of any retreat or return. Of unquestionable significance are the facts that rapid growth of technological/scientific developments as well as enormous sociological

change in the past twenty years have made imperative the accelerated retraining and continuing education for an increasingly larger number of employed and employable persons. Generally the higher attainment of educational levels and personal affluence has provided nearly everyone with a fair extent of functional literacy, a more responsible life style and with it the need for more and more learning experiences. Since the first residential adult education center at the University of Minnesota was begun in 1936, there has been much growth and development in this category of educational activity. A recent study by Ann Litchfield (Studies and Training in Continuing Education, the University of Chicago, 1968) listed 82 higher education residential adult education centers in the contiguous United States. As has been noted few analytical studies have been made. Therefore, it is timely to examine how the University of Oklahoma and similar institutions with residential adult education programs have satisfied part of this growing educational demand. It is essential to curricula planning and developing methodologies that more investigation and data are developed. Until the present no research effort similar to this study has been made of the raw data collected involving residential adult education programs at the selected institutions.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine whether there are any significant differences in selected major

program characteristics in related adult education residential programs between the Kellogg supported center at the University of Oklahoma and the Kellogg supported centers at the University of Chicago, the University of Georgia, Michigan State and the University of Nebraska. These were the first five Kellogg supported centers for adult education residential programs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is, through statistical methodologies, to analyze the data specifically pertaining to the selected program characteristics of content, methodologies, organization, objectives and evaluation. A further purpose is to identify significant differences and similarities of data between the University of Oklahoma and the selected institutions with the hope that some substantial directions will be indicated for sustaining, reinforcing and/or developing new continuing adult education services.

The Procedure

Development of the instrument used in this study was begun in 1962 when a committee representing the original five Kellogg supported centers was appointed for this purpose. In 1963, at a meeting in Chicago this committee reviewed and modified a pilot instrument. The questionnaire was approved and continued for a full year's collection of data for 1965. After this plan was extended to collect data with the instrument

for the following years through 1968.[1]

Assumptions and Delimitations

The major assumptions made in the conduct of this study were as follows:

1. That the data collection instrument used to collect the data is a valid and reliable instrument.

2. That the data collected from the five universities is representative of the programs conducted at the various centers within each university.

3. That the data reported by the five Kellogg-supported centers is reported accurately and completely in the figures shown in the statistical computations.

4. That the computer analysis and printouts are accurate and free of errors.

5. That the data collection instrument* items numbered 17 and 18 are a valid and reliable representation of the Program Content.

6. That the data collection instrument items numbered 19 and 27 are a valid and reliable representation of the educational Program Planning.

7. That the data collection instrument items numbered 30, 32, 33, 35, and 36 are a valid and reliable representation of the educational Program Conduct.

8. That the data reported by the five different univer-

---

[1] "Continuing Education Report", No. 15, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1967.

*See Appendix

sities are representative of the type of programs conducted at the five selected Kellogg-supported centers.

Definitions of Terms

Adult education[1] - Programs offered by a college or university which provide opportunities for adults and out-of-school youth to further their education.

Adult student[2] - A person beyond compulsory school age whose major occupation is not that of full time student.

Continuing education[1] - Any extension of opportunities for reading, study, and training at the higher education level to young persons and adults following their completion of or withdrawal from full time school or college programs. The service is usually provided by special schools, centers, colleges, institutes or by separate administrative divisions such as University Extension.

Residential conference center[1] - A facility incorporating lecture hall(s), smaller rooms, audio-visual equipment especially designed for such meetings as discussion groups, workshops and conferences, etc., and residence accommodations.

Kellogg supported center - a name applied to certain residence adult education and continuing education facilities which have been developed specifically for these purposes

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Definitions of Student Personnel Terms in Higher Education, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, 1968.

[2] U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Adult/Continuing Education Activities in Institutions of Higher Education, 1970-71, U.S. Government, Washington, 1971.

through financial support of the Kellogg Foundation.

Selected institutions - the five original Kellogg supported centers located respectively at the University of Nebraska, Michigan State University, University of Oklahoma, University of Chicago, University of Georgia.

Program questionnaire - the official instrument used to gather all of the raw data essential to this study.

Hypotheses Tested in the Study

The conduct of this study allowed the testing of nine (9) hypotheses. The null propositions of these nine hypotheses were as follows:

Ho_1 - There is no statistically significant difference within twelve selected content areas in programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_2 There is no statistically significant difference in the level of program content at each of six different content levels of programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_3 There is no statistically significant difference within each of the eight initiative sources of programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_4 There is no statistically significant difference between each of the eight approaches to coordination of programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_5 There is no statistically significant difference within each of five separate approaches to the utilization of pre-conference study materials in programs at the University of Oklahoma Center residence program and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_6 There is no statistically significant difference between each of the ten different methods of instruction in programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_7 There is no statistically significant difference in the utilization of eight different instructional materials in the programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_8 There is no statistically significant difference within each of six approaches to post conference activities in programs at the University of Oklahoma Center residence programs and those held at the other selected institutions.

Ho_9 There is no statistically significant difference between the seven methods of evaluation in programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

The Data

The survey method of research was selected as the most favorable means for the aquisition of data. It was the only means through which the maximum amount of usable raw data on all residential programs could have been gathered from the selected institutions. The period of time during which the data was collected was from 1964 through 1968.

The raw data that was available from a survey from the participating universities in the Program Research Data Collection Project from 1964 to 1968 was sufficient for this study of continuing Adult Education programs of the five selected institutions. Since the survey contains a universe of data sampling computations were not necessary. When the collection of data was discontinued January 1, 1969, the committee was of the opinion that continued collection would

not yield any significant contribution to the five year data base already collected. The total tabulation of data was distributed to the first selected institution October, 1969. Access to the final data was restricted exclusively to the administrative staffs of the respective selected institutions by the committee guiding the study. At the October 1969 meeting the committee approved the release of the data effective January 1, 1970.

Analysis

The data collected through the described procedures was treated statistically to test the stated hypotheses. To test the hypotheses (Ho_1 through Ho_9), the Chi Square (x^2) for independent groups and a Contingency Coefficient (a derivative of the Chi Square Test) were used.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature is confined as much as possible to the context of the study. It is evident to the writer that at this time there is very little published material on the operation of residential programs. There is an equally small amount of literature on residential centers in general although the earliest residence center dates back to almost 40 years ago.

> "The prototype residential center for continuing education was built at the University of Minnesota in 1934. Nearly two decades passed before the idea was taken seriously and moved forward. From 1951 to the present, the story is that of an idea whose time had come. In 1951, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation made a grant to Michigan State University to assist in the construction of a continuing education center on the campus at East Lansing. The response was gratifying. Adult students came to programs in such numbers that the facility soon had to be expanded. Thus, encouraged, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation supported the construction of another center at the University of Georgia. Again the results were gratifying. Consequently, in studied and deliberate order, and carefully spaced over several years, further grants were made to the Universities of Chicago, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oxford, Columbia, New England, Notre Dame, and the California State Polytechnic College."[1]

The completion of all the first five centers, Michigan State University, University of Georgia, the University of Nebraska, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of

---

[1]Thurman J. White, Ph.D., Higher Adult Education in North America, Prepared for ICUAE/UNESCO BOOK - 1972.

not yield any significant contribution to the five year data base already collected. The total tabulation of data was distributed to the first selected institution October, 1969. Access to the final data was restricted exclusively to the administrative staffs of the respective selected institutions by the committee guiding the study. At the October 1969 meeting the committee approved the release of the data effective January 1, 1970.

Analysis

The data collected through the described procedures was treated statistically to test the stated hypotheses. To test the hypotheses (Ho_1 through Ho_9), the Chi Square (x^2) for independent groups and a Contingency Coefficient (a derivative of the Chi Square Test) were used.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature is confined as much as possible to the context of the study. It is evident to the writer that at this time there is very little published material on the operation of residential programs. There is an equally small amount of literature on residential centers in general although the earliest residence center dates back to almost 40 years ago.

> "The prototype [illegible] ter for continuing education was bui[illegible] ty of Minnesota in 1934. Nearl[illegible] before the idea was taken seri[illegible]. From 1951 to the present [illegible] n idea whose time had come [illegible] logg Foundation made a g[illegible] versity to assist in the [illegible] ing education center o[illegible] ng. The response was g[illegible] ts came to programs in suc[illegible] ility soon had to be expand[illegible] d, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation [illegible] onstruction of another center at the [illegible] of Georgia. Again the results were gratifying. Consequently, in studied and deliberate order, and carefully spaced over several years, further grants were made to the Universities of Chicago, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oxford, Columbia, New England, Notre Dame, and the California State Polytechnic College."[1]

The completion of all the first five centers, Michigan State University, University of Georgia, the University of Nebraska, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of

---

[1]Thurman J. White, Ph.D., Higher Adult Education in North America, Prepared for ICUAE/UNESCO BOOK - 1972.

Chicago, was not realized until 1963. Any writings regarding residence programs held at these centers would, of course, be dated after this period.

The first meeting for the Program Data Committee for the Kellogg Centers was convened at the University of Oklahoma in February, 1962. After several preliminary efforts a more comprehensive data gathering project was developed and underway by 1965. These quantitative tabulations were obtained up to 1969, at which time the data gathering project was considered to be complete and was terminated.

Most of the writings prior to the completion of the first five Kellogg supported centers and even afterward were focused on averages, general trends, tendencies and related opinions selectively screened from raw data. No other studies could be found comparing analytically residential programs between residential centers or more specifically between the center at the University of Oklahoma and any other residential center.

Only one other formal research effort analyzing data from selected residential centers was found. The institutions chosen were the first five Kellogg supported centers which were the same ones concerned in this study; this is about the only similarity in the two studies. Eugene Welden, now with the U.S. office of education, was concerned generally with participant relationships to conference planning. Welden collected data over an eight week period in 1965. His study was a comparison of (A) programs without partici-

pant representation in planning with (B) programs planned with participant representation. The three hypotheses were:[1]

1. Participants in conferences planned with participant representation will perceive the conference as more directly related to their personal motives than will participants in conferences planned without participant representation.

2. Participants in conferences planned with participant representation will express a higher degree of satisfaction with the conference than will participants in conferences planned without participant representation.

3. Participants in conferences planned with participant representation will express a higher degree of interest in continuing educative activity than will participant representation.

These hypotheses were properly analyzed through statistical methodology. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to test the three null hypotheses. The parametric t test was used also. Although the direction of Welden's research is clearly on another track from the purpose of this study. Welden's conclusions indicate that participation in residential programs is by adults' own chosing and that their remaining or returning is correlated with their needs, desires, and abilities. It should be mentioned that his findings strongly support a current opinion among specialists and programmers in Residential Adult Education. Thurman White is more succinct. "Because unless the adult student believes a program of 'value' to him, he votes to discontinue the

---

[1] J. Eugene Welden, Program Planning and Program Effectiveness in University Residential Centers (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1966).

program by simply staying away from it."[1]

Litchfield and Cunningham as a part of the overall study of 12 institutions included the five selected institutions involved in the study. The range of all reporting institutions was arranged in a percentage order by each item of the questionnaire. Since this report was based on a variety of conference centers and since there is no indepth statistical analysis the Litchfield-Cunningham report does not give the comparative analysis sought in this writer's study.

---

[1]Thurman J. White, Higher Education for Everybody? Issues and Implications prepared for the Commission on Academic Affairs Committee on Higher Education - 1970.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The major part of this study was accomplished by performing an analysis of the questionnaire responses pertaining to 970 resident adult education programs at the universities of Michigan, Georgia, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Chicago for the FY 1968. Nine different areas were compared with contrasts being made between the conduct of the adult education programs at the Kellogg-supported education centers located at the University of Oklahoma and the Kellogg-supported centers located on the campuses of the other four universities. The methods and procedures used in the conduct of the study were divided into three separate areas; (1) the pre-study procedures, (2) the data collection procedures, and (3) the data analysis procedures.

Pre-Survey Procedures

The pre-survey procedures, consisting of all those tasks it was necessary to accomplish prior to the actual conduct of the study, were further divided into several subareas or tasks. Each of these subtasks is explained in the following sections.

Choice of Data Collection Instrument

Development of the instrument used in this study was begun in 1962 at the University of Oklahoma when a committee

representing the original five Kellogg-supported centers was appointed for this purpose. In 1963 at a meeting in Chicago this committee reviewed and modified a pilot instrument to be used in collecting data from program specialists who had directed resident programs during FY 1964. The instrument was field tested during two six-month trial periods covering all the 1964 programs. After thorough review and revision, the questionnaire was approved for collecting the data pertaining to the 1965 programs. The results of the 1965 collection proved to be satisfactory and the instrument was further approved for the years of 1966, 1967, and 1968. The actual instrument used in collecting the data for these last three years is shown in Appendix A.

The validity and reliability of the instrument is well established even though an actual coefficient cannot be reported. This method of establishing the validity and reliability of an instrument or test is referred to as consensual validity and reliability or the jury method of establishing the validity and reliability of an instrument. In this case the professionals responsible for the collection of the data were of a general consensus that the instrument was a valid and reliable measure of the data being sought.

Choice of Samples of Participants

Since the investigator was interested in the comparison of the Kellogg-supported center at the University of Oklahoma with comparable populations, it was necessary to choose those which had the most commonalities with the University

of Oklahoma and still had complete data figures reported for the time period designated. As a result of these criteria, the investigator choose four other Kellogg-supported centers which were located at universities and which had conducted comparable programs during the time period designated for the data collection. The five adult education centers were the Kellogg-supported residential programs located at the following institutions: (1) Michigan State University, (2) the University of Georgia, (3) the University of Nebraska, (4) the University of Oklahoma, and (5) the University of Chicago. The number of programs held at each of the institutions during the FY 1968 is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Programs held at each of the Five Universities*
(N=970)

University	No. of Programs
1. Michigan State	197
2. Georgia	241
3. Nebraska	159
4. Oklahoma	256
5. Chicago	117
TOTAL	970

*The five universities shown were the Kellogg-supported adult-education centers chosen for the samples of this study.

Choice of Program Areas to be Compared

The investigator was not interested in all the areas which were measured by the data collection instrument. Through discussions with faculty and administrators familiar with resident adult programs and the questionnaire, it was determined that the University of Oklahoma programs would be compared to the programs from the other universities through characteristics in three general areas. These three areas were as follows: (A) program content, (B) program planning, and (C) program conduct. Using the questionnaire, the questions which would measure each of the areas being examined were chosen. The resulting choices are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Areas of Program Comparison and the Questionnaire Items Chosen From Each*

1. Program Content	a. Item #17; Program Content b. Item #18; Level of Content
2. Program Planning	a. Item #19; Initiator of Activity b. Item #27; Program Coordinator
3. Program Conduct	a. Item #30; Pre-Conference Act. b. Item #32; Instructional Meth. c. Item #33; " Mat. d. Item #35; Post-Conf. Act. e. Item #36; Evaluation Att.

*See Appendix

The three areas chosen for comparing the five universities were selected for the following reasons: (1) they were the areas most descriptive of the programs being conducted within each of the universities, (2) the three areas chosen had the most complete data of any of the areas shown on the data collection questionnaire, and (3) the three areas chosen were the most easily defined with the least amount of ambiguity among the five universities.

The questionnaire items chosen as the most representative of each area were chosen for the following reasons: (1) the questionnaire items chosen appeared to be the most representative of the general area they were in by all five of the representatives from the resident adult education centers considered in the study, (2) the questionnaire items chosen were observed to have the most complete data of all the items representing the three general areas, and (3) the questionnaire items chosen provided the most useful information for reviewing and revision of the training programs being conducted by the various institutions included in the study.

Additional data were included as part of the study information. However, these data were only the descriptive statistics needed to compare the subjects from the five different university programs. These descriptive data were not used in testing the nine hypotheses stated in Chapter I, but only in comparing the characteristics of the samples.

Survey Procedures

The survey procedures used in the conduct of this study consisted of the actual data-collection tasks performed in recording the information on 970 programs. At the close of each training program, the program directors were asked to complete the questionnaire shown in Appendix A. These data were used, in turn, to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter I. A few of the returns were unusable. This was the result of the failure to complete the form properly. The instruments which were not usable could not be readministered because of a great time lag, turnover in personnel, and other obstacles in forwarding and collecting questionnaires. This accounts for the discrepancy noted in the total number of programs and the totals noted for a particular university on some of the contingency tables. For example, there were 197 programs held at Michigan State University but the total shown in table No. 17 entitled Contingency (Appendix D-2), the results for question number 18, is only 191. This discrepancy indicates that six (6) of the responses on the Michigan State programs were invalid on this question.

Data-Analysis Procedures

After the data were collected for the 970 programs they were coded and entered on IBM cards for further processing and analysis. The card format used for entering the data is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Card Format Used to Enter Survey-Questionnaire Data*

Information	Column(s)
1. Number of institution	1-2
2. Beginning date of activity	3-4
3. Year of activity	5-6
4. Number of participants	7-10
5. Nights in residence	11-12
6. Number in residence (%)	13
7. Days spent in planned sessions	14-16
8. Type of activity	17
9. Number of previous meetings	18-19
10. Nature of clientele	20
11. Conference fee	21
12. Major component of conference fee	22
13.	23
14.	24
15.	25
16.	26
17. Program content	27
18. Level of program content	28
19. Initiator of activity	29
20. Method of notifying participants	30-37
21. Who determined the objectives	38
22. Choice of instructors	39
23. Choice of instruction methods	40
24.	41
25.	42
26.	43
27. Program coordinator	44
28.	45
29.	46
30. Pre-conference activities	47
31.	48-51
32. Instructional methods	52-61
33. Instructional materials	62
34.	63
35. Post-Conference Activities	64
36. Evaluation attempted	65
37.	66
38.	67
39. Sex of participants	68-76
(Second Card)	
40. Age of Participants	1-15
41. Educational level of participants	16-36
42. Participants' occupation	37-72
43. Number of institution	73-74

*See Appendix

Computations Made in Testing Hypotheses One-Nine

The nine hypotheses stated in Chapter I indicate that a comparison is to be made between the various program areas as reported by the University of Oklahoma and the four other universities. This comparison was made in two ways: first, the data reported by the University of Oklahoma was compared to each of the other four universities' data. Second, a comparison was made between the University of Oklahoma data and an average of the other four universities' data.

The data collected from the programs which were used in testing the nine hypotheses were all recorded at the nominal level of measurement, e.g. frequency counts of the number of programs from each institution which fell within a certain category. As a result, the only appropriate statistical tests for the findings were the Chi Square (x^2) for independent groups and a Contingency Coefficient (a derivative of the Chi Square Test). Using these statistical procedures, the investigator made the comparisons necessary to test the hypotheses. All tests were made at the .05 level of significance, 2-tailed tests on all comparisons.

The data reported by the five universities were submitted to a central data processing unit for compilation and reporting. Certain results of the compilation are presented in the appendices of this document. Appendix C contains the computer printout of the demographical data reported by the five adult education centers. Appendix D contains the data used in testing the nine hypotheses. Appendix E contains

the data used in making the additional findings. All of the tables presented in these appendices are simply a reduction of the original computer printout as supplied by the central data processing office. It should be noted that the data were run on a standardized computer program designed to make the same computations on the data entered from all variables. For this reason, many of the computations are meaningless. For example, the variance, skewness, and kurtosis of the demographical data are uninterpretable. The only descriptive statistics relevant to these variables are the frequency counts listed under the "Mean" column of the printout.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Questionnaire responses relating to 970 adult-education programs conducted at Michigan State University, University of Georgia, University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma, and University of Chicago were analyzed to determine the similarities and differences among the programs from the five institutions in the areas of program content, program planning, and program conduct. These three areas being contrasted involved a total of nine questionnaire items for comparison. A Chi Square test of significance was the major testing statistic used in contrasting the responses of specialists who directed the resident adult education programs for Fiscal Year 1968 at the Kellogg-supported centers of five selected universities.

The results of testing the nine hypotheses and additional findings are presented and summarized in this chapter of the report. The conclusions drawn from these results are presented in the final chapter. Chapter V also contains implications for further research along with recommendations, which, if implemented, should contribute to the improvement of programs of the five universities participating in the study. The specific details for implementing the recommendations have been ommitted because of the unique nature of each of the educational centers.

Descriptive Statistics of the Five Samples

The descriptive statistics reported by the five university centers, are reported in Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The data reported include the sex, age, educational level attained, and the occupation of participants.

The highest male/female ratio was reported by the University of Oklahoma participants. This ratio was 79.9/20.1. The lowest male/female ratio, 64-36, was reported by the University of Georgia. However, a Chi Square test between the two ratios failed to show a significant difference ($x^2 = 1.46$, df = 1, $p > .05$).

The ages of the participants were also part of the demographical data collected. The highest average age, 40.9 years, was reported by the University of Oklahoma, and the lowest average, 33.7 years, was reported by Michigan State University. A comparison of the ages of the different groups of participants showed no significant differences among them ($t - 1.89$, df = 347, $p > .05$).

The educational level of the five groups of subjects showed that the Universities of Chicago, Georgia, and Oklahoma had the largest percentages of attendants among those who had completed college. The participants from Michigan State University and the University of Nebraska were enrolled in courses which were applied to graduate work toward an advanced degree. However, no tests of significance were made

TABLE 4

Characteristics of Participants from Michigan State University (N = 27,705)

Characteristic	Categories of Characteristic	No.	Percent of Total
Sex of Participants	1. Male	20,806	75.1
	2. Female	6,899	24.9
	3. Unknown	0	0.0
Age of Participants	1. Under 21	5,713	20.6
	2. 21-35	11,287	40.7
	3. 36-55	8,906	32.1
	4. Over 55	1,799	6.4
	5. Unknown	0	0.0
Educational Level	1. Elem. School	1,008	3.6
	2. Some High Sch.	5,100	18.4
	3. High Sch. Grad.	7,005	25.2
	4. Some College	4,303	15.5
	5. College Grad.	6,842	24.7
	6. Graduate Work	3,447	12.4
	7. Unknown	0	0.0
Occupational Category of Participants*	1. Prof., Tech	12,909	46.6
	2. Farmers	1,097	4.0
	3. Managers/Off.	6,386	23.0
	4. Clerical	768	2.8
	5. Sales workers	1,136	4.1
	6. Craftsmen	163	0.6
	7. Operatives	57	0.2
	8. Service	1,185	4.3
	9. Farm Laborers	0	0.0
	10. Laborers except Farm	0	0.0
	11. Others	4,004	4.0
	12. Unknown	0	C.0

*A definition of occupational categories is presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 5

Characteristics of Participants from the University of Georgia (N = 22,915)

Characteristic	Categories of Characteristic	No.	Percent of Total
Sex of Participants	1. Male	14,609	64.0
	2. Female	8,306	36.0
	3. Unknown	0	0.0
Age of Participants	1. Under 21	2,476	10.8
	2. 21-35	6,206	27.1
	3. 36-55	11,798	51.4
	4. Over 55	2,435	11.0
	5. Unknown	0	0.0
Education Level	1. Elem. School	1,834	8.0
	2. Some High Sch.	1,802	7.8
	3. High Sch. Grad.	1,742	7.6
	4. Some College	2,810	12.2
	5. College Grad.	8,431	36.7
	6. Graduate Work	6,302	27.5
	7. Unknown	0	0.0
Occupational Category of Participants*	1. Prof., Tech.	19,237	83.9
	2. Farmers	2	0.0
	3. Managers/Off.	2,677	11.7
	4. Clerical	122	0.5
	5. Sales workers	48	0.2
	6. Craftsmen	243	1.1
	7. Operatives	41	0.1
	8. Service	31	0.1
	9. Farm Laborers	0	0.0
	10. Laborers except Farm	0	0.0
	11. Others	515	2.2
	12. Unknown	0	0.0

*A definition of occupational categories is presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 6

Characteristics of Participants from the University of Nebraska (N = 13,146)

Characteristic	Categories of Characteristic	No.	Percent of Total
Sex of Participants	1. Male	9,584	72.9
	2. Female	3,562	27.0
	3. Unknown	0	0.0
Age of Participants	1. Under 21	426	3.2
	2. 21-35	6,589	50.1
	3. 36-55	5,304	40.4
	4. Over 55	827	6.3
	5. Unknown	0	0.0
Educational Level	1. Elem. School	214	1.6
	2. Some High Sch.	363	2.8
	3. High Sch. Grad.	1,880	14.3
	4. Some College	2,776	21.1
	5. College Grad.	3,856	29.3
	6. Graduate Work	4,056	30.8
	7. Unknown	0	0.0
Occupational Category of Participants*	1. Prof., Tech.	8,261	62.8
	2. Farmers	599	4.6
	3. Managers/Off.	1,325	10.0
	4. Clerical	232	1.8
	5. Sales workers	541	4.1
	6. Craftsmen	161	1.2
	7. Operatives	41	0.3
	8. Service	391	3.0
	9. Farm Laborers	8	0.0
	10. Laborers except Farm	57	0.0
	11. Others	1,530	11.6
	12. Unknown	0	0.0

*A definition of occupational categories is presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 7

Characteristics of Participants from the University of Oklahoma (N = 13,355)

Characteristic	Categories of Characteristic	No.	Percent of Total
Sex of Participants	1. Male	10,669	79.9
	2. Female	2,686	20.1
	3. Unknown	0	0.0
Age of Participants	1. Under 21	100	0.8
	2. 21-35	4,336	32.5
	3. 36-55	7,270	54.4
	4. Over 55	1,649	12.3
	5. Unknown	0	0.0
Educational Level	1. Elem. School	2	0.0
	2. Some High Sch.	101	0.0
	3. High Sch. Grad.	3,551	26.6
	4. Some College	2,201	16.5
	5. College Grad.	5,454	40.8
	6. Graduate Work	2,046	15.3
	7. Unknown	0	0.0
Occupational Category of Participants*	1. Prof., Tech.	7,663	57.4
	2. Farmers	18	0.0
	3. Managers/Off.	2,176	16.3
	4. Clerical	520	3.9
	5. Sales workers	294	2.2
	6. Craftsmen	548	4.1
	7. Operatives	5	0.0
	8. Service	1,825	13.7
	9. Farm Laborers	0	0.0
	10. Laborers except Farm	22	0.0
	11. Others	283	2.1
	12. Unknown	0	0.0

*A definition of occupational categories is presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 8

Characteristics of Participants from the University of Chicago (N = 7,919)

Characteristic	Categories of Characteristic	No.	Percent of Total
Sex of Participants	1. Male	6,145	77.6
	2. Female	1,774	22.4
	3. Unknown	0	0.0
Age of Participants	1. Under 21	407	5.1
	2. 21-35	3,355	42.4
	3. 36-55	2,734	34.5
	4. Over 55	1,424	18.0
	5. Unknown	0	0.0
Educational Level	1. Elem. School	0	0.0
	2. Some High Sch.	298	3.8
	3. High Sch. Grad.	719	9.0
	4. Some College	735	9.0
	5. College Grad.	2,223	28.0
	6. Graduate Work	3,944	49.8
	7. Unknown	0	0.0
Occupational Category of Participants*	1. Prof., Tech.	5,412	68.3
	2. Farmers	0	0.0
	3. Managers/Off.	1,204	15.2
	4. Clerical	334	4.2
	5. Sales workers	87	1.0
	6. Craftsmen	75	1.0
	7. Operatives	176	2.2
	8. Service	160	2.0
	9. Farm Laborers	0	0.0
	10. Laborers except Farm	43	1.0
	11. Others	428	5.4
	12. Unknown	0	0.0

*A definition of occupational categories is presented in Appendix B.

among the percentages reported by the five centers.

The occupational information of the participants was relatively homogenous for all five groups. Two categories, professional—technical and managers—company officials, were the predominant selections of the participants. The University of Georgia reported the highest percentage of professional—technical subjects (83.9), and Michigan State University reported the lowest percentage (46.6). At the same time, Michigan State University reported the highest percentage of managers—company officials (23.0) and the University of Nebraska reported the lowest percentage (10.0). No statistical tests were performed either inter-group or intra-group among the percentages reported by the five adult-education centers. Such tests would be almost uninterpretable from an inferential perspective and would serve no purpose toward the testing of the nine hypotheses stated earlier. The data are presented simply for the information of the reader, and for clarity of certain statements.

Summary of Descriptive Data

The descriptive data presented in Tables 4-8 show that the sex, age, educational level, and the occupation of the participants from the five different centers are fairly homogenous. There appears to be about three times as many males as females attending the centers, most are between the ages of 21 and 35, have some college hours, and hold either professional or semi-professional positions in their occupations.

Results of Testing Hypotheses

The nine hypotheses stated in Chapter I were tested and the results presented in the following sections of the dissertation. Only the data used in the computations necessary for testing the null hypothesis are presented in the tables accompanying each hypothesis. A more complete analysis of the data is presented in Appendices D and E.

Results of Testing Hypothesis One

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number one was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference within twelve selected content areas in programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

In order to test this hypothesis it was necessary to compare the frequencies reported by the University of Oklahoma program directors in each of the program content areas with the average responses reported by the other four centers for the same program content areas. The chi square computations performed on each of the content areas yielded the results presented in Table 9.

The results of testing hypothesis number one, shown in Table 9, indicate that the content of programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma center differed from the content of programs conducted at the other four centers in two areas. These two areas were Agriculture ($x^2 = 11.62$, df = 1, $p < .01$) and Humanities ($x^2 = 6.75$, df = 1, $p < .05$). The other program-content areas were not significantly different from the

TABLE 9

The University of Oklahoma's Program Content Contrasted With the Program Content of the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers*

Twelve Areas of Program Content	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Agriculture	21.9	11.63	1	0.4	11.62***
2. Behavioral Sci.	16.5	8.35	12	4.7	0.51
3. Biological Sci.	3.4	2.6	0	0.0	NA
4. Business	38.5	22.25	73	28.5	0.39
5. Education	32.3	17.60	17	6.6	2.64
6. Engineering	6.0	2.63	30	11.7	3.26
7. Health Prof.	16.0	9.90	7	2.7	2.24
8. Humanities	7.0	19.20	3	1.2	6.75**
9. Law	2.5	4.80	15	5.9	0.05
10. Physical Sci.	1.6	1.03	0	0.0	NA
11. Interdiscipl.	26.0	15.00	62	24.2	1.09
12. Other	10.5	5.33	36	14.1	2.08

*These four centers are located at Michigan State University, the University of Georgia, the University of Nebraska, and the University of Chicago.

**Significant; $p < .05$

***Significant; $p < .01$

University of Oklahoma's programs although one, Engineering, did approach significance ($x^2 = 2.65$; 3.84 needed for significance at the .05 level).

Results of Testing Hypothesis Two

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number two was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference in the level of program content at each of six different content levels of programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

In testing this hypothesis it was necessary to compare the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma program directors at each program-content level with the percentages reported by the centers for the same program-content levels. The chi square calculations made in testing the hypothesis are presented in Table 10.

The results presented in Table 10 indicate that there was only one level of program content, the Graduate level, which was significantly different from the program-content levels reported by the other four education centers (x^2 = 5.20, df = 1, $p < .05$). The University of Oklahoma reported a percentage of 5.9 at the Graduate level while the average of the other four centers was computed to be 12.75 percent. This indicates that the Graduate-level program content at the Kellogg-supported centers located at Michigan State, Georgia, Nebraska, and Chicago universities was reported more often than the graduate level programs reported by the University of Oklahoma's adult education center. None of the other levels of program content was statistically different.

TABLE 10

The University of Oklahoma's Program-Content Level as Contrasted With the Program-Content Level of the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers

Six Areas of Program Content	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Post Graduate	21.75	12.75	15	5.9	1.30
2. Graduate	55.00	28.83	64	25.2	5.20*
3. Undergraduate	23.50	13.25	22	8.7	0.47
4. Pre-College	4.50	2.43	1	0.4	0.83
5. Multi-Level	46.00	25.60	93	36.6	0.98
6. Unable to Class.	26.00	19.68	59	23.2	0.14

*Significant; $p < .05$

Results of Testing Hypothesis Three

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number three was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference within each of the eight initiative sources of programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

The chi square test was performed between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma program directors and the percentages reported by the other four centers on each of the initiator-of-activity groups. The resulting chi square calculations are presented in Table 11.

Two of the eight areas of program initiation were

TABLE 11

The Initiators of Program Activity at the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Initiators of Activity in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Adult Education Centers

Eight Areas of Program Initiation	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Org., group, or ind. outside the university	59.0	37.2	18	7.0	3.08
2. Continuing Educ. staff	4.3	2.5	173	67.7	38.54**
3. University Faculty	21.0	12.4	12	4.7	0.01
4. Faculty of another university	1.7	1.0	0	0.0	NA
5. Groups 3 and 2 combined	17.8	8.2	11	4.3	0.16
6. Groups 1 and 3 combined	18.5	11.8	3	1.2	5.18*
7. Groups 1 and 2 combined	18.0	9.5	30	11.7	0.11
8. Groups 1, 2, and 3 combined	50.7	23.5	9	3.5	3.11

*Significant; $p < .05$

**Significant; $p < .001$

found to be significantly different. These two areas were number two, the continuing education staff, ($x^2 = 38.54$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$) and number six, outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of the individual university reporting, ($x^2 = 5.18$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). The University of Oklahoma reported that 67.6 percent of its program activity was initiated by the continuing education staff and only 1.2 percent was initiated by outside sources working in conjunction with the University of Oklahoma faculty. These two percentage figures were compared to 2.5 percent and 11.8 percent, the averages of the percentages reported by the other centers in the same two areas of program initiation. These results indicate that the programs conducted by the University of Oklahoma center are basically the result of programs and conferences initiated by the continuing education staff, but the other centers indicated that other sources were responsible for the initiation of program activity. Sources outside the university were the major initiators of program activity for Chicago, Nebraska, and Michigan State, while Georgia indicated that most of its program activity was initiated by the corporate efforts of external sources, the continuing education staff, and the university faculty. All the centers except the University of Oklahoma initiated program activity more by combining the efforts of outside sources and the continuing education staff.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Four

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number four was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference between each of the eight approaches to coordination of programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Again, chi square tests were performed between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma program directors in each of the program-coordination sources and the percentages reported by the other four universities on the same program-coordination sources. The results of the calculations are presented in Table 12.

The calculations shown in Table 12 indicate that four significant differences occurred among the percentages reported by the various centers for the eight different program-coordination groups. These four differences were as follows: (1) between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma and the other centers for group one, organization, group, or individual outside the university (x^2 = 7.19, df = 1, $p < .05$), (2) between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma and the other centers for group two, the continuing education staff (x^2 = 40.29, df = 1, $p < .001$), (3) between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma and the other centers for group five, the continuing education staff working in conjunction with the university faculty (x^2 = 8.16, df = 1, $p < .05$), and (4) between the percentages reported by the University of

TABLE 12

The University of Oklahoma's Program Coordination as Contrasted to the Program Coordination in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers

Eight Sources of Program Coordination	Averages of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Org., group, or ind. outside the university	22.3	16.2	4	1.6	7.19*
2. Continuing Educ. staff	59.0	17.0	221	86.7	40.29***
3. University Faculty	4.3	2.9	10	3.9	0.08
4. Faculty of another University	2.0	1.3	0	0.0	NA
5. Groups 2 and 3 combined	35.5	17.8	4	1.6	8.16*
6. Groups 1 and 3 combined	4.8	2.9	0	0.0	NA
7. Groups 1 and 2 combined	29.5	18.5	9	3.5	11.26**
8. Groups 1, 2, and 3 combined	21.3	11.5	7	2.7	3.03

*Significant; $p < .05$

**Significant; $p < .01$

***Significant; $p < .001$

Oklahoma and the other four centers for group seven, an organization, group, or individual from outside the university working in conjunction with the continuing education

staff (x^2 = 11.26, df = 1, p $<$.01).

A survey of the data used in making the computations for hypothesis number four shows that three of the universities, Michigan State, Georgia, and Oklahoma, coordinate the majority of their programs with continuing education staff members. However, Nebraska's main source of program coordination was a combination of external sources working in conjunction with the continuing education staff, and Chicago reported that 41 percent of their programs were coordinated by organizations, individuals or groups outside the university. The pattern of coordination seems to be apparent in this case, nearly all programs conducted are coordinated by external sources, the continuing education staff, or a combination of the two.

The results of Table 12 suggest that the University of Oklahoma adult education center has the majority of its programs coordinated by its own staff (86.7%). However, this was not the case in the other four university centers. The differences in the program coordination efforts could be interpreted in two different ways: (1) it could be interpreted that the University of Oklahoma center is more self sustaining and less dependent on other sources for its leadership than the other adult education centers, (2) it could mean that the University of Oklahoma center receives less support from external sources than the other education centers.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Five

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number five was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference within each of five separate approaches to the utilization of pre-conference study materials in programs at the University of Oklahoma Center residence program and those held at the other selected institutions.

Chi square calculations were also made in testing hypothesis number five. Percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma program directors for each of the pre-conference activities areas were compared with the percentages reported by the other four university centers for the same pre-conference activity areas. The chi square results are presented in Table 13.

The chi square values reported in Table 13 show that the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma and the percentages reported by the other four institutions were not significantly different in any of the areas of pre-conference activity. A perusal of the data reported by the various universities indicates that little pre-conference activity was conducted by the learning centers. The highest percentage of no-pre-conference activities was reported by Oklahoma (93.3%), and the lowest percentages was reported by the Nebraska center (76.6%). This indicates that very little pre-conference activity was conducted prior to the participant's arrival for the program.

In this writer's experience* as a programmer in Residen-

TABLE 13

The University of Oklahoma's Pre-Conference Activities as Contrasted to the Pre-Conference Activities in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers

Five Types of Pre-Conference Act.	Averages of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. No pre-conference activities used	138.0	78.5	238	93.3	0.64
2. Suggested readings mailed to part.	11.8	6.2	5	2.0	1.16
3. Study materials (books, etc.)	17.8	10.6	8	3.1	2.22
4. Assignments prepared by participants	6.3	3.6	2	0.8	0.49
5. Pre-conference study groups formed	2.0	1.4	2	0.8	0.08

tial Adult Education there has been only one instance, within the programs he has been involved, that substantial study materials were sent to the participants in advance of the program. When the materials were forwarded to the participants it was helpful to advise them what would be expected of them as they became acquainted with the material. It can by hypothesized that this procedure would be especially true when a conference was to be a refresher type activity.

*Over ten years service as a program director at the University of Oklahoma contributing data throughout the entire five year period of collection, 1964-1968.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Six

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number six was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference between each of the ten different methods of instruction in programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

The data for testing hypothesis number six came from question number 32 of the questionnaire, methods of instruction. Program directors were asked to rank the ten teaching methods (1, 2, and 3) as to their use in the program which they conducted. Using the percentages reported by each university for each teaching technique, an "instructional index" was computed by multiplying the percentages in column one by three, the percentages in column two by two, and the percentages in column three by one, and summing the products. Each university had an instructional index for each of the ten teaching methods. These indexes were used to test the hypothesis stated earlier. A chi square was computed between the indexes reported by the University of Oklahoma program directors and the indexes reported by the other four universities. The results of the chi square calculations were presented in Table 14.

The calculations made on the different teaching techniques indicated that two significant differences exist between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma directors and the percentages reported by the directors from the other four universities, Michigan State, Georgia,

TABLE 14

Methods of Instruction Used in Oklahoma's Educational Programs as Contrasted to the Instructional Methods in the Other Four Kellogg-Supported Centers

Ten Types of Instructional Methods	Average Rating Index of Four Universities	Rating Index of the Univ. of Okla.	Chi Square
1. Lecture	234.8	268.4	1.13
2. Small Discussion Groups	128.9	96.1	2.36
3. Large Discussion Groups	78.2	81.8	0.09
4. Role Playing	10.8	9.5	0.04
5. Case Analysis	32.6	34.8	0.04
6. Lab. or Demonstration	29.4	19.6	0.99
7. Field Trip	1.6	12.8	5.13*
8. Panel, Symposium, or Debate	19.9	19.2	0.01
9. Interview or Individual Counseling	2.5	8.7	1.86
10. Individual Guided Study	3.5	43.4	20.77**

*Significant, $p < .05$

**Significant, $p < .001$

Nebraska, and Chicago. These two significant differences were noted for the instructional methods of Field Trips ($x^2 = 5.13$, df = 1, $p < .05$) and Individual Guided Study ($x^2 = 20.77$, df = 1, $p < .001$). In both cases the University of Oklahoma used these instructional methods significantly more than the other four universities.

The most interesting facet of Table 14 is the amount of use given each of the teaching techniques. Since the instructional indexes were computed on an interval-measurement basis, the figures reported for each of the instructional methods are proportionate. eg. The lecture method is used over twice as much as the small-discussion-group method. This figure was derived in the following way:

$$\frac{\text{Type-of-Instruction Ratio}}{} = \frac{\text{Lecture Index}}{\text{Small-Discussion-Group Index}}$$

Thus . . . .

$$2.79 = \frac{268.4}{96.1}$$

The percentages computed for each of the instructional techniques are presented in Table 15. These percentages show that the teaching methods arranged in their order of use would be as follows: (1) Lecture, (2) Small Discussion Groups, (3) Large Discussion Groups, (4) Case Analysis, (5) Laboratory or Demonstration, (6) Panel, Symposium or Debate, (7) Individual Guided Study, (8) Role Playing, (9) Field

Trip, and (10) Interview or Individual Counseling. These results indicate that the program directors are not taking full advantage of some of the better teaching techniques.

TABLE 15

Percent of Total Use of Instructional Methods Comparing the Data Reported by the University of Oklahoma and the Data Reported by Four Other Learning Centers

Ten Types of Instructional Methods	Index and % of Use by Four other Centers		Index and % of Use Reported by the Univ. of Okla. Center	
	Index	%	Index	%
1. Lecture	234.8	43.31	268.4	45.16
2. Small-Gp. Disc.	128.9	23.77	96.1	16.17
3. Large-Gp. Disc.	78.2	14.42	81.8	13.76
4. Role Playing	10.8	1.99	9.5	1.60
5. Case Analysis	32.6	6.01	34.8	5.86
6. Demonstration	29.4	5.42	19.6	3.30
7. Field Trips	1.6	0.30	12.8	2.15
8. Panel Disc.	19.9	3.67	19.2	3.23
9. Interviews	2.5	0.46	8.7	1.46
10. Ind. Study	3.5	0.65	43.4	7.30

A complete list of the data reported by the different centers is presented in Appendix D. Each of the teaching techniques is presented in an individual table and they appear in Appendices D-6a through D-6j. Data are presented in both frequency and percentage figures.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Seven

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number seven was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference in the utilization of eight different instructional materials in the programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

Hypothesis number seven was tested by comparing the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma for each of the eight instructional materials categories with the percentages reported by the other four centers for the same categories. The eight chi square values resulting from the calculations are presented in Table 16.

The results of testing hypothesis seven indicate that two types of instructional materials are utilized by the University of Oklahoma center significantly more than they are used by the other centers. These two materials are as follows: (1) Charts, posters or other graphic displays (x^2 = 7.55, df = 1, $p < .05$), and (2) Distributed copies of speeches or lectures (x^2 = 5.43, df = 1, $p < .05$).

By far the most popular form of instructional material is specially prepared papers or abstracts and the next most popular method is the use of no materials at all. The instructional method in their order of importance (use) would be as follows: (1) specially prepared papers or abstracts, (2) no materials used, (3) slides or films with commentary, (4) specialized books, (5) charts, posters, or other graphic

TABLE 16

Instructional Materials Used in Oklahoma's Educational Programs as Contrasted With the Instructional Materials Used in Other Kellogg-Supported Centers

Eight Types of Instructional Mater.	Averages of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. No Materials Used	38.8	22.6	30	11.9	1.69
2. Prepared Abstracts or Papers	82.5	47.4	121	48.0	0.01
3. Specialized Books	14.5	8.2	20	7.9	0.01
4. Slides or Films with Comments	16.0	10.0	5	2.0	3.00
5. Case Histories	6.3	3.8	1	0.4	1.79
6. Assigned Readings	5.3	3.1	6	2.4	0.04
7. Charts, Posters, or Graphic Displays	4.3	3.1	52	20.6	7.55*
8. Distributed Copies of Lecture	2.3	1.9	17	6.7	5.43*

*Significant; $p < .05$

displays, (6) case histories, (7) assigned readings, and (8) distributed copies of speeches or lectures. However, the first two types of materials accounted for over two-thirds of the materials used in the conduct of the programs at all five of the centers.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Eight

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number eight was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference within each of six approaches to post conference activities in programs at the University of Oklahoma Center residence programs and those held at the other selected institutions.

Chi square calculations were made between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma for each of the post-conference-activity categories and the percentages reported by the other four centers for the same post-conference-activity categories. The results of the calculations, presented in Table 17, show that there were no differences between the percentages reported for the six different areas. In fact, the percentages reported for each of the areas were almost identical.

The most prevalent type of post-conference activity is to do nothing at all. The centers reported an average of 85.3 percent on the first type of post-conference activity. The others and their percent of use were as follows: (1) list of readings (3.00%), (2) study materials (4.02%), (3) radio or TV follow-up (2.24%), (4) study groups (2.24%), and (5) definite assignment prepared (4.64%). These results indicate that over 80 percent of the time, the various centers have no form of follow-up or post-conference activities whatsoever.

TABLE 17

The University of Oklahoma's Post-Conference Activities as Contrasted to the Post-Conference Activities in Other Kellogg-Supported Centers.

Six Types of Post-Conference Activities	Averages of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. No Activities	148.0	83.7	235	91.8	0.19
2. List of Readings	8.0	3.7	1	0.4	1.56
3. Study Materials	6.5	4.1	10	3.9	0.01
4. Radio or TV supp.	2.0	1.6	2	0.8	0.16
5. Study Groups	3.5	2.3	5	2.0	0.01
6. Prepared Assignments	9.8	5.5	3	1.2	1.54

Post-conference activities should be viewed in much the same way as pre-conference activities--a necessary part of conducting a conference. It might be hypothesized that too often conferences are conducted, reported, re-planned, and re-conducted when an effective follow-up program would have served the same purpose. Since most of the adult education centers are equipped to do so, the radio and television media could be an effective means of presenting follow-up materials to conference participants. Participation certificates, etc. could be withheld until the persons enrolled in the conference had completed the necessary tasks, thereby insuring a maximum level of participation.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Nine

The null hypothesis tested in proposition number nine was as follows:

> There is no statistically significant difference between the seven methods of evaluation in programs held at the University of Oklahoma Center and those held at the other selected institutions.

In testing the ninth and final hypothesis, the researcher performed chi square statistical tests between the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma directors for each of the eight types of evaluation with the percentages reported by the other four institutions for the same eight evaluation procedures listed on the data collection instrument. This was by far the most important issue considered in this study since evaluation of the programs conducted is the primary motif of the researcher's argument. The results of the chi square calculations and additional findings on the evaluation procedures are presented in Tables 18 and 19.

The results of the chi square analysis of the different percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma directors and the directors from the other centers indicated that only one difference existed. The one significant difference was in the second area of evaluation, scheduled random interviews with participants ($x^2 = 5.69$, df = 1, $p < .05$). In this case the differences observed can be seen in the percentage reported for technique number two by the University of Oklahoma participants (27.7%) as opposed to the percentage

TABLE 18

Type of Evaluation Attempted by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Types of Evaluation Attempted by Other Kellogg-Supported Adult-Education Centers**

Six Types of Program Evaluations	Averages of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. No Evaluation	97.0	57.3	88	34.4	2.90
2. Interviews of Ss	19.0	8.2	71	27.7	5.69*
3. Depth Interviews	5.7	3.0	2	0.8	0.68
4. Reaction Sheets	43.5	24.0	72	28.1	0.16
5. Written Exam.	8.0	4.3	2	0.8	1.36
6. Interview Later	2.5	1.6	2	0.8	0.15
7. Coordinator Assessments	4.3	3.1	19	7.4	0.90

*Significant; $p < .05$

**The evaluations attempted by the various adult education centers during the specified time period were not considered as a part of the post-conference activities, presented in the results of hypothesis number eight. Although the evaluations did occur after the conferences had been conducted, some pretest instruments were administered to the program participants. Post-conference activities dealt almost exclusively with the continuation and prolongation of conference activities by various instructional methods.

reported by the other four centers (8.23%). The percentages reported by each of the centers are shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

Percentage of Time Spent Conducting the Eight Evaluation Techniques

University	None	Random Int.	Depth Int.	React. Sheet	Exam	Follow up Int.	Assess ment
Michigan State	32.5	7.2	4.6	47.9*	5.7	0.5	1.5
Georgia	52.3*	21.6	2.5	15.8	5.8	1.2	0.8
Nebraska	79.7*	3.2	0.0	14.6	1.3	1.3	0.0
Oklahoma	34.4*	27.7	0.8	28.1	0.8	0.8	7.4
Chicago	64.6*	0.9	1.8	17.7	4.4	3.5	7.1
Average Percentage/ Percent of Total Use	52.7	12.1	1.9	24.8	3.6	1.5	3.4
Rank Order of Methods Used	1	3	6	2	4	7	5

*Highest percentage reported by the particular center

The results reported in Table 19 indicate that the programs conducted at the five centers used in this study go un-evaluated for the most part (52.7% of the time). When an evaluation is conducted, the most popular method is through a reaction sheet completed by the program participants at the close of the program. Actually, only two methods of evaluation are used to any extent, random interviews and reaction sheets completed by the program participants. The other

four types of evaluations, depth interviews of selected participants, written examinations, follow-up interviews, and written assessment by coordinator, are used so infrequently they can be considered to be of negligible importance to the five centers used in this study.

Michigan State University reported that 32.5 percent of the programs conducted during the time period designated were not evaluated. Of the other 67.5 percent, evaluation techniques were as follows; posttest reaction sheet (47.9 %), random interviewing of participants (7.2 %), written posttest examination (5.7 %), in-depth interviewing of participants (4.6 %), coordinator assessment (1.5 %), and follow-up interviewing of participants (0.5 %).

The University of Georgia made no evaluation of 52.3 percent of their programs conducted during the time period designated by the researcher. Use of the six evaluation techniques was reported in the following percentages; random interviews with participants (21.6 %), posttest reaction sheet (15.8 %), written posttest examination (5.8 %), in-depth interviews with participants (2.5 %), follow-up interviews (1.2 %), and coordinator assessment (0.8 %).

The University of Nebraska reported the least evaluation of the programs conducted during the period designated. Over 79 percent (79.7 %) of the programs were not evaluated. Of the other 20.3 percent the use of the six evaluation techniques were reported to be as follows; posttest reaction

sheet (14.6 %), random interviews with participants (3.2 %), both written examinations and follow-up interviews were reported for (1.3 %), and the in-depth interviewing of participants and coordinator assessment were not used at all (0.0 %).

The University of Oklahoma conducted no evaluations of 34.4 percent of the programs conducted during the designated time period. The evaluation time for the remaining 65.6 percent of the programs was distributed in the following way; random interviews with participants (27.7 %), posttest reaction sheet completed by participants (28.1 %), coordinator assessment (7.4 %), and in-depth interviews of participants, written posttest examinations, and follow-up interviews were reported as (0.8 %) of the time.

The University of Chicago indicated that 64.6 percent of the programs conducted at their center during the time designated were not evaluated. Of the 35.4 percent which were evaluated, the time distribtuion was as follows; posttest reaction sheet (17.7 %), coordinator assessment (7.1 %), follow-up interviews with participants (3.5 %), posttest written examinations (4.4 %), in-depth interviews with participants (1.8 %), and random interviews with participants (0.9 %).

Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Nine hypotheses were tested using the data submitted by five Kellogg-supported learning centers located at Michigan State University and at the Universities of Georgia, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Chicago concerning programs conducted at the centers during the Fiscal Year 1968. The data reported were collected from a questionnaire completed by each director of these programs. Although the questionnaire contained much more information, the researcher analyzed only the data from certain areas; (1) program content (question number 17), (2) level of program content (question number 18), (3) the initiator(s) of program activity (question number 19), (4) program coordination (question number 27), (5) preconference activities (question number 30), (6) methods of instruction (question number 32), (7) instructional materials (question number 33), (8) post-conference activities (question number 35) and (9) evaluation of program attempted (question number 36).

The results of the data analysis of the nine hypotheses are presented in Tables 9 through 19. A cogent summary of the hypothesis testing results is presented in Table 20. For simplicity's sake, only the significant areas are shown for each of the hypotheses tested. The complete data printout is presented in the Appendices of this document.

TABLE 20

Summary of Significant Differences Observed in Testing Hypotheses One-Nine

Hypo. No.	Area of Comparison	Significantly Different Sub-Areas	Chi Square	Sig. Level
1.	Program Content	a. Agriculture	11.62	<.001
		b. Humanities	6.75	<.01
2.	Level of Program Content	a. Graduate	5.20	<.05
3.	Initiator of Program Activity	a. CE Staff	38.54	<.001
		b. CE Staff & Univ. Fac.	5.18	<.05
4.	Program Coordination	a. External Sources	7.19	<.01
		b. CE Staff	40.29	<.001
		c. CE Staff & Univ. Faculty	8.16	<.01
		d. External Sources & CE Staff	11.26	<.001
5.	Pre-Conf. Act.	a. (None)	NA	NA
6.	Instructional Methods	a. Field Trips	5.13	<.05
		b. Ind. Study	20.77	<.001
7.	Instructional Materials	a. Charts & Graphs	7.55	<.01
		b. Copies of Lecture	5.43	<.05
8.	Post-Conf. Act.	a. (None)	NA	NA
9.	Evaluation Methods	a. Random Int. of Participants	5.69	<.05

Additional Findings

The researcher felt that it was important to make additional computations and comparisons in order to explain and/or clarify the findings resulting from the testing of the nine hypotheses. The percentages and numbers reported by the University of Oklahoma for the questionnaire items which were related to the housing of participants, financing of the programs conducted, and the major beneficiary of the program were compared to the numbers and percentages reported by the other four centers. A chi square analysis was made of items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16. These 11 items furnished additional information relevant to the testing of the nine hypotheses. The results of the comparisons are presented in Tables 21-31.

The number of participants per program as reported by the University of Oklahoma Center was compared to the number of participants per program as reported by the other four centers in Table 21. The results indicate that there were no differences between the two groups of subjects. A perusal of the data shows that Michigan State has the largest overall numbers within each program conducted at the center. Michigan State reported that 3.7 percent (7) of their programs had more than 500 participants in them.

The data presented in Tables 22 and 23 are concerned with the housing of the participants during the conference activity. The results of Table 22 show that the University of Oklahoma had program participants in residence for five

TABLE 21

The Number of Program Participants Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to Four Other University Centers

Number of Program Participants	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. 1-25	39.75	23.90	105	41.2	2.35
2. 26-50	51.75	29.70	83	32.5	0.06
3. 51-75	24.75	13.60	22	8.6	0.56
4. 76-100	14.50	8.13	15	5.9	0.19
5. 101-150	16.50	9.90	14	5.5	0.50
6. 151-200	10.25	5.55	9	3.5	0.24
7. 201-300	7.00	3.95	3	1.2	0.79
8. 301-400	3.67	2.16	2	0.8	0.33
9. 401-500	4.00	2.25	1	0.4	0.69
10. Over 500	3.67	1.93	1	0.4	0.56

nights more frequently than the programs conducted at the other four centers ($x^2 = 5.50$, df = 1, $p < .05$). No significance was noted in the number of nights in residence as reported by the University of Oklahoma center and the other four centers at the other levels of none, one, two, three, or four nights in residence. It appears that the University of Nebraska has the fewest participants stay overnight at the center. This could be due to the lack of facilities necessary for keeping participants overnight.

TABLE 22

The Number of Nights in Residence of Program Participants Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Data Reported by the Other Four Centers

Number of Nights* Spent in Residence	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. None	24.5	14.8	27	10.5	0.37
2. One	55.5	27.8	30	11.7	3.43
3. Two	36.5	21.0	22	8.6	2.70
4. Three	19.5	11.2	16	6.2	0.73
5. Four	10.0	5.2	42	16.4	3.11
6. Five	24.8	13.5	93	36.3	5.50**

*Some programs required participants to spend as much as 20 nights in residence. However, the numbers reported in the categories beyond five were too insignificant to make meaningful comparisons.

**Significant beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

The results of Table 23 show that the University of Oklahoma center has significantly fewer participants in the 61-80 numbers than the other four centers reporting ($x^2 = 4.36$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). Michigan State has the highest percentage in this category (31.0%) and Oklahoma has the lowest (4.6%). The University of Oklahoma showed that between 81-100 percent of their program participants stay in the facilities provided by the adult education center. This could be due to the relative isolation of the University of Oklahoma from other housing facilities for the program participants.

TABLE 23

The Number of In-Residence Participants as Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Numbers Reported by Four Other Centers

Number of Participants In Residence (Per Program)	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. None	23.8	14.3	24	9.4	0.51
2. 1-20	14.0	7.9	35	13.7	0.78
3. 21-40	12.0	7.0	9	3.5	0.59
4. 41-60	14.8	8.3	14	5.5	0.29
5. 61-80	39.0	18.2	12	4.7	4.36*
6. 81-100	74.3	41.2	162	63.3	2.37

*Significant beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

Table 24 is also associated with the information presented in the three previous tables. Since the University of Oklahoma has shown a significant difference in the number of nights in residence, it was anticipated that there would also be a significant difference in the number of planned session days as reported by the University of Oklahoma center and the other four centers. As predicted, the University of Oklahoma reported a significantly higher percentage for the category of four planned session days ($x^2 = 4.64$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). Tables 21, 22, 23, and 24 shed some light on the results of hypotheses one and two. A reason for the longer sessions in some areas of program content and

TABLE 24

Number of Planned Session Days as Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted With the Number Reported by the Other Centers

Number of Session Days (Per Program)	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. One-Half	8.8	4.9	2	0.8	1.68
2. One	52.8	29.5	40	15.6	2.18
3. Two	47.8	26.9	30	11.7	3.12
4. Three	20.8	12.4	14	5.5	1.39
5. Four	12.0	7.2	65	25.4	5.51*
6. Five	23.8	12.5	77	30.1	3.78

*Significant beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

level could be that it takes longer to present an undergraduate course in Agriculture or Humanities than some of the other disciplines such as the health professions or Engineering.

Table 25 is related to the type of conference activity. It was anticipated that there would be a difference in the data reported by the University of Oklahoma and the data reported by the other four centers, because of the continuing aspects of some government programs such as VISTA located on the campus of the University of Oklahoma. A significant difference was noted for the fifth category of types of

TABLE 25

Type of Conference Activity as Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Type of Activity Reported by the Other Four Centers

Type of Program Activity	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Single Conf.	89.8	48.3	101	39.6	0.43
2. Annual Conf.	51.0	29.4	46	18.0	1.40
3. Series; Same Ss	14.3	7.5	16	6.3	0.05
4. Series; Dif. Ss	23.0	14.8	92	36.1	4.64*

*Significant beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

activity, a conference which had been part of a series held during the year for different participants. The University of Oklahoma reported a significantly higher percentage than the other four centers ($x^2 = 4.64$, df = 1, $p < .05$).

The data reported in Tables 25 and 26 reflect the continuing nature of the training programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma center. These two tables shed light on the results of hypotheses three, four and five. The majority of the programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma center are initiated and coordinated by the continuing education staff for a certain type of clientele for a certain period of time because of the long-term and perpetual contracts held with certain organizations. Table 26 snows that the

TABLE 26

Nature of Program Clientele as Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted With the Program Clientele Reported by the Other Four Centers

Nature of Program Clientele	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. University	5.8	3.2	5	2.0	0.14
2. Local	3.5	4.6	4	1.6	0.75
3. State	81.0	46.7	81	31.6	1.41
4. Regional	37.8	21.9	57	22.3	0.01
5. National	40.5	24.9	78	30.5	0.28
6. International	5.8	3.9	31	12.1	2.26

majority of the University of Oklahoma programs are oriented toward either state or national clientele.

Tables 27, 28, and 29 all deal with the financing of program activity. Table 27 shows that there were no differences in the fees reported by the University of Oklahoma center and the other four centers being used in the study. It appears that most of the other four centers conduct programs for less than $5.00 per participant. Most of the University of Oklahoma center's programs cost from $40.00 to $80.00 per participant. This too reflects the commercial nature of the training conducted at the University of Oklahoma center.

Table 28 compares the major fee components reported

TABLE 27

Total Conference Fee Reported by the University of Oklahoma as Contrasted to the Conference Fee Reported by the Other Four Centers

Amount of Conference Fee	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. None	14.0	8.8	44	17.3	1.43
2. 5.00 or Less	47.0	27.4	28	11.0	3.65
3. 5.01-10.00	22.5	12.4	16	6.3	1.04
4. 10.01-20.00	28.8	15.1	18	7.1	1.50
5. 20.01-40.00	16.0	9.1	37	14.6	0.65
6. 40.01-80.00	21.0	12.7	58	22.8	1.47
7. 80.01-100.00	7.3	4.1	8	3.1	0.06
8. 100.01-150.00	7.0	3.9	22	8.7	0.97

by the various centers. The major component in all centers is the tuition paid by participants. The University of Oklahoma center reported 73.4 percent of the major fee component was tuition, and the average percentage of the other four centers for this component was 55.3 percent. But, the difference between the percentages was not significant ($x^2 = 1.29$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$). One interesting fact is that none of the centers reported any travel cost as part of the fee component. The travel could have been paid by the individual participant.

TABLE 28

Comparison of the Major Fee Components Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Four Other University Centers

Major Fee Component	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Housing	12.0	8.1	6	2.8	1.50
2. Meals	30.8	18.1	32	15.0	0.14
3. Tuition	103.0	55.3	157	73.4	1.29
4. Travel	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.00
5. Ed. Materials	4.8	3.0	1	0.5	1.04
6. Other	20.0	14.9	18	8.4	0.92

Table 29 is also related to the financing source(s) of the programs conducted at the various centers. The results show that the individual participants pay their conference fees less often (13.3%) than individual participants pay from the other four resident centers (38.3%) ($x^2 = 6.43$, df = 1, $p < .01$). These findings support earlier results and statements about program participants being sponsored by employers who paid their conference fees (48.6%) for the University of Oklahoma center as compared to 26.1 percent for the average of the other four centers. Another area which showed a large descrepancy in the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma center and percentages reported

TABLE 29

A Comparison of the Major Sources of Activity Financing as Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted to the Sources Reported by Four Other Learning Centers

Sources of Activity Funding	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Participants	70.5	38.3	34	13.3	6.43*
2. Employers	46.5	26.1	124	48.6	3.47
3. Sponsors	17.8	10.8	28	11.0	0.01
4. S & Employer	17.8	10.5	9	3.5	1.87
5. Private Grant	5.8	3.4	5	2.0	0.17
6. Gov. Grant	14.0	7.6	50	19.6	2.76
7. University	4.0	2.3	3	1.2	1.77
8. Univ. & Agent	2.0	1.5	2	0.8	0.18

*Significant beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

by the other four centers at the other four universities used in this study was in the number of programs which were paid for through government grants. The University of Oklahoma center reported 19.6 percent as opposed to 7.6 percent for the other four centers. This difference was not significant ($x^2 = 2.76$, df = 1, $p > .05$).

The findings in Table 30 support the results of hypotheses three and four. The majority of the programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma center were initiated by the

TABLE 30

A Comparison of the Group(s) the Programs Were Sponsored for as Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted to the Group(s) Reported by Four Other Kellogg-Supported Centers

Groups the Programs Were Sponsored For	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. Public	18.3	9.4	87	34.3	7.72*
2. University	10.0	5.8	6	2.4	0.72
3. Sponsors	99.8	55.5	66	26.0	1.25
4. Special Group	49.3	29.4	95	37.4	0.49

*Significant beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

University of Oklahoma's continuing education staff, coordinated by the University of Oklahoma's continuing education staff, and are conducted for the employees of large organizations through long-term contracts. The findings in Table 30 show that the University of Oklahoma center had significantly more programs for the general public than were conducted at the other four centers ($x^2 = 7.72$, df = 1, $p < .01$). In this case the data reported for the VISTA programs were probably classified as general public data. None of the other areas was significantly different on the percentages reported by the University of Oklahoma center and the centers located at the other four universities.

TABLE 31

A Comparison of the Types of External Sponsorship Reported by the University of Oklahoma and Contrasted to Four Other Centers

Type of External Sponsorship	Average of Four Other Centers		University of Okla.		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	
1. None	17.8	14.3	149	58.4	14.70**
2. Profit Organ.	30.5	18.7	10	3.9	5.41*
3. Trust Co.	12.8	7.1	1	0.4	3.76
4. Non-Profit Org.	50.8	28.5	28	11.0	4.11*
5. Non-Profit Trst	6.3	4.3	9	3.5	0.04
6. Gov. Agency	34.5	18.6	56	22.0	0.15
7. Combination	14.5	8.4	2	0.8	3.78

*Significant Beyond the .05 level; ($p < .05$)

**Significant beyond the .001 level; ($p < .001$)

Table 31 shows that the University of Oklahoma reported percentages for the seven different types of external sponsorship that were significantly different than the percentages reported by the other universities in three areas: (1) No external sponsorship— University of Oklahoma = 58.4%, other centers = 14.3%; $x^2 = 14.70$, df = 1, $p < .001$. (2) Profit-making organization— University of Oklahoma = 3.9%, other centers = 18.7%; $x^2 = 5.41$, df = 1, $p < .05$. (3) Non-profit organizations— University of Oklahoma = 11.0%, other

centers = 28.5%; $x^2 = 4.11$, df = 1, $p < .05$. Two other areas were approaching significance, an association of profit making organization, and a combination of some of the other six types of sponsorship (An association of profit making organizations, $x^2 = 3.76$, df = 1, $p > .05 < .10$; A combination of the other types of sponsorship, $x^2 = 3.78$, df = 1, $p > .05 < .10$). The University of Oklahoma had significantly fewer programs sponsored by profit-making organization and non-profit organizations and significantly more programs sponsored by none of the external sources listed in the questionnaire than was reported by the other four university centers.

Summary of Additional Findings

Eleven additional comparisons were made on the data collected from program participants. These 11 contrasts were made in an attempt to clarify the results of the hypothesis testing. A summary of additional findings is presented in Table 32

TABLE 32

Summary of Significant Additional Findings

Item No.	Essence of Item	Significant Sub-Areas	Chi Square	Sig. Level
5	No. of nights in res.	(five)	5.50	$<.05$
6	" " people " "	(61-80%)	4.36	$<.05$
7	" " session days	(four)	5.51	$<.05$
8	Type of activity	(Series)	4.64	$<.05$
13	Major money source	(individual)	6.43	$<.01$
15	Recipients of prog.	(public)	7.72	$<.01$
16	Type of external sponsorship	(None)	14.70	$<.001$
		(profit org.)	5.41	$<.05$
		(Non-profit organization)	4.11	$<.05$

The findings of Table 32 are synthesized with the findings of testing the nine hypotheses in the final section of this chapter. The specific additional findings are related to hypotheses one, two, three, and four.

Synthesis of Hypothesis Testing and Additional Findings

The results of testing the first two hypotheses showed that the adult education center at the University of Oklahoma conducted fewer Agriculture and Humanities programs and had fewer programs with graduate level content than those conducted at the other centers. Additional findings concerning the number of nights the participants spend in residence, the number of participants per program, the percentage of program participants who stayed in residence, and the number of planned program days supported the findings of hypotheses one and two. These additional findings showed that the University of Oklahoma center had more programs which required four planned-session days, five nights in residence, and the lack of external housing facilities requires that program participants be billeted in continuing education housing.

Additional findings concerning the type of conference activity, clientele, conference fee, major fee component, major financing source, recipient of program benefits, and the type of external sponsorship support the findings of hypotheses three and four. Basically, the programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma are initiated by the continuing education staff and coordinated by them. A reason for this type of program origin and coordination becomes evident when the type of clientele served is considered. The University of Oklahoma center is based more on long-term continuous programs conducted for different groups of a large organiza-

tion's employees.

The rest of the hypotheses tested, five through nine, were related to the additional findings in only an indirect way. The results of these five hypotheses indicated that the programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma's adult education center differ from the programs conducted at the adult education centers located at Michigan State, Nebraska, Georgia and Chicago Universities in the following ways: (1) two instructional materials, the use of graphs and charts and the dissemination of copies of the lectures to be presented during the conference; (2) two instructional methods, field trips and individual guided study; and (3) one evaluation technique, the interviewing of randomly drawn program participants. The conclusions drawn from these findings, suggestions for program improvement, and implications for further research are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATION, IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether any differences existed between the adult education programs conducted at Michigan State, Nebraska, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Chicago in the areas of program content, program initiation, program coordination, pre- or post-conference activities, methods or materials of instruction, or the type of evaluation attempted by the program coordinators. The questionnaire responses of the specialists who directed 970 programs involving 85,040 participants at the five centers during the time period of Fiscal Year 1968 were analyzed to determine the similarities and differences reported by the University of Oklahoma center as compared to the data reported by the other four centers. A Chi Square Test of significance was used to test nine hypotheses about various sub-areas of the programs being contrasted, and to make comparisons in some additional areas relevant to the hypotheses tested.

The sex, age, educational level, and the occupation of the participants from the five different centers were fairly homogeneous. There appeared to be about three times as many males as females attending the centers, most were between the ages of 21 and 35, have some college hours, and hold either professional or semi-professional positions in their occupations.

The following is a summary of the tests of the nine

hypotheses of the study. The results of testing hypothesis number one indicated that the content of programs conducted at the University of Oklahoma center differed from the content of programs conducted at the other four centers in two areas. These two areas were Agriculture and Humanities. The other program-content areas were not significantly different from the University of Oklahoma's programs although one, Engineering, did approach significance.

Hypothesis number two showed a significant difference regarding the content level. The Graduate-level program content at the Kellogg-supported centers located at Michigan State, Georgia, Nebraska, and Chicago universities was reported more often than the graduate level programs reported by the University of Oklahoma's adult education center. None of the other levels of program content showed any significant difference.

Hypothesis three, program initiation, provided two out of eight categories showing significant differences. These two areas were number two, the continuing education staff, and number six, outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of the individual university reporting. Sources outside the university were the major initiators of program activity for Chicago, Nebraska, and Michigan State, while Georgia indicated that most of its program activity was initiated by the corporate efforts of external sources, the continuing education staff, and the university faculty. All the centers except the University of Oklahoma initiated

program activity by combining the efforts of outside sources and the continuing education staff.

Hypothesis four, program coordination, indicated significant differences. Three of the universities, Michigan State, Georgia, and Oklahoma, coordinated the majority of their programs with continuing education staff members. However, Nebraska's main source of program coordination was a combination of external sources working in conjunction with the continuing education staff, and Chicago reported that 41 percent of their programs were coordinated by organizations, individuals or groups outside the university.

Hypothesis five, pre-conference study materials, indicated there was no significant difference among the programs at the five centers. The examination of data also indicated that very little pre-conference activity was conducted prior to the participants' arrival for the program.

Hypothesis six, instructional methods, calculations indicated that two significant differences were noted for the instructional methods of Field Trips and Individual Guided Study. In both cases the University of Oklahoma used these instructional methods significantly more than the other four universities. Further study shows that the lecture method was used over twice as much as the small discussion groups.

Hypothesis seven, types of instructional material, indicates that two types of instructional materials were utilized by the University of Oklahoma center significantly more than

they were used by the other centers. These two materials were as follows: (1) Charts, poster, or other graphic displays, and (2) Distributed copies of speeches or lectures.

Hypothesis eight, post-conference activities, indicated no significant differences and furthermore showed that percentages reported for each of the areas were almost identical. Eighty percent of the time the various centers had no follow up or post-conference activities.

Hypothesis nine, evaluation, produced one significant difference. This was the category scheduled random interviews with participants. The University of Oklahoma showed significantly more involvement with this evaluative method.

The demographic data and the additional findings support the above comparisons made between the program data reported by the University of Oklahoma's adult education center and the program data reported by the adult education centers located at Michigan State, Georgia, Nebraska, and Chicago Universities.

Recommendations

The empirical data presented in this study support the following recommendations:

At least some type of evaluation should be conducted at the termination of each program presented at each of the adult education centers. An evaluation by the program director, participants, or both.

There are at least three reasons for conducting at least a cursory evaluation of any and all programs presented in the five adult education centers used in this study. (1) Programs should be evaluated because it is the best means of improving the overall characteristics of the program being presented. Egan Guba (1967) had summarized the advantages of program evaluation in the following statement:

> At the present time there is no known way of improving the content of programs so much, the quality of presentation so much, the efficient use of materials so much, or the probability of supporting overall program results as effectively as through the discriminant use of objective evaluation techniques. (p. 13)[1]

(2) Programs should be evaluated because it will provide the empirical information needed in making decisions to continue, discontinue, expand, or diversify the program being evaluated. It is doubtful that any well established and productive training programs were established as a result of the initiator's first effort. Meaningful programs evolve through the processes of continual change and improvement brought

---

[1]Egan Guba, Evaluating Federally-Funded Education Program. Key Note Address of an Evaluation Seminar held at Ohio State University, Summer 1967. Published by Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

about by constant evaluation. (3) Programs should be evaluated and the results used to support arguments for funding or refunding of comparable projects. With the increasing emphasis on accountability, more and more research financing very well could be based on the empirical data available for the support of the proposer's requests. These three reasons should be sufficient rationale for the evaluation of programs conducted in the future. (4) Instructional methods, which have been proven more effective than straight lecture, should be encouraged. An important way to augment this would be more utilization of instructional materials.

Implications for Further Research

Apart from frustrations produced by some of the design features of the questionnaires, other implications might encourage future research effort.

1. Other aspects of the programs conducted in the adult education centers should be considered than those considered in this study. The area of program financing and billeting the program participants could be evaluated further.

2. Other studies should be made using other data collected from the five adult education centers located at the five different universities.

Conclusion

It is anticipated that the present evaluation attempt will stimulate others to seek ways of quantifying and comparing the data reported by the five different adult-education

centers contrasted in this study. By making such comparisons and evaluating the results according to a common scale such as statistical techniques the continuing education field can be improved and expanded.

Residence programs offered only one time as well as continuing residence programs would probably be enriched by the inclusion of independent study efforts prior to a program in residence. A post-residence program use of independent study methods would seem to be particularly encouraging to the development and progress of repeating or continuing residence programs.

APPENDIX A

COMPLETE INSTRUMENT USED TO COLLECT DATA FROM PARTICIPANTS

PROGRAM RESEARCH PROJECT

QUESTIONNAIRE

General Purpose

The general purpose of this questionnaire is to provide data which will:

1. Contribute to a better understanding of continuing education as it is practiced in residential centers.

2. Provide individual centers with comparative knowledge of continuing education as it is practiced by several residential centers.

Specific Purpose

The specific purpose of this questionnaire is to provide data which can be used to study:

1. The utilization of residential centers

2. The cost of residential programs

3. The function of key center personnel

4. The method by which programs are planned and conducted

5. The clientele of residential centers

Guide for Completing the Questionnaire

1. A separate questionnaire should be completed for each center activity to which a member of the conference department or program office contributed in any of the following ways:

   (a) guiding the whole activity from planning through follow-up
   (b) consulting on the design or methodology of the activity
   (c) advising on the subject matter of the activity
   (d) evaluating the activity
   (e) counselling individual participants during the conference

2. Business functions such as meals or meetings in which the educational content of the activity was not influenced by a member of the conference or program office should not be reported.

3. The following categories are provided for assistance in answering question seventeen, program content:

1.	Agriculture:	animal or dairy husbandry, forestry, horticulture, plant pathology, soils, etc.
2.	Behavioral Sciences:	anthropology, economics, history, international relations, political science, psychology, social welfare, sociology, etc.
3.	Biological Sciences:	anatomy, bacteriology, biology, biophysics, entomology, zoology, etc.
4.	Business:	accounting, business administration, real estate, security investments, etc.
5.	Education:	counselling and guidance, elementary education, school administration, speech correction, etc.
6.	Engineering:	aeronautical engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, architecture, etc.
7.	Health Professions:	dental hygiene, medicine, occupational therapy, public health, etc.
8.	Humanities:	english, fine arts, foreign languages, literature, philosophy, religion, etc.
9.	Interdisciplinary:	two or more basic groupings; an example of an interdisciplinary program might be a conference on air pollution which addressed the problem in terms of its legal, scientific, behavioral and health aspects.
10.	Law:	constitutional law, estate and gift taxation, legal history and jurisprudence, etc.
11.	Physical Sciences:	astronomy, chemistry, mathematics, meteorology, physics, etc.
12.	Other:	any miscellaneous conference that does not fit into above categories.

4. The following universities, together with their code numbers to be recorded in question one, are presently cooperating in this research project:

Michigan State University	01
University of Georgia	02
University of Nebraska	03
University of Oklahoma	04
University of Chicago	05
University of Illinois	06
Syracuse University	07
Washington University	08
Wayne State University	09
University of Minnesota	10
University of Maryland	11

PROGRAM RESEARCH PROJECT

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Institution reporting:

Place 2 digit code number of institution, as listed in the Guide, one above the other in brackets. Example: Michigan State University would be 01 and would be recorded (0); University of Maryland would be 11 and would be recorded (1) (1)
(1)

( ) 1
( ) 2

Card One Columns

2. Beginning date of activity:

Place the number of the month, 01-12, one above the other in the brackets. Example: If the activity began in March, it would be recorded (0); if it began in November, it would be recorded (1)
(3) (1)

( ) 3
( ) 4

3. Year of activity:

To indicate the year, place the last 2 digits one above the other in the brackets. Example: 1967 would be recorded (6)
(7)

( ) 5
( ) 6

4. Number of participants in attendance:

Indicate the number of participants registered by placing the correct figure in the brackets. Include all full and part time enrollees as well as instructors and guests. Example: 25 participants would be recorded (0); 86 participants, (0); 139 participants, (0)

(0)	(0)	(0)
(1)	(2)	(8)
(3)	(5)	(6)
(9)		

and 1142 participants, (1)
(1)
(4)
(2)

( ) 7
( ) 8
( ) 9
( ) 10

5. Nights in residence:

Indicate the number of nights spent in residence at the center by this group by placing the correct figure in the brackets. Example: 3 nights in residence would be recorded (0); 18 would be recorded (1); none would be recorded (0) (3) (8)
(0)

( ) 11
( ) 12

6. Number in residence: (Circle one)

Indicate the average percentage of participants in residence when all the nights shown in question five are considered.

None	1	13
1 - 20%	2	
21 - 40%	3	
41 - 60%	4	
61 - 80%	5	
81 - 100%	6	

7. Days spent in planned sessions:

(One half day equals either a full morning, or a full afternoon, or a full evening session. One day is any combination of these). Record the number of days spent in planned sessions by placing the correct figures in the brackets. Example: 1/2 day or less would be recorded (0); 3 1/2 days, (0); 9 days, (0); 18 1/2 days, (1)
(0) (3) (9) (8)
(5) (5) (0) (5)

( ) 14
( ) 15
( ) 16

8. Type of activity: (Circle one)

A single conference not related to any other conference . . .	1	17
One of a series of conferences held biannually or annually	2	
A conference which is part of a series held during the year for the same participants	3	
A conference which is part of a series held during the year for different participants	4	

9. Number of times this organization has met previously at the center:

(This organization need not be interpreted as the same people each time). Place the correct answer in the brackets provided. Example: 3 would be recorded (0); 11 would be recorded (1). If
(3) (1)
the organization has never met before at the center, record, (0)
(0)

( ) 18
( ) 19

10. Nature of the clientele: (Circle one)

A university clientele (faculty, staff, students)	1	20
A local clientele	2	
A state clientele	3	
A regional clientele	4	
A national clientele	5	
An international clientele	6	

FINANCING

11. Conference fee: (Circle one)

Indicate the conference fee paid by individual participants or paid for them for full time attendance.

None	1	21
$ 5.00 or less	2	
5.01 - $ 10.00	3	
10.01 - 20.00	4	
20.01 - 40.00	5	
40.01 - 80.00	6	
80.01 - 100.00	7	
100.01 - 150.00	8	
150.01 - 200.00	9	
200.01 - 250.00	10	
250.01 - 300.00	11	
Over $300.00	12	

12. Major component of the conference fee: (Circle one)

Housing	1	22
Meals	2	
Tuition	3	
Travel	4	
Educational materials	5	
Other	6	

13. Major source of activity financing: (Circle one)

Costs paid by individual participants	1	23
Costs paid for individual participants by employer	2	
Costs paid for individual participants by sponsor of activity	3	
Costs shared by individual participant and employer or sponsor of activity	4	
Costs paid by private grant	5	
Costs paid by government grant	6	
Costs subsidized by the university	7	
Costs paid by university and some other agent	8	

SPONSORSHIP

14. Sponsored by: (Circle one)

Members of the university community	1	24
Members of an external group	2	
Members of the university and an external group working jointly	3	

15. Sponsored for: (Circle one)

The general public	1	25
University faculty and/or students	2	
Members of the sponsoring organization	3	
Special group or audience other than members of sponsoring organization	4	

16. Type of external sponsorship: (Circle one)

None	1	26
A profit making organization	2	
An association of profit making organizations	3	
A non-profit organization	4	
An association of non-profit organizations	5	
A government agency (local, state, federal)	6	
Some combination of the above	7	

PROGRAM

A. Characteristics

17. Program Content: (Circle one)

If necessary, see Guide for an explanation of the categories.

Agriculture	1	27
Behavioral Sciences	2	
Biological Sciences	3	
Business	4	
Education	5	
Engineering	6	
Health Professions	7	
Humanities	8	
Law	9	
Physical Sciences	10	
Interdisciplinary	11	
Other	12	

18. Level of program content: (Circle one)

Post graduate	1	28
Graduate	2	
Undergraduate	3	
Pre-college	4	
Multi-level content	5	
Unable to classify	6	

B. Planning

19. The initiative for this activity came from: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university	1	29
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	8	

20. Methods used to promote attendance at this activity:

Rank the following methods in order of their promotional importance for this activity. Place a 1 in the bracket of the most important, a 2 in the bracket of the second most important, and a 3 in the bracket of the third most important. Place a 0 in the brackets of all methods not ranked.

Personal invitation by mail	( )	30
Direct mail: brochures, letters, etc.	( )	31
Magazines and trade publications	( )	32
Newspaper advertising	( )	33
Personal visitation	( )	34
Radio and TV promotion	( )	35
Posters and take one material	( )	36
Organization encourages members to attend	( )	37

21. The purposes and objectives of the activity were set by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university .	1	38
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff .	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . .	8	

22. The faculty or speakers or others acting in a teaching-leadership capacity were selected by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university .	1	39
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff .	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . .	8	

23. The methods of instruction for the activity were chosen by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university .	1	40
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff .	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . .	8	

24. The educational materials for the activity were selected by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university .	1	41
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff .	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . .	8	

25. The general program design was constructed by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university .	1	42
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff .	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . .	8	

26. The sequence of activities during the program was planned by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university .	1	43
Continuing education staff	2	
Faculty of this university	3	
Faculty of some other university	4	
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff .	5	
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university	6	
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff	7	
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . .	8	

27. The program was coordinated by: (Circle one)

(Coordination means broad responsibility for the management of the program)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university . 1 44
Continuing education staff 2
Faculty of this university 3
Faculty of some other university 4
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff . 5
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university 6
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff 7
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . . 8

28. Facilitation of the program activities was performed by: (Circle one)

(Facilitation means on the spot duty to see that the program goes as planned)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university . 1 45
Continuing education staff 2
Faculty of this university 3
Faculty of some other university 4
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff . 5
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university 6
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff 7
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . . 8

29. Budget decisions for this activity were made by: (Circle one)

Organization, group, or individual outside the university . 1 46
Continuing education staff 2
Faculty of this university 3
Faculty of some other university 4
Faculty of this university and continuing education staff . 5
Outside organization, group, or individual and faculty of this university 6
Outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff 7
All three - faculty of this university, outside organization, group, or individual and continuing education staff . . 8

C. Conduct

30. Pre-conference activities: (Circle the number of the one pre-conference activity used most frequently)

No pre-conference activities used 1 47
List of suggested readings mailed to participants 2
Study materials mailed (books, case studies, etc.) 3
Definite assignment prepared by participants 4
Pre-conference study groups formed 5

31. Instructional personnel:

From the key on the left, indicate the percentage of this program's total instructional time performed by each group listed at the right by placing the appropriate number in each of the brackets beside the group. (All brackets should thus have some number in them).

none	1	Faculty of this university	( )	48
1 - 20% . .	2	Faculty of other university	( )	49
21 - 40% . .	3	Members of the center staff	( )	50
41 - 60% . .	4	Individuals, not members of the above groups	( )	51
61 - 80% . .	5			
81 - 100% . .	6			

32. Methods of instruction:

Rank the following methods in order of their frequency of use during this activity. Place a 1 in the bracket of the most frequent, a 2 in the bracket of the second most frequent and a 3 in the bracket of the third most frequent. Place a 0 in the bracket of all methods not ranked.

Lecture	( )	52
Small discussion group	( )	53
Large discussion group	( )	54
Role playing	( )	55
Case analysis	( )	56
Laboratory or demonstration	( )	57
Field trip	( )	58
Panel, symposium or debate	( )	59
Interview or individual counselling	( )	60
Individual guided study	( )	61

33. Materials of instruction: (Circle the number of the one method used most frequently)

No materials used	1	62
Specially prepared papers or abstracts	2	
Specialized books	3	
Slides or films with commentary	4	
Case histories	5	
Assigned readings	6	
Charts, posters or other graphic displays	7	
Distributed copies of speeches or lectures	8	

34. The major contribution of the conference coordinator or consultant was: (Circle one)

Initiating the original idea for the activity	1	63
Facilitating the details of a program planned by others . .	2	
Consulting on the design or methodology of the activity . .	3	
Performing instructional duties	4	
Evaluating the activity	5	
Advising or counselling individual participants	6	
Administering the activity from planning to follow-up . . .	7	

35. Post conference activities: (Circle the number of the one post conference activity used most frequently)

No post conference activities used	1	64
Prepared list of readings completed	2	
Study materials mailed to participants	3	
Radio or TV follow-up	4	
Post conference study group formed	5	
Definite assignment prepared	6	

36. Evaluation attempted: (Circle the number of the one evaluation method used most frequently)

No evaluation attempted	1	65
Scheduled random interviews of participants	2	
Depth interviews of selected participants	3	
Post meeting reaction sheet completed by participants . . .	4	
Examination written by participants	5	
Follow-up interviews of participants planned	6	
Written assessment of conference made by coordinator . . .	7	

37. In the opinion of the coordinator-consultant, this activity was: (Circle one)

Excellent - all objectives met	1	66
Good - major objectives met	2	
Satisfactory - some objectives met.	3	
Unsatisfactory - few objectives met	4	
Poor - no objectives met	5	

38. In the opinion of the coordinator-consultant, the level of participant satisfaction was: (Circle one)

Very high	1	67
High	2	
Moderate	3	
Low	4	
Very low	5	

PARTICIPANT DATA

For questions 39-42, please give as much data on participants as is possible through your present system of registration. Include all full and part time participants as well as instructors and guests.

39. Sex of participants:

For each category on the right, place the number of actual participants in that category in the appropriate brackets. Where none of the participants fell in a category, place a 0 in each of the three brackets. All brackets should thus have some number in them.

Example: If an activity had 145 participants of whom 120 were male, 25 were female and none were unknown, it would be recorded:

male	(1)	(2)	(0)
female	(0)	(2)	(5)
unknown	(0)	(0)	(0)

Male	( ) ( ) ( )	68-70
Female	( ) ( ) ( )	71-73
Unknown	( ) ( ) ( )	74-76

40. Age of participants:

For each category on the right, place the number of actual participants in that category in the appropriate brackets. Where none of the participants fell in a category, place a 0 in each of the three brackets. All brackets should thus have some number in them.

Example: If an activity had 180 participants of whom none were under 21, 54 were 21-35, 70 were 36-55, 30 were over 55 and 26 were of unknown age, it would be recorded:

under 21	(0)	(0)	(0)
21-35	(0)	(5)	(4)
36-55	(0)	(7)	(0)
over 55	(0)	(3)	(0)
unknown	(0)	(2)	(6)

Card Two Columns

Under 21	( ) ( ) ( )	1- 3
21-35	( ) ( ) ( )	4- 6
36-55	( ) ( ) ( )	7- 9
Over 55	( ) ( ) ( )	10-12
Unknown	( ) ( ) ( )	13-15

41. Highest educational level achieved by participants:

To record this question, use the method described in the two previous questions.

Elementary school graduate	( ) ( ) ( )	16-18
Some high school	( ) ( ) ( )	19-21
High school graduate	( ) ( ) ( )	22-24
Some college	( ) ( ) ( )	25-27
College graduate	( ) ( ) ( )	28-30
Graduate study	( ) ( ) ( )	31-33
Unknown	( ) ( ) ( )	34-36

42. Occupational category of participants:

To record this question, use the method described in the three previous questions.

Professional, technical and kindred workers	( ) ( ) ( )	37-39
Farmers and farm managers	( ) ( ) ( )	40-42
Managers and officials	( ) ( ) ( )	43-45
Clerical and kindred workers	( ) ( ) ( )	46-48
Sales workers	( ) ( ) ( )	49-51
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	( ) ( ) ( )	52-54
Operatives and kindred workers	( ) ( ) ( )	55-57
Service workers, including household	( ) ( ) ( )	58-60
Farm laborers and foremen	( ) ( ) ( )	61-63
Laborers, except farm and mine	( ) ( ) ( )	64-66
Others	( ) ( ) ( )	67-69
Unknown	( ) ( ) ( )	70-72

43. Institution reporting:

Place 2 digit code number of institution, as listed in the Guide, one above the other in brackets. Example: Michigan State University would be 01 and would be recorded (0); University of Maryland would be 11 and would be recorded, (1) (1)
(1)

( ) 73
( ) 74

APPENDIX B

DEFINITIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES NEEDED TO COMPLETE THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

Appendix B

The following categories are provided for assistance in answering question seventeen, program content:

1.	Agriculture:	animal or dairy husbandry, forestry, horticulture, plant pathology, soils, etc.
2.	Behavioral Sciences:	anthropology, economics, history, international relations, political science, psychology, social welfare, sociology, etc.
3.	Biological Sciences:	anatomy, bacteriology, biology, biophysics, entomology, zoology, etc.
4.	Business:	accounting, business administration, real estate, security investments, etc.
5.	Education:	counselling and guidance, elementary education, school administration, speech correction, etc.
6.	Engineering:	aeronautical engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, architecture, etc.
7.	Health Professions:	dental hygiene, medicine, occupational therapy, public health, etc.
8.	Humanities:	english, fine arts, foreign languages, literature, philosophy, religion, etc.
9.	Interdisciplinary:	two or more basic groupings; an example of an interdisciplinary program might be a conference on air pollution which addressed the problem in terms of its legal, scientific, behavioral and health aspects.
10.	Law:	constitutional law, estate and gift taxation, legal history and jurisprudence, etc.
11.	Physical Sciences:	astronomy, chemistry, mathematics, meteorology, physics, etc.
12.	Other:	any miscellaneous conference that does not fit into above categories.

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHICAL DATA REPORTED BY THE FIVE ADULT EDUCATION CENTERS

Appendix C-1

Demographical Information for Michigan State University

TOTAL NO. PARTICIPANTS 27705

	NUMBER	PER CENT OF TOTAL
SEX		
MALE	20806	75.100
FEMALE	6899	24.900
AGE		
UNDER 21	5713	20.620
21-35	11287	40.742
36-55	8906	32.147
OVER 55	1799	6.492
ED. LEVEL		
ELEMENTARY	1008	3.637
SOME H.S.	5100	18.410
H.S. GRAD.	7005	25.286
SOME COLLEGE	4303	15.530
COLLEGE GRAD.	6842	24.697
GRAD. STUDY	3447	12.440
OCCUPATIONAL CAT.		
PROFESSIONAL	12909	46.594
FARMERS	1097	3.960
MANAGERS	6386	23.051
CLERICAL	768	2.770
SALES	1136	4.101
CRAFTSMEN	163	0.588
OPERATIVES	57	0.205
SERVICE	1185	4.278
FARM LABOR	0	0.
LABORERS	0	0.
OTHERS	4004	14.453

Appendix C-2

Demographical Information for the University of Georgia

TOTAL NO. PARTICIPANTS 22915

	NUMBER	PER CENT OF TOTAL
SEX		
MALE	14609	63.753
FEMALE	8306	36.247
AGE		
UNDER 21	2476	10.805
21-35	6206	27.082
36-55	11798	51.485
OVER 55	2435	10.628
ED. LEVEL		
ELEMENTARY	1834	8.000
SOME H.S.	1802	7.861
H.S. GRAD.	1742	7.599
SOME COLLEGE	2810	12.257
COLLEGE GRAD.	8431	36.787
GRAD. STUDY	6302	27.496
OCCUPATIONAL CAT.		
PROFESSIONAL	19237	83.949
FARMERS	2	0.010
MANAGERS	2677	11.683
CLERICAL	122	0.532
SALES	48	0.209
CRAFTSMEN	243	1.058
OPERATIVES	41	0.179
SERVICE	31	0.134
FARM LABOR	0	0.
LABORERS	0	0.
OTHERS	515	2.246

Appendix C-3

Demographical Information for the University of Nebraska

TOTAL NO. PARTICIPANTS 13146

	NUMBER	PER CENT OF TOTAL
SEX		
MALE	9584	72.901
FEMALE	3562	27.099
AGE		
UNDER 21	426	3.243
21-35	6589	50.119
36-55	5304	40.350
OVER 55	827	6.287
ED. LEVEL		
ELEMENTARY	214	1.628
SOME H.S.	363	2.763
H.S. GRAD.	1880	14.300
SOME COLLEGE	2776	21.120
COLLEGE GRAD.	3856	29.336
GRAD. STUDY	4056	30.852
OCCUPATIONAL CAT.		
PROFESSIONAL	8261	62.842
FARMERS	599	4.554
MANAGERS	1325	10.079
CLERICAL	232	1.767
SALES	541	4.112
CRAFTSMEN	161	1.227
OPERATIVES	41	0.314
SERVICE	391	2.974
FARM LABOR	8	0.059
LABORERS	57	0.432
OTHERS	1530	11.640

Appendix C-4

Demographical Information for the University of Oklahoma

TOTAL NO. PARTICIPANTS 13355

	NUMBER	PER CENT OF TOTAL
SEX		
MALE	10669	79.886
FEMALE	2686	20.114
AGE		
UNDER 21	100	0.751
21-35	4336	32.471
36-55	7270	54.434
OVER 55	1649	12.344
ED. LEVEL		
ELEMENTARY	2	0.015
SOME H.S.	101	0.754
H.S. GRAD.	3551	26.587
SOME COLLEGE	2201	16.483
COLLEGE GRAD.	5454	40.838
GRAD. STUDY	2046	15.322
OCCUPATIONAL CAT.		
PROFESSIONAL	7663	57.381
FARMERS	18	0.136
MANAGERS	2176	16.297
CLERICAL	520	3.896
SALES	294	2.202
CRAFTSMEN	548	4.101
OPERATIVES	5	0.038
SERVICE	1825	13.664
FARM LABOR	0	0.
LABORERS	22	0.166
OTHERS	283	2.118

Appendix C-5

Demographical Information for the University of Chicago

TOTAL NO. PARTICIPANTS 7919

	NUMBER	PER CENT OF TOTAL
SEX		
MALE	6145	77.597
FEMALE	1774	22.403
AGE		
UNDER 21	407	5.134
21-35	3355	42.361
36-55	2734	34.522
OVER 55	1424	17.983
ED. LEVEL		
ELEMENTARY	0	0.
SOME H.S.	298	3.762
H.S. GRAD.	719	9.076
SOME COLLEGE	735	9.288
COLLEGE GRAD.	2223	28.074
GRAD. STUDY	3944	49.800
OCCUPATIONAL CAT.		
PROFESSIONAL	5412	68.346
FARMERS	0	0.
MANAGERS	1204	15.206
CLERICAL	334	4.213
SALES	87	1.094
CRAFTSMEN	75	0.945
OPERATIVES	176	2.228
SERVICE	160	2.026
FARM LABOR	0	0.
LABORERS	43	0.540
OTHERS	428	5.402

APPENDIX D

DATA USED TO TEST HYPOTHESES ONE THROUGH NINE

Appendix D-1

Contingency Table No. 16; Questionnaire Item No. 17

Program Content

Institution	AGRICULTURE	BEH. SCI.	BIO. SCI.	BUSINESS	EDUCATION	ENGINEERING	HEALTH	HUMANITIES	LAW	PHY. SCI.	INTERDISC.	OTHER	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	11.8 23	8.7 17	1.5 3	25.6 50	10.3 20	2.6 5	12.3 24	2.6 5	0.5 1	1.0 2	16.4 32	6.7 13	195	14.6
GEORGIA	6.7 16	15.4 37	5.4 13	19.6 47	25.0 60	0.4 1	3.7 9	2.5 6	2.9 7	0.4 1	16.0 24	7.9 19	240	18.0
NEBRASKA	16.4 26	2.5 4		16.4 26	18.9 30	7.5 12	8.2 13	1.3 2	3.1 5		20.8 33	5.0 8	159	11.9
OKLAHOMA	0.4 1	4.7 12		28.5 73	6.6 17	11.7 30	2.7 7	1.2 3	5.9 15		24.2 62	14.1 36	256	19.2
CHICAGO		6.8 8	0.9 1	27.4 32	16.2 19		15.4 18	12.8 15	4.3 5	1.7 2	12.8 15	1.7 2	117	8.8

Data for Hypothesis No. One

Appendix D-2

Contingency Table No. 17;
Questionnaire Item No. 18

Level of Program Content

Institution	POST GRAD.	GRADUATE	UNDERGRAD	PRE-COLLEGE	MULTI-LEVEL	UNCLASSIF.	TOTAL	PERCEN
MICH. STATE	10.5 20	32.5 62	8.4 16	6.3 12	29.3 56	13.1 25	191	14.4
GEORGIA	12.0 29	40.2 97	12.0 29	1.2 3	30.7 74	3.7 9	241	18.2
NEBRASKA	11.4 18	27.2 43	26.6 42	1.3 2	10.8 17	22.8 36	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	5.9 15	25.2 64	8.7 22	0.4 1	36.6 93	23.2 59	254	19.1
CHICAGO	17.1 20	15.4 18	6.0 7	0.9 1	31.6 37	29.1 34	117	8.8

Data for Hypothesis No. Two

Appendix D-3

Contingency Table No. 18;
Questionnaire Item No. 19

Source of Program Initiative

Institution	OUT UNIV	C.E. STAFF	FAC TH IS U	FAC OTH U	FAC + STAFF	OUT U + FAC	OUT U +STAFF	ALL THREE	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	26.0 51	1.0 2	11.7 23		12.2 24	7.7 15	16.3 32	25.0 49	196	14.7
GEORGIA	20.3 49	3.3 8	6.2 15	0.8 2	18.3 44	5.4 13	7.9 19	37.8 91	241	18.1
NEBRASKA	40.1 63	0.6 1	22.3 35	0.6 1	1.3 2	15.3 24	12.1 19	7.6 12	157	11.8
OKLAHOMA	7.0 18	67.6 173	4.7 12		4.3 11	1.2 3	11.7 30	3.5 9	256	19.2
CHICAGO	62.4 73	5.1 6	9.4 11	1.7 2	0.9 1	18.8 22	1.7 2		117	8.8

Data for Hypothesis No. Three

Apppendix D-4

Contingency Table No. 33;
Questionnaire Item No. 27

Program Coordinated By . . .

Institution	OUT UNIV	C.E. STAFF	FAC TH IS U	FAC OTH U	FAC + STAFF	OUT U + FAC	OUT U +STAFF	ALL THREE	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	3.1	35.6	1.5		21.6	0.5	21.1	16.5		
	6	69	3		42	1	41	32	194	14.6
GEORGIA	2.9	51.9	0.4	0.8	28.6	0.8	2.9	11.6		
	7	125	1	2	69	2	7	28	241	18.1
NEBRASKA	17.7	19.0	4.4		16.5	4.4	28.5	9.5		
	28	30	7		26	7	45	15	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	1.6	86.7	3.9		1.6		3.5	2.7		
	4	221	10		4		9	7	255	19.2
CHICAGO	41.0	10.3	5.1	1.7	4.3	7.7	21.4	8.5		
	48	12	6	2	5	9	25	10	117	8.8

Data for Hypothesis No. Four

Appendix D-5

Contingency Table No. 36;
Questionnaire Item No. 30

Pre-Conference Activities

Institution	NONE	READ LIST	STUDY MAT.	DEF. ASSIGN.	STUDY GROUPS	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	80.7 155	2.1 4	14.1 27	2.6 5	0.5 1	192	14.5
GEORGIA	79.2 190	11.7 28	6.2 15	2.9 7		240	18.2
NEBRASKA	76.6 121	5.7 9	9.5 15	6.3 10	1.9 3	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	93.3 238	2.0 5	3.1 8	0.8 2	0.8 2	255	19.3
CHICAGO	77.5 86	5.4 6	12.6 14	2.7 3	1.8 2	111	8.4

Data for Hypothesis No. Five

Appendix D-6a

Contingency Table No. 41;
Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Lecture or Speakers

VAR 54 INS METH-LECTURE

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	78.3 148	9.0 17	2.1 4			0.5 1					10.1 19	189	14.3
GEORGIA	79.7 192	9.5 23	1.2 3	0.4 1							9.1 22	241	18.2
NEBRASKA	77.2 122	8.2 13	1.3 2		0.6 1						12.7 20	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	79.9 202	14.2 36	3.5 9	0.4 1		0.4 1					2.7 7	256	19.3
CHICAGO	51.3 58	7.1 8	8.8 10								32.7 37	113	8.5

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part a

Appendix D-6b

Contingency Table No. 42; Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Small Discussion Group

VAR 55 INS METH-SM DISC GROUP

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	10.6 20	43.9 83	6.5 16								37.0 70	189	14.3
GEORGIA	9.5 23	41.1 99	9.5 23	0.4 1							39.4 95	241	18.2
NEBRASKA	11.4 18	27.2 43	4.4 7			0.6 1					56.3 89	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	5.5 14	28.1 72	23.4 60	0.4 1	0.4 1						42.2 108	256	19.4
CHICAGO	19.8 22	38.7 43	5.4 6								36.0 40	111	8.4

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part b

Appendix D-6c

Contingency Table No. 43; Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Large Discussion Group

VAR 56 INS METH-LARGE DISC GR

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	1.6 3	21.7 41	25.9 49								50.8 96	189	14.3
GEORGIA	2.9 7	11.2 27	8.7 21	0.4 1							76.8 185	241	18.2
NEBRASKA	6.3 10	29.7 47	8.9 14	0.6 1							54.4 86	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	5.1 13	26.2 67	14.1 36	0.8 2	0.8 2						53.1 136	256	19.3
CHICAGO	17.7 20	23.[illegible] 26	12.4 14								46.9 53	113	8.5

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part c

Appendix D-6d

Contingency Table No. 44;
Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Role Playing

VAR 57 INS METH-ROLE PLAYING

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	2.6 5		2.6 5								94.7 179	189	14.3
GEORGIA	0.4 1	0.4 1	0.8 2								98.3 237	241	18.3
NEBRASKA		0.6 1	2.5 4	1.3 2							95.6 151	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	0.4 1	2.0 5	4.3 11	0.8 2	0.4 1	0.4 1					91.8 235	256	19.4
CHICAGO	0.9 1	4.5 5	14.4 16								80.2 89	111	8.4

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part D

Appendix D-6e

Contingency Table No. 45; Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Case Analysis

VAR 58 INS METH-CASE ANALYSIS

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	0.5 1	3.2 6	7.4 14								88.9 168	189	14.3
GEORGIA	5.0 12	9.5 23	12.4 30	0.4 1							72.6 175	241	18.3
NEBRASKA	2.5 4	8.2 13	17.7 28	1.3 2							70.3 111	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	0.8 2	8.6 22	15.2 39		0.4 1	0.4 1					74.6 191	256	19.4
CHICAGO	1.8 2	4.5 5	12.7 14								80.9 89	110	8.3

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part e

Appendix D-6f

Contingency Table No. 46;
Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Laboratory Demonstration

VAR 59 INS METH-LAB AND DEMON

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	6.3 12	5.8 11	5.3 10								82.5 156	189	14.3
GEORGIA	2.1 5	5.8 14	10.0 24		0.4 1						81.7 197	241	18.3
NEBRASKA	2.5 4	7.0 11	7.0 11								83.5 132	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	0.8 2	7.8 20	1.6 4	0.8 2			0.4 1				88.6 226	255	19.5
CHICAGO	4.5 5	3.6 4	4.5 5								87.4 97	111	8.4

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part f

Appendix D-6g

Contingency Table No. 47; Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Field Trips

VAR 60 INS METH-FIELD TRIP

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	0.5 1	2.6 5	1.6 3								95.2 180	189	14.4
GEORGIA			2.5 6								97.5 235	241	18.3
NEBRASKA			6.3 10	1.3 2	0.6 1						91.8 145	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA		2.7 7	7.4 19			0.4 1					89.5 229	256	19.4
CHICAGO	0.9 1	0.9 1									98.1 106	108	8.2

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part g

Appendix D-6h

Contingency Table No. 48; Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Panel, Symposium or Debate

VAR 61 INS METH-PAN, SYM,DEB

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NOT RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	0.5 1	1.6 3	5.9 11								92.0 173	188	14.3
GEORGIA		3.3 8	6.6 16	1.2 3							88.8 214	241	18.3
NEBRASKA		6.3 10	12.0 19	1.9 3	0.6 1						79.1 125	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	1.2 3	4.3 11	7.0 18	0.8 2							86.7 222	256	19.4
CHICAGO	3.7 4	4.6 5	11.0 12								80.7 88	109	8.3

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part h

Appendix D-6$_i$

Contingency Table No. 49;
Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Interview or Individual Counseling

Institution	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	Not Ranked	TOTAL	PERCENT
Mich. State						0.5 1					99.5 187	188	14.3
Geo.	0.4 1	0.4 1	1.4 4	0.4 1							97.1 234	241	18.3
Neb.		0.6 1			0.6 1	0.6 1					98.1 155	158	12.0
Okla.	0.8 2	2.0 5	2.3 6	0.4 1							94.5 242	256	19.4
Chic.	0.9 1		1.8 2								97.3 107	110	8.3

Data for Hypothesis No. Six-- i

Appendix D-6j

Contingency Table No. 50; Questionnaire Item No. 32

Instructional Method--Individual Guided Study

VAR 63 INS METH-IND GUIDED ST

Institution	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	TENTH	NUI RANKED	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE		0.5 1			1.1 2						98.4 185	188	14.3
GEORGIA		1.2 3	1.2 3	0.4 1							97.1 234	241	18.3
NEBRASKA		1.3 2	1.3 2								97.5 154	158	12.0
OKLAHOMA	10.2 26	2.3 6	8.2 21	0.4 1			0.4 1				78.5 201	256	19.4
CHICAGO		0.9 1	3.6 4								95.5 105	110	8.3

Data for Hypothesis Six--Part j

Appendix D-7

Contingency Table No. 51; Questionnaire Item No. 33

Instructional Materials Used

VAR 64 INTR. MATERIALS

Institution	NONE	SPEC PAPERS	SPEC BOOKS	SLIDE, FILM	CASE HIST	ASSIG READ	CHART, GRAPH	SPEECH COP	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	32.2 58	40.6 73	12.8 23	3.3 6	4.4 8	3.3 6	2.2 4	1.1 2	180	13.9
GEORGIA	18.5 44	59.2 141	6.7 16	5.5 13	2.9 7	3.8 9	2.5 6	0.8 2	238	18.4
NEBRASKA	21.0 33	38.9 61	9.6 15	22.9 36	3.2 5	0.6 1	1.9 3	1.9 3	157	12.1
OKLAHOMA	11.9 33	48.0 121	7.9 20	2.0 5	0.4 1	2.4 6	20.6 52	6.7 17	252	19.4
CHICAGO	18.5 20	50.9 55	3.7 4	8.3 9	4.6 5	4.6 5	5.6 6	3.7 4	108	8.3

Data for Hypothesis No. Seven

Appendix D-8

Contingency Table No. 53; Questionnaire Item No. 35

Types of Post-Conference Activities

Institution	NONE	READ LIST	STUDY MAT.	RADIO, TV	STUDY GROUP	DEF. ASSIGN.	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	88.2 172	3.6 7	3.6 7	0.5 1	0.5 1	3.6 7	195	14.7
GEORGIA	81.7 197	9.5 23	1.2 3		2.1 5	5.4 13	241	18.1
NEBRASKA	81.6 129	0.6 1	7.0 11		1.3 2	9.5 15	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	91.8 235	0.4 1	3.9 10	0.8 2	2.0 5	1.2 3	256	19.3
CHICAGO	83.2 94	0.9 1	4.4 5	2.7 3	5.3 6	3.5 4	113	8.5

Data for Hypothesis No. Eight

Appendix D-9

Contingency Table No. 54; Questionnaire Item No. 36

Types of Evaluation Attempted After Conference

Institution	NONE	RANG. INTER.	DEPTH INTER.	REAC. SH.	EXAMIN ATION	FOLLOW -UP	ASSESS MENT	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	32.5 63	7.2 14	4.6 9	47.9 93	5.7 11	0.5 1	1.5 3	194	14.6
GEORGIA	52.3 126	21.6 52	2.5 6	15.8 38	5.8 14	1.2 3	0.8 2	241	18.1
NEBRASKA	79.7 126	3.2 5		14.6 23	1.3 2	1.3 2		158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	34.4 88	27.7 71	0.8 2	28.1 72	0.8 2	0.8 2	7.4 19	256	19.3
CHICAGO	64.6 73	0.9 1	1.8 2	17.7 20	4.4 5	3.5 4	7.1 8	113	8.5

Data for Hypothesis No. Nine

APPENDIX E

DATA USED IN MAKING SECONDARY (ADDITIONAL) FINDINGS

Appendix E-1

Contingency Table No. 1;
Questionnaire Item No. 2

Beginning Date of Activity

Institution	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	12.2 24	9.1 18	20.3 40	16.8 33	8.6 17	8.6 17	6.6 13	6.1 12	11.7 23				197	14.8
GEORGIA	10.2 24	9.6 23	6.7 16	10.9 26	8.4 20	6.3 15	7.5 18	5.9 14	10.0 24	12.1 29	7.1 17	5.4 13	239	18.0
NEBRASKA	11.4 18	12.0 19	12.7 20	8.9 14	11.4 18	12.7 20	5.7 9	3.2 5	2.5 4	10.1 16	4.4 7	5.1 8	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	9.0 23	11.3 29	9.0 23	11.7 30	7.8 20	7.4 19	4.7 12	5.5 14	9.4 24	10.2 26	7.8 20	6.2 16	256	19.2
CHICAGO	20.5 24	6.0 7	18.8 22	3.4 4	6.8 8	3.4 4	1.7 2	5.1 6	10.3 12	7.7 9	8.5 10	7.7 9	117	8.8

Appendix E-2

Contingency Table No. 3; Questionnaire Item No. 4

Number of Participants in Attendance

Institution	NONE	1-25	26-50	51-75	76-100	101-150	151-200	201-300	301-400	401-500	OVER 500	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	15.3	37.7	11.1	11.1	11.6	5.3	5.3	2.6	3.2	3.7			
	29	58	21	21	22	10	10	5	6	7		189	14.4
GEORGIA	22.0	31.4	16.9	6.8	6.8	8.1	3.8	1.3	2.1	0.8			
	52	74	40	16	16	19	9	3	5	2		236	18.0
NEBRASKA	26.9	23.7	19.2	10.3	9.0	4.5	3.2		1.9	1.3			
	42	37	30	16	14	7	5		3	2		156	11.9
OKLAHOMA	41.2	32.5	8.6	5.9	5.5	3.5	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.4			
	105	83	22	15	14	9	3	2	1	1		255	19.5
CHICAGO	31.3	33.0	7.0	4.3	12.2	4.3	3.5	2.6	1.7				
	36	38	8	5	14	5	4	3	2			115	8.8

Appendix E-3

Contingency Table No. 4;
Questionnaire Item No. 5

Number of Nights in Residence

Institution	NONE	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN	EIGHT	NINE	TEN
MICH. STATE	16.8 33	20.3 40	18.3 36	8.6 17	11.2 22	10.2 20	7.1 14			0.5 1	1.5 3
GEORGIA	3.7 9	31.5 76	22.0 53	10.8 26	3.7 9	22.0 53	1.7 4	0.4 1	0.8 2	0.4 1	0.4 1
NEBRASKA	26.4 42	39.0 62	14.5 23	12.6 20	5.0 8	1.3 2					
OKLAHOMA	10.5 27	11.7 30	8.6 22	6.2 16	16.4 42	36.3 93	1.2 3			0.4 1	5.1 13
CHICAGO	12.0 14	20.5 24	29.1 34	12.8 15	0.9 1	20.5 24		0.9 1			1.7 2

Appendix E-3 (Cont'd)

Number of Nights in Residence

Institution	ELEVEN	TWELVE	THIRTEEN	FOURTEEN	FIFTEEN	SIXTEEN	SEVENTEEN	EIGHTEEN	NINETEEN	TWENTY	TWENTY ONE	OVER 21	TOTAL	PERCENT
CH. STATE	0.5 1	3.[illegible] 6							0.5 1			1.5 3	197	14.8
GEORGIA		0.8 2	0.4 1			0.4 1				0.4 1		0.4 1	241	18.1
NEBRASKA				1.3 2									159	11.9
OKLAHOMA		1.2 3		0.4 1	0.4 1			0.4 1	0.4 1	0.4 1		0.4 1	256	19.2
CHICAGO							0.9 1					0.9 1	117	8.8

Appendix E-4

Contingency Table No. 5;
Questionnaire Item No. 6

Number of Participants in Residence

Institution	NONE	1-20 PCT	21-40 PCT	41-60 PCT	61-80 PCT	81-100 PCT	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	15.2 30	5.1 10	3.0 6	9.6 19	31.0 61	36.0 71	197	14.9
GEORGIA	4.6 11	6.7 16	4.6 11	6.3 15	20.1 48	57.7 138	239	18.1
NEBRASKA	25.3 40	16.5 26	17.7 28	11.4 18	17.1 27	12.0 19	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	9.4 24	13.7 35	3.5 9	5.5 14	4.7 12	63.3 162	256	19.3
CHICAGO	12.0 14	3.4 4	2.6 3	6.0 7	17.1 20	59.0 69	117	8.8

Appendix E-5

Contingency Table No. 6;
Questionnaire Item No. 7

Days Spent in Planned Sessions

Institution	HALF	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
MICH. STATE	4.1 8	32.0 63	23.4 46	9.6 19	5.6 11	11.7 23	4.1 8	3.0 6	1.5 3	0.5 1	3.0 6
GEORGIA	5.0 12	27.4 66	27.0 65	8.7 21	4.1 10	20.7 50	2.5 6	0.4 1	0.8 2	0.4 1	0.4 1
NEBRASKA	7.0 11	32.9 52	29.1 46	15.2 24	11.4 18	3.2 5					0.6 1
OKLAHOMA	0.8 2	15.6 40	11.7 30	5.5 14	25.4 65	30.1 77	2.0 5				4.3 11
CHICAGO	3.4 4	25.6 30	28.2 33	16.2 19	7.7 9	14.5 17		0.9 1			0.9 1

Appendix E-5 (Cont'd)

Number of Days Spent in Planned Sessions

Institution	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	OVER 21	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE					0.5 1	0.5 1						0.5 1	197	14.8
GEORGIA		1.2 3	0.8 2						0.4 1				241	18.1
NEBRASKA				0.6 1									158	11.8
OKLAHOMA	0.8 2	1.2 3		0.8 2	1.2 3					0.4 1		0.4 1	256	19.2
CHICAGO	1.7 2						0.9 1						117	8.8

Appendix E-6

Contingency Table No. 7;
Questionnaire Item No. 8

Type of Conference Activity

Institution	SINGLE CONF.	SERIES	SERIES SAME	SERIES DIFF.	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	62.8 123	29.6 58	3.6 7	4.1 8	196	14.8
GEORGIA	51.2 123	24.2 58	12.9 31	11.7 28	240	18.1
NEBRASKA	49.1 78	31.4 50	7.5 12	11.9 19	159	12.0
OKLAHOMA	39.6 101	18.0 46	6.3 16	36.1 92	255	19.2
CHICAGO	29.9 35	32.5 38	6.0 7	31.6 37	117	8.8

Appendix E-7

Contingency Table No. 9; Questionnaire Item No. 10

Nature of Conference Clientele

Institution	UNIVERSITY	LOCAL	STATE	REGIONAL	NATIONAL	INTERNATION.	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	2.6 5	1.0 2	54.1 105	7.2 14	32.0 62	3.1 6	194	14.6
GEORGIA	3.3 8	0.4 1	53.9 130	24.9 60	15.8 38	1.7 4	241	18.2
NEBRASKA	5.1 8	1.9 3	51.6 81	32.5 51	7.0 11	1.9 3	157	11.8
OKLAHOMA	2.0 5	1.6 4	31.6 81	22.3 57	30.5 78	12.1 31	256	19.3
CHICAGO	1.8 2	14.9 17	7.0 8	22.8 26	44.7 51	8.8 10	114	8.6

Appendix E-8

Contingency Table No. 10;
Questionnaire Item No. 11

Amount of Conference Fee

Institution	NONE	UP TO $5	$5.01-10	$10.01-20	$20.01-40	$40.01-80	$80.01-100	$100.01-150	$150.01-200	$200.01-250	$250.01-300	OVER $300	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	8.2	21.3	10.4	13.7	10.9	15.8	2.7	4.4	10.4	1.1		1.1		
	15	39	19	25	20	29	5	8	19	2		2	183	13.9
GEORGIA	7.1	28.2	14.5	21.6	7.5	7.9	5.0	5.0	1.2		1.2	0.8		
	17	68	35	52	18	19	12	12	3		3	2	241	18.3
NEBRASKA	2.5	28.3	17.6	20.8	11.9	11.3	5.0	2.5						
	4	45	28	33	19	18	8	4					159	12.1
OKLAHOMA	17.3	11.0	6.3	7.1	14.6	22.8	3.1	8.7	4.7	0.4	3.5	0.4		
	44	28	16	18	37	58	8	22	12	1	9	1	254	19.3
CHICAGO	17.5	31.6	7.0	4.4	6.1	15.8	3.5	3.5	2.6		0.9	7.0		
	20	36	8	5	7	18	4	4	3		1	6	114	8.7

Appendix E-9

Contingency Table No. 11; Questionnaire Item No. 12

Major Component of the Conference Fee

Institution	HOUSING	MEALS	TUITION	TRAVEL	EDUC. MAT.	OTHER	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	3.8 7	4.3 8	86.5 160		2.2 4	3.2 6	185	14.7
GEORGIA	3.0 7	19.6 46	64.3 151	1.3 3	3.0 7	8.9 21	235	18.7
NEBRASKA	12.8 20	34.0 53	51.3 80	0.6 1	0.6 1	0.6 1	156	12.4
OKLAHOMA	2.8 6	15.0 32	73.4 157		0.5 1	8.4 18	214	17.0
CHICAGO	12.6 14	14.4 16	18.9 21	0.9 1	6.3 7	46.8 52	111	8.8

Appendix E-10

Contingency Table No. 12;
Questionnaire Item No. 13

Major Source of Conference Activity Financing

Institution	INDIVIDUAL	EMPLOYER	SPONSOR	SHARED	PRIV. GRANT	GOV. GRANT	UNIVERSITY	UNIV.-OTHER	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	43.8 85	15.5 30	4.6 9	18.6 36	6.7 13	7.7 15	2.6 5	0.5 1	194	14.6
GEORGIA	40.2 96	32.2 77	9.2 22	4.6 11	1.3 3	10.0 24	2.5 6		239	18.0
NEBRASKA	49.1 78	31.4 50	5.7 9	5.7 9	1.9 3	5.0 8	0.6 1	0.6 1	159	12.0
OKLAHOMA	13.3 34	48.6 124	11.0 28	3.5 9	2.0 5	19.6 50	1.2 3	0.8 2	255	19.2
CHICAGO	20.0 23	25.2 29	23.5 27	13.0 15	3.5 4	7.8 9	3.5 4	3.5 4	115	8.7

Appendix E-12

Contingency Table No. 15; Questionnaire Item No. 16

Type of External Sponsorship

Institution	NONE	PROF. ORG.	ASS. PROF.	NON-PROF.	ASS. & CN-PR.	GOVERNMENT	COMBINATION	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	20.1 39	5.2 10	14.9 29	27.8 54	3.1 6	14.9 29	13.9 27	194	14.6
GEORGIA	17.9 43	20.4 49	2.1 5	30.4 73	1.7 4	22.9 55	4.6 11	240	18.1
NEBRASKA	13.3 21	14.6 23	8.9 14	25.9 41	1.3 2	27.8 44	8.2 13	158	11.9
OKLAHOMA	58.4 149	3.9 10	0.4 1	11.0 28	3.5 9	22.0 56	0.8 2	255	19.2
CHICAGO	6.0 7	34.5 40	2.6 3	30.2 35	11.2 13	8.6 10	6.9 8	116	8.7

Appendix E-11

Contingency Table No. 14; Questionnaire Item No. 15

Conference was Sponsored For . . .

Institution	PUBLIC	UNIVERSITY	SPONS. ORG.	SPECIAL	TOTAL	PERCENT
MICH. STATE	23.7 46	5.2 10	45.4 88	25.8 50	194	14.6
GEORGIA	6.6 16	5.4 13	67.2 162	20.7 50	241	18.2
NEBRASKA	6.4 10	6.4 10	52.2 82	35.0 55	157	11.8
OKLAHOMA	34.3 87	2.4 6	26.0 66	37.4 95	254	19.2
CHICAGO	0.9 1	6.0 7	57.3 67	35.9 42	117	8.8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Continuing Education Report", No. 15, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1967.

Guba, Egan. Evaluating Federally-Funded Education Programs. Key Note Address of an Evaluation Seminar held at Ohio State University, Summer 1967. Published by Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Litchfield, Ann. Studies and Training in Continuing Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1968.

McGee, Howell W. "Me and My Ouija Board," From the Dean's Desk, Association of University Evening Colleges, 1969.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Adult/Continuing Education Activities in Institutions of Higher Education, 1970-71, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Definitions of Student Personnel Terms in Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Welden, J. Eugene. Program Planning and Program Effectiveness in University Residential Centers. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1966.

White, Thurman J., Ph.D. Higher Adult Education in North America, Prepared for ICUAE/UNESCO BOOK - 1972.

White, Thurman J., Ph.D. Higher Education for Everybody? Issues and Implications. Prepared for the Commission on Academic Affairs Committee on Higher Education - 1970.