

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. 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 material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations 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 through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8009342

TRAVIS, GEORGE YEAGLEY

AN ANALYSIS OF INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS FOR ADULT
EDUCATION SERVICES

The Ohio State University

PH.D.

1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

Copyright 1979

by

Travis, George Yeagley

All Rights Reserved

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs _____
2. Colored illustrations _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓ throughout

7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
9. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available
from school or author _____
10. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text
follows _____
11. Poor carbon copy _____
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type _____
13. Appendix pages are poor copy _____
14. Original copy with light type _____
15. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
16. Other _____

AN ANALYSIS OF INDICES OF
EFFECTIVENESS OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS FOR ADULT EDUCATION SERVICES

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

George Y. Travis, B.A., M. Ed.

The Ohio State University
1979

Reading Committee:

William Dowling
Russell Spillman
Dewey Adams

Approved By

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William D. Dowling", written over a horizontal line.

Adviser
Department of Vocational-Technical
Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of a dissertation is always an effort involving many people.

I wish to particularly thank Dr. Andrew Hendrickson who assisted in my transition into adult education and to Dr. Newton Rochte who provided key assistance in the developmental phase of the dissertation topic. Invaluable assistance was received from my committee chairman, Dr. William Dowling, and from committee members Dr. Dewey Adams, Dr. William Moore, Jr., Dr. Herman Peters, and Dr. Russell Spillman. All were unfailing in their support, encouragement, and patience. The research could not have been conducted without the support of practitioners Laura Weisel and Max Way who served as advisory experts, Jim Miller who provided key support from the Ohio Department of Education and the many local administrators who provided the data.

Special thanks are due to two helpers who became supporters and friends--Elaine Elgin for assistance in editing and typing and Larry Gable for assistance in research design and statistical analysis.

VITA

July 27, 1931	Born - Ravenna, Ohio
1950-53	U.S. Air Force
1956	B.A., Kent State University Kent, Ohio
1956-61	Orrville City Schools Orrville, Ohio
1961	Cuyahoga Falls City Schools Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio
1962	M.Ed., Kent State University Kent, Ohio
1962-65	Triway Local Schools Wooster, Ohio
1965	South Western City Schools Grove City, Ohio
1966-77	Ohio State Department of Education Columbus, Ohio
1977	Teaching Associate, Vocational- Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

Travis, George, Weisel, Laura and White, Arthur. "The London Procedure: A Screening, Diagnostic and Teaching Guide for Adult Learning Problems," Adult Literacy and Basic Education, Volume 2, Number 3-Fall, 1978.

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Adult Education. Dr. William Dowling

Related Areas: Higher Education Administration. Dr. Russell Spillman

Counseling. Dr. Herman Peters

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
VITA	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Significance of the Problem	7
Scope and Limitations of this Study	8
Organization of the Dissertation	10
Definition of Terms	11
Footnotes for Chapter I	13
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
U.S. Office of Education 1927 Study	16
U.S. Office of Education 1940 Study	17
U.S. Office of Education 1959 Study	19
The 1977 Study	20
History of Adult Education and the Ohio Department of Education	23
The Formative Years	24
1900 to 1926	25
1926 to 1950	28
1950 to Present	32
Summary	46
Footnotes for Chapter II	48
III. METHODOLOGY	52
Levels Removed	52
Unification of Services	55
The Survey Instrument	56

Chapter	Page
Analysis of Data	62
Footnotes for Chapter III	68
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	70
Independent Variable -- Levels Removed	70
Dependent Variable #1, Percent of Target	
Population Enrolled	71
Dependent Variable #2 -- Matching Dollars	73
Dependent Variable #3 -- Total State Budget for	
Adult Education	77
Dependent Variable #4 -- Cost Per Hour	79
Dependent Variable #5 -- Public Budget	81
Summary - Independent Variable Levels Removed	83
Independent Variable, Unification	83
Dependent Variable #1 -- Percent of Target	
Population Enrolled	84
Dependent Variable #2 -- Matching Dollars	86
Dependent Variable #3 -- Total State Budget for	
Adult Education	88
Dependent Variable #4 -- Cost Per Hour	90
Dependent Variable #5 -- Public Budget	92
Summary - Independent Variable, Unification	94
The Survey Instrument	94
Instrument Returns	95
Consultant and Advisory Functions	97
Communication and Interpretation Functions	100
Administrative and Regulatory Functions	103
Independent Variable, Levels Removed -- Instrument	
Analysis	105
Independent Variable, Unification -- Instrument	
Analysis	106
Footnote for Chapter IV	110
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	111
Summary	111
Recommendations for Further Research	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY	140

APPENDIXES	Page
A. Dependent Variables for the 50 States	123
B. The Survey Instrument	125
C. Local Education Agencies to Which Survey Instruments Were Mailed	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Administrative Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	53
2. Administrative Unification of Adult Education in State Departments of Education	56
3. Number of Local Education Agencies Offering ABE, HSC, and GED Programs	61
4. Survey Instrument Returns From Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin, by Dates Received .	63
5. Administrative Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	71
6. Mean Percent of Target Population Enrolled, Categorized by Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	72
7. ANOVA for Comparing the Percent of Target Popula- tion Enrolled with Administrative Levels Removed	73
8. Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Student Categorized by Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	74
9. ANOVA for Comparing Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Student With Administrative Levels Removed	75
10. Scheffe Test Indicating Differences Between Matching Appropriated and Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	76
11. Total State Budget For Adult Education Per Individual in the Target Population Categorized by Levels Separating Adults From the Chief State School Officer	77

Table		Page
12.	ANOVA for Comparing State and Local Dollars Appropriated With Administrative Levels Removed	78
13.	Mean Cost Per 100 Hours of Instruction, Categorized by Levels Removed	79
14.	ANOVA for Comparing Cost Per 100 Hours of Instruction With Administrative Levels Removed.	80
15.	Mean Percent of Money Budgeted for Adult Education Categorized by Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	81
16.	ANOVA for Comparing Percent of Public School Budget Budgeted for Adult Education, With Administrative Levels Removed	82
17.	Organization of ABE, GED and HSC Programs in State Departments of Education, by Administrative Units . . .	84
18.	Mean Percent of Target Population Enrolled Categorized by State Department of Education Organizational Unification	85
19.	ANOVA for Comparing the Percent of Target Population Enrolled With State Department of Education Organizational Unification	85
20.	Mean Dollars Appropriated Per Adult Education Student in the Target Population Categorized by State Department of Education Organizational Unification	87
21.	ANOVA for Comparing Dollars Appropriated Per Student With State Department of Education Organizational Unification	88
22.	Total State Budget for Adult Education per Individual in the Target Population, Categorized by State Department of Education Organizational Unification.	89
23.	ANOVA for Comparing Total State Budget With State Department of Education Organizational Unification	89

Table	Page
24. Mean Cost Per 100 Hours of Instruction Categorized by State Department of Education Organizational Unification	91
25. ANOVA for Comparing Cost Per 100 Hours of Instruction With State Department of Education Organizational Unification	92
26. Percentage of Money Budgeted for Adult Education Categorized by State Department of Education Organizational Unification	93
27. ANOVA for Comparing the Percent of Public School Budget for Adult Education With State Department of Education Organizational Unification	94
28. Instrument Returns, Categorized by Response to First and Second Mailing, and Telephone Contact	96
29. Scores of Local Administrators of ABE, HSC and GED Programs, Indicating Perceptions of Services of State Departments of Education - Possible Range 75 to 15	97
30. Scores of Local Administrators of ABE, HSC and GED Programs Indicating Perceptions of Consultant and Advisory Functions of State Departments of Education - Possible Range 35 to 7	98
31. ANOVA for Differences Among the States Consultant and Advisory Scores	99
32. Scheffe Post Hoc Contrast Tests for Differences Among the States on Consultant and Advisory Scores	100
33. Scores of Local Administrators of ABE, HSC and GED Programs Indicating Perceptions of Communication and Interpretation Functions of State Departments of Education - Possible Range 25 to 5	101
34. ANOVA for Differences Among the States Communication and Interpretation Scores	102

Table		Page
35.	Scheffe Post Hoc Contrast Test for Differences Among the States on Communication and Interpretation Scores	102
36.	Scores of Local Administrators of ABE, HSC and GED Programs Indicating Perceptions of Administrative and Regulatory Functions of State Departments of Education - Possible Range 15 to 3	103
37.	ANOVA for Differences Among the States Administrative and Regulatory Scores	104
38.	Scheffe Post Hoc Contrast Test Results for Differences Among the States on Administrative and Regulatory Scores.	105
39.	Analysis of Relationships Between Consultant and Advisory Functions, Communication and Interpretation Functions, and Administrative and Regulatory Functions, and Levels Separating Adult Education From the Chief State School Officer	107
40.	Analysis of Instrument Scores for Relationships Between Consultant and Advisory Functions, Communication and Interpretation Functions, and Administrative and Regulatory Functions and Independent Variable Unification . . .	109

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

Key functions in the administration of public school education in the United States are performed at the state level. The functions are placed at the state level by authority of the United States Constitution. The tenth amendment to the Constitution states,¹

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people.

Public school education falls within the purview of the tenth amendment, and is considered to be a power delegated to the states. Thurston and Rowe comment,²

The principle stated in this amendment makes it clear that if power and authority are not enumerated as national in scope within the Constitution and if not forbidden therein they become state concerns. Education as a function clearly falls in these categories. The state, therefore, is free to go ahead in any way it wishes to provide education to its people.

There is further legal authority for education as a state function. Moehlman cites state constitutional provisions, statutory enactments, positive judicial interpretations, and continuous exercise of the

function at the state level as providing a broad base for such authority.³

The Constitution delegates educational powers to the states and states have in turn placed the legal responsibility for education with state education agencies, commonly referred to as State Departments of Education. According to Mazzoni,⁴

States occupy a pivotal position in the arrangements that have evolved for educational governance in the United States. They are constitutionally responsible for the establishment, support, and supervision of the public schools.

In discussing the legal basis for state departments of education, the National Council of Chief State School Officers states that the exercise of education as a state function is subject only to federal and state constitutional limits.⁵ In establishing state departments of education, the Council observes, "State constitutions and statutes vary widely in their respective provisions for creating state education agencies and assigning their responsibilities."⁶

In a statement of guiding principles for the legal status, functions, and organization of service areas in state departments of education, the National Council of Chief State School Officers states, "Since education is a state function, the courts have consistently held that the legislature may vest in the state education agency authority to supervise the state system of education."⁷ This statement of

principles further states that state agencies may by law take any reasonable step to cause programs to be provided if local education agencies fail to provide programs which meet minimum requirements.

Authorities have long recognized the diversity that has evolved in state departments of education. Moehlman commented in 1951, "There are forty-eight state organizations for public education, and no two of them are alike either in organization or detailed procedure." ⁸ In 1952, the National Council of Chief State School Officers reported that "Functions are few; services are manifold. Obviously, the relative emphasis placed on each of the functions varies from state to state, as do the services to carry out the functions." ⁹ In a 1968 publication the National Council of Chief State School Officers states, "Despite the similarity of function, state departments of education are entrusted with a wide variety of activities depending on the particular states." ¹⁰

Moreover, the diversity in organizational patterns is viewed as being desirable. According to Thurston and Rowe, "It would be folly to suggest that one pattern or one formula is appropriate for all state departments of education." ¹¹ After an analysis of state policy making for the public schools, Campbell and Mazzoni offer concluding ¹² comments:

The above constitute our recommendations. We have deliberately refrained from drawing upon these recommendations to propose an "ideal" structure for state educational governance. We do not believe that there is any such model, one

that is suitable for all times and states. States vary too much in their educational and political needs and stages of development for any single structural prescription to be appropriate.

The National Council of Chief State School Officers similarly reports "There is, however, no single formula for determining the internal organization of a particular state department of education. Any single plan for determining the organization of all state departments of education would not be appropriate or desirable."¹³

An example of the diversity among state departments of education can be found in their placement of adult education services within the administrative hierarchy. Placement ranges from Arkansas and Utah where the highest placed adult education unit reports directly to the chief state school officer, to Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island where adult education administrative units are four levels removed from the chief state school officer. In 38 states, key adult education programs are placed within a central administrative unit, while in 12 states the same programs are located in two or in three separate administrative units.

The varieties in organizational structure relating to the placement of adult education in state departments of education raises questions concerning organizational structure and its relationship to program success and development of adult education in local education agencies.

Statement of the Problem

Each of the fifty states has provided a state level administrative framework for adult education services within the state department of education. A review of table organization charts for the fifty states reveals the kinds of diversity in the placement of adult education cited in the introduction.

In the first part of this study two facets of diversity will be examined and assessed for their impact on adult education programs at the local school district level.

One is the vertical placement of adult education in the table of organization charts. Each state department of education has an adult education administration unit that is clearly identifiable. The diversity occurs in the number of administrative levels separating this unit from the chief state school officer. In some states, the adult education unit reports directly to the chief state school officer while in other states as many as four administrative levels separate them.

The other kind of diversity occurs in the unification or separation of key adult education programs. Adults who have not earned a high school diploma, and wish to work towards one, have access to a diploma or its equivalent through Adult Basic Education, High School Continuation, and General Education Development (GED) testing programs.

In most states those three programs are organized under a single administrative unit. In some states, two of the programs are under a single administrative unit and the other under a separate unit. In one state, each of the three programs is in a separate administrative unit.

These two diverse administrative concerns, the levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer and the unification of programs will constitute independent variables. They will be assessed for their relationship to key local program factors in each of the states for which uniform data are available. These factors are the dependent variables:

1. The percent of the target population, adults without high school diplomas, which is participating in the three programs.
2. State matching dollars appropriated for adult education, apportioned per individual in the target population.
3. The total state budget for adult education, per individual in the target population.
4. Cost per adult education student for 100 hours of instruction.
5. The percent of the total budget for public school education allocated to adult education.

In the second part of this study, the same independent variables will be used to assess measures which were obtained from a survey instrument which indicated the degree to which selected state departments of education perform certain functions.

The problem discussed leads to the following research questions which are answered in this dissertation.

Research Question 1 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the stated dependent variables?

Research Question 2 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in state departments of education and the stated dependent variables?

Research Question 3 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Research Question 4 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in a state department of education, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Significance of the Problem

The study has potential significance for each of the 50 state departments of education. Identification of effective organizational patterns for adult education services may suggest a review of administrative or contract structures for adult education within each state department of education and an assessment of the relative advantages and disadvantages of their assignment of responsibility for adult education in the administrative hierarchy.

The study provides new information in the comparison of organizational patterns among state departments of education in adult education. The author found no existing compilation of information either of the independent variables of levels removed or unification of services for adult education.

The survey instrument developed for the study provides a useful tool for state departments of education. The instrument can be used to assess the effectiveness of the state level adult education services as perceived by local education agency administrators.

Scope and Limitations of This Study

In the first part of the study the two independent variables, levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer and unification of program, will be assessed against stated dependent variables for each of the 50 states.

In the second part of the study, the survey instrument will be used to gather data from selected local adult education program directors in the six states which constitute U.S. Office of Education Region V. These states are Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. Sufficient diversity exists among these states to consider them as a representation of total population. These states are suitable for comparison because of their diversity in administrative levels and because the adult education units are representatively removed from the chief state school officer. They are similar in geographical proximity,

concentration of major cities , and characteristics of their populations . These states constitute a U.S. Office of Education administrative unit operating under the direction of a Regional Program Officer based in Chicago . The six states worked cooperatively in a regional staff development project in adult basic education from 1973 to 1975 . State directors of adult education in these states offered their cooperation and assistance in conducting the required research .

There are limitations to the study . The survey instrument gathered useful information from the six states in Region V . One of the limitations was the scarcity of national data gathered in adult education . The 1977 study conducted by the National Advisory Council on Adult Education is the first such effort to gather uniform data from the states . It was not possible to gather data which are missing in the NACAE report . Missing data are reported as missing data and are not included in the statistical analysis .

The compilation of information concerning unification of adult education services is new information . It was not anticipated that 42 of the 50 states would have an identical unified structure , and seven of the remaining eight states have a similar second pattern . This unforeseen lack of diversity necessitated descriptive as well as statistical analysis and reporting .

Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation will be presented in five chapters.

Chapter I is an introduction and overview of the dissertation. Chapter II presents a review of the literature. Chapter III explains the methodology followed in research, and a description of statistics used in analysis of the data. Chapter IV presents findings, and the summary and conclusions are found in Chapter V.

Definition of Terms

Adult Basic Education is a federally funded program to provide instruction for adults age 16 and over who are not enrolled in the public schools, and whose functional educational level is at the 8th grade or below. Adult Basic Education is referred to as ABE.

Adult Basic Education and Secondary Adult Education (ABE/SAE) are programs in local education agencies consisting of Adult Basic Education, High School Continuation, and General Education Development Programs.

Adult High School Continuation Programs are those organized instructional programs consisting of those courses provided by a public high school for which credit may be granted toward the issuance of a high school diploma. Adult High School Continuation is referred to as HSC.

Adult Vocational Education is an education program of knowledge and skills to allow the adult to upgrade himself in his present occupation, retrain himself in his occupation, or to prepare himself to enter another occupation suitable to his abilities.

Chief State School Officer is the highest ranking administrator in state departments of education. Most Chief State School Officers are referred to as State Superintendents.

Community Education is defined as a program in which a public building, including but not limited to a public elementary or secondary school or a community or junior college, is used as a community center operated in conjunction with other groups in the community, community organizations, and local governmental community services for the community that center serves in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of the community.

The General Education Development Programs are comprised of five examinations in the academic areas of English grammar and spelling, social studies, natural sciences, literature, and mathematics. Upon passage of all five tests with a designated overall average and individual minimum scores, participants in Ohio are awarded a Certificate of High School Equivalence. The General Education Development Program is referred to as GED.

Levels Removed refers to the number of administrative levels separating the highest identifiable adult education unit in state departments of education table of organization charts, from the chief state school officer.

Local Education Agency (LEA) are the local school districts in each state, sometimes referred to as local school corporations.

State Education Agency (SEA) is the State Department of Education, sometimes referred to as Department of Public Instruction.

Unification of Services refers to Adult Basic Education, High School Continuation, and General Education Development testing programs as they are administratively organized into one, two, or three administrative units in state departments of education.

Footnotes for Chapter I

1

Constitution of the United States -- The Tenth Amendment

2

Lee M. Thurston and William H. Roe, State School Administration (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 57.

3

Arthur B. Moehlman, School Administration (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951), p. 323.

4

Roald F. Campbell and Tim I. Mazzoni, Jr. State Policy Making for the Schools: A Comparative Analysis (the Educational Governance Project, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1974), p. 1

5

The State Department of Education, National Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington D.C., 1952, p. 9.

6

Ibid, p. 9.

7

Ibid, p. 10.

8

Moehlman, Op. Cit., p. 338.

9

The State Department of Education, Op. Cit., p. 17.

10

State and Local Responsibilities for Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington D.C., 1968, p. 12.

11

Thurston and Rowe, Op. Cit., p. 83.

12

Campbell and Mazzoni, Op. Cit., p. 402.

The State Department of Education, Op. Cit., p. 31.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

While literature abounds in theory and practice of administration and in the field of adult education, few efforts have been made to study the administration of adult education in state departments of education. Several key studies will be reviewed. A historical review of adult education in the Ohio Department of Education will be made as an example of how adult education evolved in its present state in Ohio, a representative state department of education. Some historical events are reported which indirectly influenced adult education in Ohio.

This chapter will be organized in two major sections. The first section will discuss U.S. Office of Education publications in 1927, 1940, and 1959, which reviewed the status of adult education in the states. A 1977 report by the National Advisory Council on Adult Education will be discussed.

The second section will review the development of adult education in the Ohio Department of Education.

U.S. Office of Education 1927 Study

In 1927 the Bureau of Education was a part of the Department of Interior. Bulletin No. 18, Public Education of Adults in the Years 1924-26, was completed from results of a questionnaire sent out by the Bureau during the 1924-26 biennium. The questionnaire concerned events which had transpired in the field of adult education in state departments of education, in city school systems, and in colleges and universities.

According to the report, 60 percent of the states had at that time enacted legislation which tended to encourage adult education. Summaries of state laws were given for California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Tennessee.

The report states, "To make a state system of elementary adult education effective there should be state supervision."¹ It was reported that twenty-four states were giving supervision to such work, with thirteen states having full-time supervisors.

"Outstanding Activities" of state departments of education were reviewed for California, Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Most of these activities related to teaching immigrants, American Indians, and illiterates. It is interesting

to note that Virginia claimed to have reduced the number of illiterates under age 20 from 28,000 to 14,000 in a five year period.

Other than the summary statements about staffing supervisory positions, no mention is made of how the administration of state departments was organized.

U.S. Office of Education 1940 Study

The 1940 report, Supervision of Education for Out-of-School Youth and Adults as a Function of State Departments of Education, was one of a series of monographs written by a team of twenty representatives of the U.S. Office of Education who visited state departments of education throughout the U.S. in 1939. The monograph deals with the origin, development, personnel employed, and major functions and procedures used by state departments of education.

Legislation by states providing schools for adults had its origin in Ohio in 1839. Three trends are noted as having developed since then.²

They are:

1. state legislation recognizing adult education as an accepted and necessary feature of public education;
2. broadening of evening adult schools from special groups such as illiterates and aliens to include all types of education for all types of adults, and
3. the growing practice of providing financial aid and supervision through state departments of education.

The major section of the 1940 report is titled "Development, Organization and Procedures in State Supervision of Adult Education." The 1940 report included the status of selected states with reported "Comprehensive Programs of Adult Education." Information is presented which illustrates the growing diversity of administrative patterns.³ Following is the writer's summarization of the report.

California. A Division of Adult and Continuing Education has been created in the Department of Education. The chief of the division has responsibility for the entire field of adult education, and is responsible to the state superintendent of instruction. Funds for support of the central staff are included in the regular appropriation for the Department.

Connecticut. A 1927 law provided that the state board of education should establish a division to have charge of all adult education in the state department of education and should support a director thereof. Financial aid to adult education activities includes amounts paid toward the salaries of local directors and a grant based on average daily attendance of adults.

Delaware. There is now in the state department of education a division of adult education and a service bureau for foreign born. One director serves both agencies. A state formula provided that one percent of the entire state appropriation for public education be delegated to the support of non-vocational adult education. For the 1939-41 biennium the legislature reduced this to 1/2 of one percent.

New York. A Bureau of Americanization has existed for two decades. This was later consolidated with the bureau of vocational education. In 1927 the bureau became the bureau of adult education, which in 1937 joined the bureau of library extension to form the present division of adult education and library extension. At present, local school boards must support educational activities for adults from local funds.

North Carolina. While there is a fairly large division of adult education at work in the state department of education, only the director is regarded as a member of the department staff. In addition to this director, this division has an assistant director, a field representative and literacy specialist, and two state supervisors, all of whom are paid out of Works Progress Administration funds. A state appropriation provides aid on a 50-50 basis to county and city school systems meeting state qualifications.

Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has a division of extension education which coordinates with other divisions within the department, and has direct supervision over all adult education activities within the department except for vocational rehabilitation. The state aid program for adult education is based primarily upon a minimum salary schedule for teachers.

Rhode Island. The state now employs a state supervisor of adult education and Americanization. Half of the local district adult education expenditures are reimbursed for the first \$1,000, and one-fifth of expenses above \$1,000 are provided by the state.

South Carolina. South Carolina employs an adult education supervisor who is responsible directly to the state superintendent of education. The state also employs a director of extension. For the 1937-38 school year the state appropriated \$25,000 for adult education. About \$5,000 was expended for expenses of the state office, the rest was used to pay salaries of teachers of illiterates and citizenship.

Utah. Although the law permits the state superintendent to employ a state director of adult education, such a director is not now being employed. Supervisory duties are carried on by members of the existing staff. A state-aided supplementary program is available to ongoing programs, but local districts provide most of the money needed.

Virginia. The state board authorized the hiring of a state supervisor of adult education. The State superintendent has placed this person in the division of special and adult education. The state board has appropriated \$25,000 each

of the last two years for the development of adult education in the state. Monies paid from state funds have been contingent upon supplying at least an equal amount by the local school district.

The remainder of the report deals with special organizations and fields served as a part of adult education. These include the Works Progress Administration, National Youth Administration, and Civilian Conservation Corps. Supervision by radio, public forums, and other related areas were also reported.

U.S. Office of Education 1959 Study

In 1959 the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare published Miscellaneous No. 31, Adult Education Services of State Departments of Education. This report was based on responses from every state department of education to inquiries sent out in the fall of 1957. The report is comprehensive in its coverage of all aspects of general adult education, with several issues having direct implications for state department administrative organization.

Three major service areas are defined which should be administered by a state director of adult education.⁴ These are:

(1) administrative and regulatory obligation, (2) consultative and advisory assistance, and (3) communication and interpretation services. These categories were used in formulating the instrument used by the author in this study, and are discussed in further detail in Chapter 3.

Comparative data are presented for 1926-27, 1946-47, and 1956-57 for professional staff assigned to general adult education in state departments of education.⁵ With few exceptions, no significant change is noted. In 1926-27, 15 states had full directors. In 1946-47 the number was reduced to 14, and further changed to 13 in 1956-57.

During the same time the aggregate full time equivalent of professional staff increased in the states from an average of 31.6 in 1926-27 to 53.0 in 1946-47. This number declined to an average of 47.9 in 1956-57.

State representatives who responded to the USOE survey were asked to recommend the best administrative arrangement for adult education in the structure of state departments of education. The question was open ended, and drew the following responses:⁶

Fifteen state representatives feel there should be a separate division of adult education with a director or assistant superintendent assigned to this area; nine state representatives feel adult education administrators should be on a par with areas of elementary and secondary education. Eight other representatives think general adult education should be independent of vocational education and coordinate with it. Eight representatives suggest that the director of adult education should report to the assistant commissioner or assistant superintendent of public instruction. Representatives of fifteen states left this question blank.

The study showed that eleven directors of general adult education report directly to the chief state school officer, nine to the assistant or deputy superintendent, four to the Division of Curriculum or Instruction, three to the director of the Division of Elementary or Secondary

Education and one to the director of Vocational Education. In 21 states no person was assigned to the state level director's position, or if some-one were assigned, responsibilities were marginal.⁷

The 1977 Study

In 1977, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education conducted an extensive survey of adult education in the states. The National Advisory Council was created as a result of legislation passed by the Congress of the United States in 1970. The council's responsibilities include advising the Commissioner of Education on matters of policy as well as reviewing "the administration and effectiveness" of programs under the Adult Education Act and making "recommendations with respect thereto."⁸

Among several issues addressed by the study was the question of how the states support adult education. Nine outcome variables of state support were identified. The eighth variable was, "Organizational structure of state departments of education; placement of adult education unit within state department structure."⁹

In the analysis of organizational structure, the National Advisory Council report states that in the early 1960's, approximately a dozen states had at least one staff position assigned to adult education at the state agency level. Further, "With the passage of PL 89-452, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Title II-B, Adult Basic Education), and later the Adult Education Act of 1966 (PL 89-750), state departments of education recognized

the need for reorganization or developing new units in the state education agency to effectuate a system for Federal/State grant funds to be allocated to local education agencies."¹⁰ As a result, at the time of the report, every state, territory and the District of Columbia had established a position in the state agency with responsibility for administration of the adult education act.

Statistics proposed by the National Advisory Council include the percent of each state's target population participating in key adult education programs, the amount of state funds allocated for each student in the target population, the total state and local dollars allocated for each student in the target population, the state appropriation for adult education compared with the state appropriation for general education. These items were selected as dependent variables for purposes of this study, and are further discussed in Chapter 3.

History of Adult Education and the Ohio Department of Education

While adult education in each state department of education has its own evolution and history, it is instructive to review the growth of adult education in a specific state department of education. Ohio was selected as representative of the states. Ohio's history in Adult Education dates to the earliest emergence of adult education in the United States.

Key roles in the evolution of adult education in Ohio were played by the state and national professional adult education organizations, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Ohio and national legislatures, and the Ohio Department of Education.

The historical sequence will be reviewed chronologically and divided into four major periods. The formative years run from 1839 to 1900. The years of 1900 to 1926 show an emerging role of the Ohio Department of Education. The years between 1926 and 1950 show a number of noteworthy publications by the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Education Association. The greatest amount of growth in the field of adult education has occurred from 1950 to present.

The Formative Years

The earliest state legislation in the United States concerning adult education was enacted by the Thirty Seventh General Assembly of Ohio in 1839. This body enacted a law "To amend an act entitled AN ACT for the support of better regulation of common schools and to create permanently the office of superintendent."¹¹ Section 16 of this act contained the following:¹²

Sec. 16. That in all districts composed in whole or in part of an incorporated town, city, or borough, it shall be the duty of the directors to provide a suitable number of evening common schools for the instruction of such male youth over twelve years of age as are prevented by their daily vocation from attending day schools, which schools shall be subject to such regulations as the directors from time to time may adopt for the government thereof.

The law was intended to assist out-of-school youth, but it did not exclude adults. With this enabling legislation, the Cincinnati Public Schools started Ohio's first evening school in 1840. The Cleveland City Schools instituted an evening school in 1850.

The growth of adult education in Ohio during the formative years parallels national trends. Adult evening schools proliferated in the late 1800's, largely designed for persons over the age of twelve. Morehead observes, "As the public education programs developed, the age of employed youth gradually shifted upward until the evening programs of literacy and basic skills were being directed toward a truly adult clientele. This era of emphasis on the fundamental skills continued until approximately 1900."¹³

1900-1926

Adult education services were first assigned to the Ohio Department of Education in 1917 as a result of Public Law 347 of the 64th Congress, known as the Smith Hughes Act. Key portions of this legislation are found in Section 5.¹⁴

Sec. 5. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided for in sections two, three and four of this Act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this Act and designate or create a State board, consisting of not less than three members, and having all necessary power to cooperate, as herein provided, with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the administration of public education in the State, or any State board having charge of the administration of any kind of vocational education in the State may, if the State so elect, be designated as the State board, for the purposes of this Act.

Provisions for adult education are found in Section 11 of that legislation which states, in part: ¹⁵

That at least one-third of the sum appropriated to any state for the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects shall, if expended, be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers over fourteen years of age who have entered upon employment, and such subjects in a part-time school or class may mean any subject given to enlarge the civic or vocational intelligence of such workers over fourteen and less than eighteen years of age; that such part-time schools or classes shall provide for not less than one hundred and forty-four hours of classroom instruction per year; that evening industrial schools shall fix the age of sixteen years a minimum entrance requirement and shall confine instruction to that which is supplemental to the daily employment.

A position of adult education supervisor was created in the Division of Vocational Education in the Ohio Department of Education utilizing funds provided through this legislation.

In an address "Perspectives on Adult Education in Ohio", Hendrickson stated:¹⁶

The beginning of the Adult Education Movement in Ohio was influenced by three national conferences on adult education held under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation during 1924-25, out of which grew the original national organization, the American Association for Adult Education, in 1926. One of these national conferences was held in Cleveland in 1925.

An early publication by the Ohio Department of Education concerning adult education appeared in 1925 with the title, "Adult Education in Ohio -- Facts and Figures," and bearing the subtitle "Let's Sweep Ohio Clean of Illiteracy." Illiteracy facts presented for the United States and for Ohio were based on 1920 Census data. Ohio data included the following figures:¹⁷

Ohio stands fifteenth among the states in percentage of illiteracy.

Ohio stands twenty third in percentage of native white illiteracy.

There are 131,006 people over 10 years of age who cannot read and write their names.

There are 126,645 illiterate voters in the state; 70,102 are men and 55,543 are women.

The percentage of illiteracy ranges from 0.4 in Morrow County to 7.0 in Jefferson County.

Illiteracy in Ohio is largely an urban problem; 94,871 of the state's illiterates live in cities; 36,135 live in the rural sections.

Following this review of facts about illiteracy, the publication briefly reviewed adult education in the State Penitentiary where 18 percent of the 1200 prisoners reportedly were unable to read and write.¹⁸ Further emphasis was given to Americanization programs, defined as "Americanization does not have to do simply with immigration alone. I might define it as making good American citizens of all who walk upon Ohio soil."¹⁹

The remainder of the publication contains chapter headings as follows:

Athens County's Recent Experiment -- by Mrs. J.M. Hyde, Chairman of Illiteracy, Ohio Federation of Womens Clubs.

Public Sentiment and Illiteracy -- by Dr. S.K. Mardis, Athens, Ohio.

The Massillon Americanization School -- by Florence Strevy, Supervisor.

Report of Elementary Adult Education in Cleveland -- by Frank Porter, Director of Adult Education.

A Report from Toledo -- by Mary M. Howatt, Assistant to Director, R.E. Dugdale.

Ingots from Columbus' Own "Melting Pot" -- (Reprint from Columbus Citizen).

1926 to 1950

In 1926 a second Ohio Department of Education adult education publication appeared. Titled "The Evening High School Bulletin," the publication was prepared by Lawrence Louthian, High School Supervisor.

Louthian acknowledged "The Students in the evening high schools are for the most part adult people who have come to realize the need of specific training to meet the requirements of a job and of daily living."²⁰ The high school is necessary to education, according to Louthian, for the following reasons.²¹

High school training is an essential part of present-day education. To enter schools of the various professions, the Ohio law requires a diploma from high school. A physician, a dentist, a teacher, or an attorney must now have a high school diploma. Preliminary to the examination for the degree of Certified Public Accountant, the candidate must present a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Standards listed for evening high schools include 120 hours of instruction offered for a unit of credit, a minimum of 75% of classes attended to earn credit, and that each school must have a graduating class each year. Required subjects are specified along with majors and minors, and suggested general and technical curricula are given.

Discussing the need for such regulations, Louthian stated "If a man or woman needs a second chance to secure a secondary education, he deserves the same quality of instruction and other advantages as will be found in the best of Day High School. It means standardization. It means organization. It means an attempt to do about the same type and quantity of work that is done in the Day High School."²²

A 1940 report by the U.S. Office of Education cited Ohio as one of fifteen State Departments of Education who provided supervision of adult education through public forums. A person in a state level position prepared two bulletins, Suggestions on Forum Planning and Suggestions for Planning Adult Education Programs Through Forums and Classes, in collaboration with the Bureau of Special and Adult Education at The Ohio State University.²³ A state forum counselor reportedly worked in cooperation with the Ohio Association of Adult Education and other interested agencies in the field.

The position was federally funded for an initial three and one-half month period. Ohio was one of the five states which continued to employ the state forum counselor. No records were located to indicate when and how the program was terminated.

In 1947, the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association received a report from the Educational Council of the OEA. This report included a three page section on Recreational Programs and Adult Education.

The report focused on recreational programs as well as adult education programs. The Ohio general code in Sections 4836-5 and 4836-10 authorized a board of education to "provide evening schools, Americanization schools, and to employ supervisors to direct or conduct social and recreational work in the school district, the cost

of the program to be paid from the general fund of the district or from tuition."²⁴ The report included the results of a survey of 166 city and exempted village school districts. Only 28 of the 166 districts stated that they had an adult education program operating under provisions of the legislation cited.

The survey included the question, "In your opinion, is there any legislation needed in connection with the establishment and operation of a recreational or adult educational program in your school district?" Results showed 50 school districts reporting in the affirmative and 116 in the negative.²⁵

Concluding remarks in the report include the following:²⁶

... since only 30 percent of the city superintendents and 30 percent of the exempted villages see a need for legislation, no recommendation for legislative action is needed at this time.

It is recommended that the Ohio Schools devote some space to adult education in the hope that some interest be stimulated in those districts which as yet have no program for serving the non-vocational needs of the adults in their districts.

The national adult education movement received an important thrust in 1947 when the General Education Development (GED) testing program, developed by the United States Armed Forces Institute and administered by the Veterans Testing Service, became available to non-veterans for the first time.²⁷ State departments of education, including Ohio, became involved in GED testing at a later date.

1950 to Present

Ohio played a role in the national adult education movement in 1951. The Founding Assembly for a new national organization met in Columbus under the sponsorship of the Ohio State Adult Education Organization. Andrew Hendrickson was chairman of the session during which the motion was passed which named the new organization The Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.²⁸

Additional involvement of the Ohio Department of Education in adult education occurred in 1956 as a result of the National Association of Public School Adult Education receiving a grant from the Ford Foundation. NAPSAE decided to use some of the grant funds to support the staffing of adult education positions in state departments of education.²⁹ The offer to fund a state level position was carried to State Superintendent E.E. Holt by Dr. Andrew Hendrickson in his capacity as representative of the Ohio Adult Education Association, at the request of NAPSAE's Bob Luke.

State Superintendent E.E. Holt accepted the offer, and succeeded in gaining approval of the position in the state budget so that state support would exist when the Ford Foundation funds were withdrawn. Karl Kessler filled the staff position in January, 1960. The position was administratively assigned to the Division of Elementary

Education. The Brief History of the State Board of Education in Ohio summarizes,

One of its early actions in 1960 was the acceptance of a grant from the National Association of Public School Adult Educators to create the position of Supervisor of Adult Education, such supervisor to serve local programs and directors of general adult education and to act as a consultant in this area. Later the Board approved a state-wide conference on adult education and authorized the appointment of a Citizens Committee to study adult education in Ohio.

In 1956, the Bureau of Special and Adult Education at the Ohio State University was under the direction of Professor Herschel Nisonger. In 1957 the Bureau was combined with the Bureau of Educational Research and Service. Included in the new organization was a Division of Adult Education. An early publication by the newly created Division was the 1958 publication, Improving Adult Education in Ohio's Public Schools. The publication presented the results of a survey of enrollments and administrative practices, and interviews and correspondence between Hendrickson and workers in the adult education profession.

The book contained three major topics. The first reported the results of the surveys. The second part discussed the legal status of adult education in Ohio and methods of starting and improving adult education programs. The final part contained suggestions for the Ohio

Department of Education in promoting and supervising adult education in the public schools.

The rationale for such a publication originating from an institution of higher education is given in the preface. Hendrickson states, "In states where the Departments of Public Instruction provide no supervisory service for general adult education, it can be assumed that tax-supported universities and colleges have a responsibility for providing these services."³¹ Hendrickson adds at a later point, "Except for a few short emergency periods, Ohio has never had a state staff assigned to general adult education, this function has been largely dormant."³²

In Chapter V, "The Role of the State Department of Public Instruction in Adult Education, Hendrickson poses the questions, "What benefits would accrue to adult education if state supervisory services were established? What specific services could be performed by a supervisor in the State Department?" Five primary tasks were identified.³³

1. He could provide encouragement and assistance to school superintendents wishing to initiate or improve a program.
2. He could interpret law governing adult education.
3. He could gather useful program data.
4. He could help set standards.
5. He could facilitate the in-service training of adult education leaders and teachers.

In a concluding paragraph, Hendrickson states:

If the services mentioned in this section were to be performed, we could be assured that sound growth would take place in both quantity and quality of programs. The result would be that adult education in Ohio's schools would take its rightful place along with elementary and secondary education as it is doing in other progressive states.³⁴

An illustration of the short emergency periods when adult education services were provided through the department of education occurred following the enactment of PL 81-920 by Congress. This bill, the Federal Civil Defense Act, was signed into law in September, 1950. Federal funds made available to reimburse instructional hours in Civil Defense Education were not utilized in Ohio until 1962. Four staff members in the department became teacher trainers, and conducted in-service training throughout the state. Participants on the local level who completed the course received certificates from the department of education. The program terminated with the withdrawal of federal funds, and state staff returned to their normally assigned duties.

A 1963 publication, A Brief History of the State Board of Education of Ohio, reviewed this program under the heading, "Other actions included,"³⁵

Entered into a contract with the U.S. Commissioner of Education for a civil defense adult education program in Ohio. The course, strictly for adults, is called "Education for Survival."

A reorganization within the Department of Education took place in 1959. The publication, A Brief History of the State Board of Education in Ohio observed, "The Board created two new divisions in the department during 1959. One was the Division of Guidance and Testing to replace the former Division of Scholarship Tests."³⁶ This organization resulted from funding provided in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This organization was significant to adult education because limited high school equivalency testing had been administered through the Division of Scholarship Tests since the early 1930's. When the Ohio State Board of Education adopted the GED testing program in 1962, it was assigned to the Division of Guidance and Testing.

The emerging role of adult education was additionally influenced by the GED testing program. Although non-veterans had been participants in the testing program since 1947, administrative responsibility for the program remained with the Veterans Testing Service. In 1963, in recognition of this change, the Veteran Testing Service was renamed the General Educational Development Testing Service.³⁷

Perhaps the key thrust in adult education which occurred through federal legislation was the 1964 enactment of adult basic education legislation. As a part of the Lyndon Johnson-initiated War on Poverty, federal funds were provided to educate adults past age 18 who were not currently enrolled in public schools, and whose functional educational level was at or below an eighth grade level. This legislation had a

lasting impact on Ohio and all other states because it provided an ongoing source of funds earmarked for adult education.

The passage of the original legislation and its subsequent transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the U.S. Office of Education is reviewed in the First Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education.

Presented in August, 1968, the report states,³⁸

With the passage of Title II-B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Congress established the Adult Basic Education Program in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). The program began operation in 1965, funded by OEO and administered by the Office of Education through its Adult Education Branch. The Adult Education Act of 1966 shifted the administration and the funding of the program to the Office of Education, to be conducted through the Adult Education Branch in the Division of Adult Education Programs, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Library Programs.

The goal of the original legislation is stated in the ABE Staff Training Manual of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.³⁹

The adult basic education program is the only federal program charged by the Congress to provide literacy programs to under-educated adults. It is committed to one goal; to eliminate illiteracy or functional illiteracy among the adult population.

The intended purpose of the act is reviewed in An Historical Perspective on Adult Education Legislation:⁴⁰

It is the purpose of this legislation to initiate programs of instruction for persons eighteen years old and older whose inability to read or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to obtain or retain employment.

The Ohio Department of Education responded by creating a Division of Federal Assistance, whose responsibility was to provide an accountable delivery system of federally funded programs to Ohio's public schools. The Division of Federal Assistance assumed responsibility for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which included Adult Basic Education. With the adult basic education program placed in the Division of Federal Assistance, the Ohio Department of Education had staff positions in adult education placed in the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Division of Guidance and Testing, and Division of Federal Assistance.

Staff positions proliferated in 1965 and 1966. Karl Kessler, who has been with the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education since 1960, was temporarily assigned to the Division of Federal Assistance to initiate the first state plan in ABE. A full-time position was added in the Division of Federal Assistance, and Kessler returned to adult education responsibility in the Division of Elementary Education. William Ruth joined the Division of Vocational Education as adult education consultant for Distributive Education. S.K. Gartrell and George Travis joined the Division of Federal Assistance in 1966 as consultants in adult basic education.

Dr. Paul Kohli was assigned responsibility for the state GED program also in 1966. The air of permanence that began to occur in adult education staffing in the Department of Education is reflected by the fact that Kessler, Ruth, Gartrell, Travis and Kohli still retained their basic functions in their respective divisions in 1976.

In 1966 the 106th General Assembly of Ohio passed Amended House Bill 810. A part of this bill stated:⁴¹

The state board of education shall prepare and submit to the general assembly, not later than January 1, 1967, a master plan for the organization of school districts in this state.

The Ohio Department of Education accepted this legislative mandate. One of the committees organized as part of the study was the Advisory Committee on Adult Education.

This Committee was chaired by Dr. G. Robert Holsinger, Dean of Continuing Education at The Ohio State University. Committee members included Miss Nora Duffy, President of the Ohio Association for Adult Education, Herbert Detrick, President of the Ohio Association for Public School Adult Educators, Dr. Collins Burnett, Professor of Education, The Ohio State University, Mr. Mark Hanna, past President of the Ohio Association for Adult Education, and Dr. Andrew Hendrickson, Director, Center for Adult Education at The Ohio State University.

The Committee's final report discussed such diverse topics as the role of the schools in adult education, the financing of adult education in the United States, and financial support for adult education in Ohio's schools.

The final recommendation of the Committee concerned state leadership. The recommendation reads:⁴²

The scope of the entire adult education program is so extensive and its administration so complex as to demand that there be established in the State Department of Education a separate division of adult education on a par with the division of elementary and secondary and vocational education.

Only with this degree of visibility and autonomy can a competent job be done of interpreting school laws; advising school boards; school administrators and local school directors; keeping liaison with federal government agencies and administering federally supported adult education programs with those of other agencies and with programs in other divisions of the Department of Education.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Adult Education was not included in the published report on school district organization. Since the implementation of some of these recommendations required legislative action, the report was referred to the Legislative Committee of the State Board of Education for appropriate action.⁴³

The final report to the legislature contained few references to adult education. It was acknowledged in a section on the changing age structure of the Ohio population that the 18-24 age group would increase by almost a third during 1965-75.⁴⁴ A chapter titled

"Educational Needs, Programs and Services" included a recommendation to provide "opportunities for continuing education, both in general education and in vocational training and vocational re-training."⁴⁵ In listing program needs, programs for older youths and adults who wish to finish secondary schools, and programs for adults in evening schools are acknowledged.⁴⁶

In 1966 the Ohio Association for Public School Adult Education, a state professional adult education organization, responded to an expressed need by their membership in conducting a two-day workshop on High School Diplomas for Adults. A result of this workshop was a published Study Report on High School Diplomas for Adults.

Citing then current Ohio high school standards which were necessary for issuance of a diploma, the report stated that Ohio's standards were less flexible than those recommended by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It was suggested in the report that in addition to credit for regular classroom work, credit should be granted where appropriate by examination, by placement examination, for military service and service schools for extension and correspondence study, for GED tests, for planned programs of independent study, and for work experience.⁴⁷ These forward-looking recommendations remain largely ignored to this date.

The appointment of James W. Miller to the position of Section Chief for Special Programs in the Division of Federal Assistance occurred in 1967. Miller assumed administrative responsibility for adult basic education. His responsibilities remained the same when the position title changed to that of Assistant Director of the Division and remained until 1976 when he was appointed Director of the Division of Federal Assistance. Miller became the first person in the department with background experience in adult education to achieve the rank of Division Director.

As appropriations in adult basic education increased from the federal government, it became increasingly difficult for the state to provide the ten percent matching funds required by federal legislation. Participating local education agencies had been asked to declare costs which could be classified as matching funds, but these efforts proved to be cumbersome and inadequate.

The Ohio legislature responded in 1968 with an annual appropriation of \$115,000 for adult basic education. These funds were allocated through the Division of Federal Assistance and each participating local district received an allocation including federal as well as state dollars.

In 1968, Dr. Paul Kohli was appointed as director of the GED testing program for Ohio, which remained housed in the Division of Guidance and Testing. Kohli has remained chief administrator to date.

During the 1960's the educational opportunities offered to Ohio citizens expanded through technical colleges offering two-year associate degree programs . Technical colleges are under the jurisdiction of the Ohio Board of Regents , which administers Ohio's higher education programs . At the same time , growth was occurring in expanding joint vocational school districts under the jurisdiction of the Ohio Department of Education . Both the joint vocational schools and the technical colleges offered programs for adults .

In 1969 , in an attempt to avoid conflict between these areas , a memorandum of understanding on Technical and Vocational Education was entered into by the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents .

The memorandum noted agreement that opportunities for vocational and technical education should be expanded throughout the state , but that determinations concerning the need for , and organization of vocational education should be made by the Department of Education and the individual school districts . Determinations concerning the need for , and organization of technical education should be made by the Ohio Board of Regents and the individual institutions of higher education .

In 1970 , federal funds earmarked for salaries for state departments of education became available to the Division of Vocational Education . Through a contractual arrangement with The Ohio State University , Dr. Paul Kohli was assigned to the University with faculty rank and benefits .

He remained assigned to the Division of Guidance and Testing as chief administrator of Ohio's GED program.

The Adult Education Act of 1966 was again amended in 1970. The statement of purpose of the legislation was revised to state:⁴⁸

It is the purpose of this legislation to expand educational opportunity and encourage the establishment of programs of adult public education that will enable all adults to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school and make available the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

Nineteen seventy was also noteworthy as the year in which the Ohio legislature again provided funds for adult education purposes. An annual appropriation of \$500,000 was made to support the Ohio High School Continuation program directed by Karl Kessler in the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education. As administered through the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, direct reimbursement is made to local districts when the program is completed. The reimbursement to local districts is based on \$5.00 per hour for 20 students, or a \$600 maximum for each adult education class.

The definition of an adult, which had been defined as "any individual who had attained the age of eighteen," was redefined in the legislation in 1970 to "any individual who had attained the age of sixteen."⁴⁹ This change was significant in its redefinition of the target population for adult basic education.

The Ohio Adult Basic Education program continued to show steady growth since its inception. In 1972 the Ohio legislature again recognized the need to keep pace with federal funding increases, and raised the state's annual appropriation to \$465,000.

The Adult Education Act of 1966 was amended in 1966 and in 1974. The primary emphasis of the 1966 amendments provided educational opportunities for adult Indians, while the 1974 amendments added a new dimension by adding and defining community education as a part of the legislation.⁵⁰ The 1974 amendments also made provision for each state to spend a minimum of 15 percent of their state allocations for staff development and demonstration projects.

In August of 1975, the position of Coordinator of Community Education was established within the Ohio Department of Education. Dr. Tom Hayden was hired to organize and initiate a statewide community education program. The position was made possible by the joint funding efforts of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and the Ohio Department of Education. The Mott Grant was awarded through the Eastern Michigan University Regional Center for Community Education. Hayden was assigned to the Division of Personnel, Publications and Legal Services. A fifth division of the Ohio Department of Education was now involved in the delivery of services to the adult citizens of Ohio.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Martin Essex was named Chairman of the National Community Education Advisory Council. The annual convention of the National Community Education Association was held in Cincinnati in 1975.

In 1976, a second full-time state level staff position was placed in the Community Education section in the Division of Personnel, Publications and Legal Services. This position was authorized as a part of a \$48,300 federal grant for a Community Education Developmental and Technical Assistance Project.

Summary

The literature review has cited U.S. Office of Education and National Advisory Council on Adult Education reports which show the status of adult education in state departments of education as it existed at certain points in time. Ohio was reviewed in greater detail to illustrate the diverse influences which brought adult education to where it existed in state departments of education in 1976.

U.S. Office of Education reports issued in 1927, 1940, and 1959 showed a progressive increase in the number of states which provided supervision in adult education, and increased supervisory responsibilities. The 1977 National Advisory Council reports a continuation of this increase, prompted primarily through funds provided by federal legislation. Similar expansion of state supervisory responsibility, and influence of federal legislation along with other factors, were found in Ohio.

The status of adult education in state departments of education in 1976 provides a data base for the research problem which is discussed in subsequent chapters of the study.

Footnotes for Chapter II

1

Public Education of Adults in the Years 1924-1926, Bulletin No. 18, 1927, (Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education), p. 7.

2

Supervision of Education for Out-of-School Youth and Adults as a Function of State Department of Education, Bulletin No. 6, 1940, (U.S. Office of Education), p. 3.

3

Ibid, p. 11.

4

Adult Education Services of State Departments of Education, Miscellaneous No. 31, (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare), p. 9.

5

Ibid, p. 23.

6

Ibid, p. 13.

7

Ibid, p. 12.

8

Beyond the Verge, (National Advisory Council on Adult Education), 1977, p. 1.

9

Adult Education Futures and Amendments -- Survey of State Support, (National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1977), p. 13.

10

Ibid, p. 176.

11

Laws of Ohio, Volume 37, 1838-39, Columbus, Ohio, p. 61.

12

Ibid., p. 64.

13

Lewis Morehead, "A Study of Problems Confronting the Public School Adult Education Administrator (Master's Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1962), p. 16.

14

Roy W. Roberts, Vocational and Practical Arts Education, Second Edition (Harper and Rowe: New York, 1975), p. 565.

15

Ibid., p. 569.

16

Andrew Hendrickson, "Perspectives on Adult Education in Ohio", (Monograph, 1967), p. 1.

17

Adult Education in Ohio (the F. J. Heer Printing Company: Columbus, Ohio, 1925), p. 3.

18

Ibid., p. 3.

19

Ibid., p. 4.

20

Evening High School Bulletin (the F. J. Heer Printing Company: Columbus, Ohio, 1926), p. 7.

21

Ibid., p. 5.

22

Ibid., p. 6.

23

Supervision of Education for Out of School Youth and Adults, Op. Cit., p. 69.

24

Report of the Education Council to the Ohio Education Association (Ohio Education, Columbus, 1947), p. 13.

25

Ibid., p. 14.

26

Ibid., p. 15.

27

The GED Manual (American Council on Education: Washington, D.C.), p. 1.

28

Hendrickson, Perspectives on Adult Education in Ohio, p. 3.

29

Ibid., p. 3.

30

A Brief History of the State Board of Education of Ohio (Issued by The State Board of Education, 1963), p. 15.

31

Hendrickson, Improving Adult Education in Ohio's Public Schools, p. iii.

32

Ibid., p. 26.

33

Ibid., p. 26.

34

Ibid., p. 28.

35

A Brief History of the State Board of Education of Ohio, p. 15.

36

Ibid., p. 14.

37

The GED Manual, P. Clt., p. 1.

38

Adult Basic Education -- Meeting the Challenge of 1970 (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 9.

39

ABE Staff Training (The Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., October, 1971), p. 12.

40

An Historical Perspective (National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1976), p. 13.

41

A Master Plan for School District Organization in Ohio (the State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, 1966), p. 11.

42

Summary and Recommendations From Final Report of The Advisory Committee on Adult Education, October 5, 1966, p. 7.

43

A Brief History of the State Board of Education in Ohio, 1956-1966, p. 13.

44

Master Plan For School District Organization in Ohio, Op. Cit., p. 11.

45

Ibid., p. 91.

46

Ibid., p. 95.

47

Study Report on High School Diplomas for Adults (the Ohio Association for Public School Adult Education, Columbus, Ohio, 1966), p.4. p. 4.

48

An Historical Perspective, Op. Cit., p. 23-69.

49

Ibid., p. 24.

50

Ibid., p. 29.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter will be divided into four sections. The first section will explain the independent variable Levels Removed. The second section will explain the independent variable Unification. The third section will explain the design of the survey instrument and how it was used. The fourth section will explain how the data were analyzed.

Levels Removed

The independent variable Levels Removed refers to the number of administrative levels which separate the highest placed adult education person from the chief state school officer in the table of organization of the department of education for each state.

Initially, a letter was sent to the director of adult education in each of the 50 states to request an organizational chart for that state department of education. Each of the 50 states responded to the request. A classification scheme was developed to identify the number of levels of administrative organization which separated the highest vertically identified adult education service from the chief state school officer.

This classification was developed by a three person panel of experts.

A follow-up letter was sent to each of the 50 state directors of adult education which presented the classification of levels removed for that state, as determined by the three person panel. A return verification was requested. Verifications were received from 49 of the 50 states. A final analysis showed adult education in state departments of education ranging from states reporting directly to the chief state school officer, to states with four intervening levels. Results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Administrative Levels Separating Adult Education
From The Chief State School Officer

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States
Report directly to CSSO	2
1 level removed	13
2 levels removed	20
3 levels removed	11
4 levels removed	<u>4</u>
Total	50

This classification, the number of administrative Levels Removed, operated as an independent variable. Dependent variables were abstracted from data reported by the states to the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Those data were presented in a 1977 report by the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. The dependent variables were:

- 1) The percent of each state's target population over age 16 with less than a high school diploma, which was participating in the Adult Basic Education, High School Certification, and GED programs. Data were reported in whole numbers which identified the target population for each state and the program enrollment for Adult Basic Education, High School Completion and GED programs. A conversion to percentages was necessary for comparison of data among the states.
- 2) The amount of state funds allocated for each student in the target population.
- 3) The total state and local dollars allocated for each student in the target population.
- 4) The cost per 100 hours of instruction for adult education.
- 5) The state appropriation for adult education compared with the state appropriation for general education.

A one-way analysis of variance was used for each of the dependent variables to determine the significance of relationships with the independent variable Levels Removed at the $P < 0.05$ level. Scheffe post hoc contrast tests were used to identify the points at which any differences occurred.

Frequency counts, mean scores and standard deviations were reported for the data.

Unification of Services

The follow-up letter sent to each of the 50 state directors of adult education, in which verification of the number of levels removed was requested, included a request for additional information. The question asked was, "Are Adult Basic Education, High School Continuation and GED programs on the state level organized in one, two or three administrative units? Please explain." Responses were received from 49 of the 50 states. Analysis showed Adult Basic Education, High School Continuation and GED programs to be organized in one administrative unit in most states, in two administrative units in several states, and in three administrative units in one state only. Results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Administrative Unification Of Adult Education
In State Departments Of Education

Number of Units	Number of States
1 administrative unit	42
2 administrative units	7
3 administrative units	<u>1</u>
Total	50

This classification, the unification of services, operated as a second independent variable. The same dependent variables were used as were used with the independent variable, Levels Removed. Identical statistical procedures were used in analysis of the data.

The Survey Instrument

The literature review identified two sources which classified functions that may be performed by a state department of education in the adult education area. Hendrickson listed five major functions.¹

These were:

1. Encourage and provide assistance in initiating or improving programs
2. Interpret laws

3. Gather data
4. Set standards
5. Facilitate in-service training

The 1960 report by the U.S. Office of Education listed three major service areas of state departments of education in adult education.²

Classified according to functions, the service areas were:

Administrative and Regulatory

- 1) Collect statistics;
- 2) Certify part-time teachers;
- 3) Organize and conduct state conferences;
- 4) Organize and promote in-service training;
- 5) Cooperatively establish standards for and approving adult education classes and group meetings;
- 6) Establish policies regarding standardized examinations;
- 7) Accrediting public schools;
- 8) Allocating state funds, and
- 9) Operating needed programs not adequately provided by other educational agencies.

Consultative and Advisory Assistance

- 1) Stimulating and assisting local school officials establishing programs;
- 2) Assisting local school officials with problems of curriculum, teaching methods and organization;

- 3) Preparing and publishing resource materials for teachers, directors, and superintendents;
- 4) Developing and proposing methods of financing adult education;
- 5) Assisting and encouraging the development of written policies pertaining to local and state responsibilities for general adult education, and
- 6) Assisting and suggesting methods of cooperation between institutions and agencies engaged in adult education.

Communication and Interpretation

- 1) Maintain a clearinghouse of ideas, materials and resources;
- 2) Publication and distribution of a newsletter to communicate ideas;
- 3) Develop an acceptable climate for increased participation in adult education;
- 4) Meetings conferences, workshops and interviews for the exchange of ideas, and
- 5) Cooperative planning with adult education councils, associations and other groups interested or engaged in adult education.

Functions from both the Hendrickson and the U.S. Office of Education lists were combined into an initial pilot instrument with twenty functions listed.

Pilot instrument validity was established by a three person panel of experts. This panel of experts was asked to judge the validity of the items which appeared on the instrument.

The panel of experts made a judgment that five of the twenty functions either were offered or were not offered by state departments of education. Based upon this information, a pilot instrument was developed in the form of a questionnaire. The pilot instrument contained fifteen items. Potential respondents were asked to rate the degree to which their state departments of education provided the functions listed on a scale ranging from a high of 5 to a low of 1. Five additional items were included which had two alternative responses, "yes" (it is offered) or "no" (it is not offered).

The pilot instrument was mailed to fifty-one Ohio Adult Education Administrators, seventeen each in ABE, GED, and High School Continuation programs. None of the fifty-one respondents were from Ohio districts chosen to respond to the final version of the survey, but all were administrators performing functions similar to those performed in the districts chosen to be part of the study.

Responses were returned from twenty-eight administrators. After a two week interval, these twenty-eight respondents were sent a second identical questionnaire with a cover letter explaining that a second response was requested in order to establish the reliability of this instrument as a valid research tool. The second mailing resulted in responses from eighteen districts.

The data from the two sets of responses to the pilot instrument were used in test-retest fashion to estimate instrument reliability. Pearson's r was used to calculate the correlation of each item with itself from the first mailing-second mailing situation. All fifteen Likert items correlated significantly, $p < 0.05$. Three of the five "yes-no" type items showed no significant correlation and were, therefore, rejected. Based upon these results the final study instrument was developed (Appendix B). It consisted of the fifteen Likert scale items and two "yes-no" items.

The final study instrument was sent to adult education local agency administrators in cities in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin which offer Adult Basic Education, High School Equivalency and GED programs. These six states comprise U.S. Office of Education Region V. The states are similar in geographic proximity and in concentration of major cities. Cooperative administrative efforts were established in 1973-75 when federal staff development funds for adult basic education were allocated to the Region. Each state provided a representative to a regional committee to allocate funds among the states and to design and conduct joint staff development activities in the states. Since 1975 at least two regional meetings have been held annually, and the states continue to gather, share and disseminate information. States in the Region are diverse in administrative patterns.

A letter was written to the state director of adult education in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin, asking their assistance in identifying those local school districts within the state which offered all three adult education programs -- Adult Basic Education, High School Continuation and GED programs. Responses from the six states provided identification of local school districts as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Number Of Local Education Agencies Offering
ABE, HSC, And GED Programs

State	Number of local Education Agencies
Indiana	36
Illinois	39
Michigan	38
Minnesota	7
Ohio	18
Wisconsin	<u>16</u>
Total	154

The survey instrument was mailed to the 154 local education agencies in the six states. Returns were logged upon their receipt. After the 12th day, 105 instruments had been received, a 68% return. At this time a follow-up letter and a second copy of the instrument

were mailed to those who has not responded. The second request prompted the return of additional instruments. The telephone contacts were made in a third effort. Final results showed returns from 138 districts, an 89.6 percent return (Table 4).

Analysis of the Data

The data were coded for computer analysis. Punched cards were visually checked for mistakes, and the new data were compared to the various outputs of the various SPSS subprograms for errors.³ When the punched cards were believed to be completely accurate, the analysis of the data was begun.

The SPSS subprogram FREQUENCIES was used to ascertain the absolute frequency and respective percentages of values of each variable.⁴ This program was also used to compute values of the mean and standard deviation for each variable.

Four research questions were posited and analyzed statistically.

Research Question 1 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the stated dependent variables?

To answer this question, the five dependent variables (page 54) were analyzed via one way analysis of variance treating "Levels Removed" as the independent variable in each of the five analyses. The SPSS subprogram ONEWAY was used to perform the appropriate calculations.⁵

Table 4

Survey Instrument Returns From Indiana, Illinois, Michigan,
Minnesota, Ohio And Wisconsin, On Dates Received*

1st day	2 returns
2nd day	16 returns
3rd day	28 returns
4th day	14 returns
5th day	19 returns
6th day	0 returns
7th day	6 returns
8th day	5 returns
9th day	7 returns
10th day	6 returns
11th day	0 returns
12th day	2 returns
(second questionnaire mailed)	
13th day	3 returns
14th day	3 returns
15th day	2 returns
16th day	0 returns
17th day	3 returns
18th day	10 returns
19th day	13 returns
20th day	2 returns
21st day	3 returns
(telephone calls made)	
22nd day	2 returns
23rd day	1 return
<hr/>	
Total	147

*A duplicate count, multiple returns from local districts were not all received on the same day.

Analysis of variance answers the question, "Is the variability between groups large enough in comparison with the variability within groups to justify the inference that the means of the populations from which the different groups were samples are not all the same? In other words, if the variability between groups' means is large enough, we can conclude they probably came from different populations and that there is a statistically significant difference present in the data."⁶

When differences between group means were encountered in accordance with the one way analysis of variance, the Scheffe post hoc contrast tests were used. The Scheffe post hoc contrast are multiple comparison procedures designed to be used after a finding of statistically significant differences. The purpose of the procedure is to isolate comparisons between group means which are responsible for, or have contributed to, the finding of statistically significant differences. Scheffe tests were chosen because of unequal "r's" in each of the groups.⁷

Research Question 2 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in state departments of education and the stated dependent variables?

To answer this question, the five dependent variables (page 54) were analyzed via one way analysis of variance treating "Unification" as the independent variable in each of the five analyses. Again the SPSS subprogram ONEWAY and Scheffe post hoc contrast tests⁸ were used to perform the appropriate calculations.

With regard to the "Survey Instrument" (Appendix B), individual items on the instrument were analyzed in three categorical functions: consultant and advisory functions, communication and interpretation functions, and administrative regulatory functions. One way analysis of variance was used for each of the functions across the states. When significant differences were established, Scheffe post hoc contrast tests were used to identify the differences. These calculations were also performed utilizing the SPSS subprogram ONEWAY which includes the Scheffe post hoc contrast procedure.⁹

Research Questions 3 and 4 are as follows.

Research Question 3 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Research Question 4 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in a state department of education, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

In order to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between the independent variables "Levels Removed" and the items on the survey instrument, the states were placed into two gross categories. Group One consisted of those states which were one level removed. They are:

Illinois	-	1 level removed	-	33 districts reporting
Indiana	-	1 level removed	-	32 districts reporting
Michigan	-	1 level removed	-	33 districts reporting

Group Two consisted of those states which were more than one level removed. They are:

Wisconsin	-	2 levels removed	-	15 districts reporting
Minnesota	-	3 levels removed	-	7 districts reporting
Ohio	-	4 levels removed	-	18 districts reporting

In order to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between the independent variable "Unification," and the items on the survey instrument, the states were placed in two gross categories which differed from the categories used for the independent variable "Levels Removed." Group One consisted of those states with ABE, GED, and HSC programs in one administrative unit on the state level. They are:

Illinois	-	1 administrative unit	-	33 districts reporting
Indiana	-	1 administrative unit	-	32 districts reporting
Michigan	-	1 administrative unit	-	33 districts reporting
Wisconsin	-	1 administrative unit	-	15 districts reporting

Group Two consisted of those states with ABE, GED, and HSC programs administered in two or more units. They are:

Minnesota	-	2 administrative units	-	7 districts reporting
Ohio	-	3 administrative units	-	18 districts reporting

To investigate Research Questions # 3 and 4, Student's t-test was used. Student's t-test is used to answer the question, "Is the difference between two sample means statistically different?"¹⁰ The SPSS subprogram T-TEST was used to make the appropriate calculations.¹¹

Finally, the internal consistency of the study instrument, "The Survey Instrument," was investigated. The Hoyt Analysis of Variance procedure was used as opposed to the "split-half" procedure.¹² Determining the coefficient of internal consistency as an estimate of the instrument reliability via the Hoyt method allows the use of total instrument variance whereas the "split-half" procedure allows for something less. When the "split-half" procedure is used, an additional formula must be applied to the result in order to estimate the reliability of the total instrument. Utilizing the FORTAP computer procedure, the coefficient of internal consistency was found to be 0.92.¹³

Footnotes for Chapter III

1

Andrew Hendrickson, Improving Adult Education in Ohio's Public Schools. p. iii.

2

Adult Education Services of State Department of Education, Miscellaneous No. 31, (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare), p. 9.

3

Nie, Norman J., et al. Statistical Package for the Social Science. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

4

Ibid

5

Ibid

6

Isaac, Stephen and Michael, William B. Handbook of Research and Evaluation. San Diego, Calif.: Edits Publishers, 1971, p. 140.

7

Glass, Gene U. and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970, p. 381.

8

Andrew Hendrickson. Improving Adult Education in Ohio Public's Schools.

9

Ibid

10

Isaac, Stephen and Michael, William. Handbook of Research and Evaluation. p. 140.

11

Andrew Hendrickson. Improving Adult Education in Ohio's Public Schools.

12

Winer, B. J., Statistical Principles in Experimental Design.
New York, New Jorl: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971, p. 283.

13

Bauman, D. A Fortran Test Analysis Package. Fredonia, New York:
York: Teacher Education Research Center, State University College, 1973.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter is arranged in three sections. The first section presents analysis of data for the independent variable, Levels Removed. Section two presents analysis of the data for the independent variable, Unification. The third section presents an analysis of data resulting from the survey instrument.

Independent Variable -- Levels Removed

Research Question #1 asks - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the stated dependent variables?

In order to answer Research Question #1 the number of levels separating the highest placed adult education person from the chief state school officer was determined for each of the 50 states. Frequencies for the 50 states are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Administrative Levels Separating Adult Education
From The Chief State School Officer

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States
Report directly to CSSO	2
1 levels removed	13
2 levels removed	20
3 levels removed	11
4 levels removed	<u>4</u>
Total	50

Data are presented for each of the dependent variables as measured against the independent variable, Levels Removed.

Dependent Variable #1, Percent of Target Population Enrolled

Dependent variable #1 is the percent of each state target population over age 16 with less than a high school diploma, which is participating in Adult Basic Education (ABE), High School Continuation (HSC) or General Education Development (GED) testing programs.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #1 and the independent variable, Levels Removed.

Percentages of the target population enrolled, by levels separating adult education for the chief state school officer, are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Percent of Target Population Enrolled,
Categorized By Levels Separating Adult
Education From The Chief State School Officer

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States Reporting	Percent of Target Population Enrolled
Report directly to CSSO	2	5.265
1 Level Removed	13	2.838
2 Levels Removed	20	5.663
3 Levels Removed	11	3.390
4 Levels Removed	<u>4</u>	2.550
Total	50	

The three states with the greatest reported percent of target population enrolled, California, Massachusetts, and Hawaii, are included in the category 2 Levels Removed. There is no apparent reason for this occurrence.

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the percent of target population enrolled, and the independent variable, Levels Removed. The ANOVA results show no

statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the percent of target population enrolled. Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

ANOVA For Comparing The Percent Of Target
Population Enrolled With Administrative Levels Removed

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	4	87.200	21.800	0.602	0.662
Error		1627.612	36.169		

Research Question #1 sought to determine whether statistically significant relationships exist between between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, Percent of Target Population Enrolled, the ANOVA reveals that no significant relationship existed at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Dependent Variable #2 -- Matching Dollars

Dependent variable #2 is the matching dollars appropriated by each state per student in the target population. Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #2 and the independent variable, Levels Removed.

Matching dollars appropriated by the states, according to levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Student Categorized by Levels Separating Adult Education From The Chief State School Officer

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States Reporting	Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Student
Report directly to CSSO	2	\$3.35
1 Level Removed	13	0.27
Le esl		
2 Levels Removed	20	0.82
3 Levels Removed	11	0.25
4 Levels Removed	<u>4</u>	0.23
Total	50	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the matching dollars appropriated per student in the target population, and the independent variable, Levels Removed. ANOVA results show that a statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the matching dollar appropriated per student. Results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

ANOVA For Comparing Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Student
With Administrative Levels Removed

	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	4	19.292	4.823	4.633	0.003
Error	45	46.843	1.041		

Research Question #1 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable matching state dollars appropriated per student in the target population, the ANOVA indicates that significant relationships exist at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Because of the 0.003 probability, a Scheffe post hoc test of contrast was performed to determine where the differences occurred. Results of the Scheffe tests at the $P < 0.05$ level show that the significant differences exist between those states which report directly to the chief state school officer and all states separated by one or more administrative units. Results of the Scheffe tests are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Scheffe Test Indicating Differences Between Matching Dollars
Appropriated and Levels Separating Adult
Education From The Chief State School Officer

4 Adminis- trative Levels Removed	3 Adminis- trative Levels Removed	1 Adminis- trative Levels Removed	2 Adminis- trative Levels Removed	Reports Directly to CSSO
0.23	0.25	0.27	0.82	3.35

Appendix Table A includes a listing of fifty states, and statistics gathered for the dependent variables. Column I identifies the two states which report directly to the chief state school officer. These two states are Arkansas and Utah. Column II shows that Arkansas appropriated \$0.11 per student in the target population, while Utah appropriated \$6.59 per student. These two figures have a mean of \$3.35.

Because there are only two states categorized as reporting directly to the chief state school officer, and because of the extreme disparity between the dollars appropriated by the two states, the findings should be viewed with extreme caution.

Dependent Variable #3 -- Total State Budget for Adult Education

Dependent variable #3 is the total state budget for adult education per student in the target population.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #3 and the independent variable, Levels Removed.

The total state budgets appropriated for adult education by the states, according to levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Total State Budget For Adult Education Per Individual In The
Target Population Categorized By Levels Separating Adults
From The Chief State School Officer

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States	Total State Budget For Adult Education, Per Student In The Target Population
Report directly to CSSO	2	3.89
1 Level Removed	11	0.49
2 Levels Removed	19	1.64
3 Levels Removed	8	0.70
4 Levels Removed	<u>4</u>	1.59
	44*	

*6 States missing data

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the mean total state budget for adult education, and the independent variable, Levels Removed. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the state and local dollars appropriated by the states. Results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

ANOVA For Comparing Total State Budget Appropriated
With Administrative Levels Removed

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	4	26.019	6.504	1.345	0.270
Error	39	188.537	4.834		

Research Question #1 sought to determine whether statistically significant relationships exist between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable total state budget for adult education by the states, the ANOVA indicates that no significant relationships exists at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Dependent Variable #4 -- Cost Per Hour

Dependent variable #4 is the cost per 100 hours of instruction in adult education in each of the states .

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #4 and the independent variable, Levels Removed.

The mean cost per 100 hours of instruction, according to levels separating adult education for the chief state school officer, are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Mean Cost Per 100 Hours Of Instruction, Categorized
By Levels Removed

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States Reporting	Mean Cost Per 100 Hours
Report directly to CSSO	2	\$149.50
1 Level Removed	13	119.43
2 Levels Removed	20	126.05
3 Levels Removed	11	131.79
4 Levels Removed	<u>4</u>	113.13
Total	50	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the cost per 100 hours of instruction and the independent variable, Levels Removed. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relation exists between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the cost per 100 hours of instruction. Results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

ANOVA For Comparing Cost Per 100 Hours Of Instruction
With Administrative Levels Removed

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	4	2700.957	675.239	0.0935	0.984
Error	45	325087.062	7224.156		

Research Question #1 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, Cost per 100 Hours of Instruction, no significant relationship exists at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Dependent Variable #5 -- Public Budget

Dependent variable #5 is the amount of money budgeted for adult education in the states, as compared with the amount of money budgeted for public school education in the states, expressed in percentages.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #5 and the independent variable, Levels Removed.

The mean percentages of budgets for adult education compared with budgets for public school education, according to levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Mean Percent of Money Budgeted for Adult Education
Categorized By Levels Separating Adult Education
From The Chief State School Officer

Administrative Levels Removed	Number of States Reporting	Mean Percent of Budget for Adult Education
Report directly to CSSO	2	0.35
1 Level Removed	11	0.19
2 Levels Removed	19	0.79
3 Levels Removed	7	0.40
4 Levels Removed	<u>4</u>	0.28
Total	43*	

*7 States missing data

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the mean percent of public school budgets budgeted for adult education and the independent variable, Levels Removed. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the percent of public school budget budgeted for adult education. Results are shown in Table 16

Table 16

ANOVA for Comparing Percent of Public School Budget
Budgeted for Adult Education, with Administrative Levels Removed

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	4	2.982	0.745	0.432	0.784
Error	38	65.592	1.726		

Research Question #1 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, Public Budget, no significant relationship exists at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Summary -- Independent Variable, Levels Removed

For the independent variable, Levels Removed, one way analyses of variance were used to test the significance of any relationships which may have been found. A significant relationship was found with the dependent variable #2, the amount of state dollars appropriated per student in the target population, at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance. This significant relationship must be viewed with extreme caution because the category includes only two states with extreme disparate values. No statistically significant relationships were established with the other dependent variables at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Independent Variable, Unification

Research Question 2 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in state departments of education and the stated dependent variables?

In order to answer research question #2, all fifty states were classified as having ABE, GED and HSC programs organized in state departments of education in one, two or three administrative units. The classification according to organization by administrative units is shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Organization of ABE, GED and HSC Programs
in State Departments of Education, by Administrative Units

SDE Organizational Unification	Number of States
One administrative unit	42 states
Two administrative units	7 states
Three administrative units	1 state

Data are presented for each of the dependent variables as measured against the independent variable, Unification.

Dependent Variable #1 -- Percent of Target Population Enrolled

Dependent variable #1 is the percent of each state target population over age 16 with less than a high school diploma that is participating in ABE, GED and HSC programs.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #1, and the independent variable, Unification.

Mean percentages of the target population enrolled by organization of the states into one, two, or three administrative units, is shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Mean Percent of Target Population Enrolled Categorized By State
Department of Education Organizational Unification

SDE Organizational Unification	Number of States Reporting	Mean Percent of Target Population Enrolled
One administrative unit	42	4.504
Two administrative units	7	2.528
Three administrative units	<u>1</u>	1.300
Total	50	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the percentage of target population enrolled and the independent variable, Unification. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Unification, and the percent of target populations enrolled. Results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

ANOVA For Comparing The Percent of Target Population Enrolled With
State Department of Education Organizational Unification

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	2	31.794	15.897	0.444	0.644
Error	47	1683.014	35.808		

Research Question #2 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Unification, and the stated dependent variables.

For the dependent variable, Levels Removed, the ANOVA indicates that no significant statistical relationships exist at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Dependent Variable #2 -- Matching Dollars

Dependent variable #2 is the matching dollars appropriated by each state, per student in the target population.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #2 and the independent variable, Unification. The matching dollars appropriated by the states, according to the organization of the states into one, two or three administrative units, is shown in Table 20.

Table 20

Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Adult Education Student In The Target
Population Categorized By State Department Of Education
Organizational Unification

SDE Organizational Unification	Number of States Reporting	Matching Dollars Appropriated
One administrative unit	42	0.689
Two administrative units	7	0.179
Three administrative units	<u>1</u>	0.310
Total	50	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the matching dollars appropriated per student in the target population and the independent variable, Unification. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Unification, and the matching dollars appropriated per adult education student in the target populations. Results are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

ANOVA For Comparing Matching Dollars Appropriated Per Student With
State Department Of Education Organizational Unification

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	2	1.652	0.820	0.602	0.551
Error	47	64.483	1.372		

Research Question #2 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Unification, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, Matching Dollars appropriated per student in the target population, the ANOVA indicates that no significant differences exist at the $P < 0.05$ level.

Dependent Variable #3 -- Total State Budget for Adult Education

Dependent Variable #3 is the total state budget for adult education per student in the target population.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #3 and the independent variable Unification. The total state budget state budget appropriated for adult education by the states according to organization of the states into one, two or three administrative units, is shown in Table 22.

Table 22

Total State Budget For Adult Education Per Individual In The
Target Population , Categorized By State Department Of
Education Organizational Unification

SDE Organizational Unification	Number of States Reporting	Total State Budget For Adult Education, Per Student In The Target Population
One administrative unit	37	1.450
Two administrative units	6	0.431
Three administrative units	<u>1</u>	0.150
Total	44	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the mean state and local dollars appropriated by the states , and the independent variable, Unification.

ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Unification, and the state and local dollars appropriated. Results are shown in Table 23.

Table 23

ANOVA For Comparing Total State Budget With State
Department Of Education Organizational Unification

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	2	6.664	3.332	0.0657	0.0532
Error	41	207.892	5.070		

Research Question #2 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Unification, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, state and local dollars appropriated by the states, the ANOVA indicates that no significant relationships exist at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Dependent Variable #4 -- Cost Per Hour

Dependent variable #4 is the cost per 100 hours of instruction in each of the states.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between dependent variable #3 and the independent variable, Unification.

The mean cost per 100 hours of instruction, according to organization of the states into one, two or three administrative units, is shown in Table 24.

Table 24

Mean Cost Per 100 Hours Of Instruction Categorized By
State Department Of Education Organizational Unification

SDE Organizational Unification	Number of States Reporting	Mean Percent of Target Population Enrolled
One administrative unit	42	117.11
Two administrative units	7	171.10
Three administrative units	<u>1</u>	125.47
Total	50	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the cost per 100 hours of instruction and the independent variable, Levels Removed. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Unification, and the cost per 100 hours of instruction. Results are shown in Table 25.

Table 25

ANOVA For Comparing Cost Per 100 Hours Of Instruction With
State Department Of Education Organizational Unification

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	2	18503.816	9251.906	1.406	0.255
Error	47	309293.625	6580.5000		

Research Question #2 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Unification, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, Cost per 100 Hours of Instruction, no significant relationship exists at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Dependent Variable #5 -- Public Budget

Dependent variable #5 is the amount of money budgeted for adult education, as compared with the state budget for public school education in the states, expressed in percentages.

Data were examined to search for statistically significant relationships between variable #5 and the independent variable, Unification.

The mean percentages of budgets for adult education compared with budgets for public school education, according to organization of the states into one, two or three administrative units, is shown in Table 26.

Table 26

Percentage Of Money Budgeted For Adult Education Categorized
By State Department Of Education Organizational Unification

SDE Organizational Unification	Number of State Reporting	Mean Percent of Budget for Adult Education
One administrative unit	36	0.590
Two administrative units	6	0.095
Three administrative units	<u>1</u>	0.040
Total	43	

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant relationships between the percent of public school budget budgeted for adult education and the independent variable, Unification. ANOVA results show no statistically significant relationship exists between the independent variable, Unification, and the percent of public school budget for adult education. Results are shown in Table 27.

Table 27

ANOVA For Comparing The Percent Of Public School Budget For Adult
Education With State Department of Education
Organizational Unification

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Equality of Cell Means	2	1.487	0.743	0.443	0.645
Error	40	67.087	1.677		

Research Question #2 sought statistically significant relationships between the independent variable, Unification, and the stated dependent variables. For the dependent variable, Public Budget, no significant relationship exists at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Summary -- Independent Variable, Unification

For the independent variable, Unification, one way analyses of variance were used to test for statistically significant differences. No statistically significant relationships were established with any of the dependent variables at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was used to measure the degree to which selected state departments of education were perceived by local adult education directors as performing key administrative and regulatory

functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communications and interpretation functions.

Instrument Returns

Survey instruments were sent to 154 local adult education administrators in the six states. A follow-up request was sent after twelve days to those who had not responded. Telephone calls were made after an additional eleven days to those who still had not responded. Data are presented for returns in each program by state in Table 28.

Using the SPSS CROSSTABS¹ subprogram and a Chi square statistic, it was determined that neither the second mailing nor the telephoning biased the way in which persons responded.

The fifteen items on the instrument were marked on a Likert scale with a range of 5 to 1. The 5 indicated the greatest, and 1 the least degree of satisfaction with the services performed. The range of scores possible on the instrument were 75 points to 15 points. Mean scores and standard deviation for all items on the instrument are presented in Table 29.

Table 28

Instrument Returns, Categorized By Response to First and
Second Mailing, And Telephone Contact

State	Total Number of Returns	First Mailing	First Mailing %	Second Mailing	Second Mailing %	Telephone	Tele- phone %
Illinois	33	26	78.8	7	21.2	-	
Indiana	32	21	65.6	11	34.4	-	
Michigan	33	24	72.7	9	27.3	-	
Minnesota	7	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3
Ohio	18	14	77.8	3	16.7	1	5.5
Wisconsin	15	12	80.0	3	20.0	-	

Table 29

Scores Of Local Administrators Of ABE, HSC And GED Programs ,
 Indicating Perceptions Of Services Of State Departments Of
 Education - Possible Range 75 To 15

State	Mean	SD
Illinois	60.405	7.939
Indiana	50.051	13.298
Michigan	42.540	9.197
Minnesota	45.500	9.426
Ohio	51.065	14.161
Wisconsin	54.667	6.347

For purposes of analysis, individual instrument items were classified as consultant and advisory functions, communication and interpretation functions, and administrative and regulatory functions. Each of the three functions were measured against the two independent variables, Levels Removed and Unification

Consultant and Advisory Functions

Consultant and advisory functions were identified in instrument items 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10. These consultant and advisory functions were

- develop and prepare method of financing adult education,
- assist and encourage the development of written policies pertaining to local and state responsibilities in adult education,

- provide encouragement and assistance to schools wishing to initiate adult education programs ,
- provide encourage and assistance to schools wishing to improve adult education programs ,
- assist local schools with problems of adult education curricula, teaching methods, and organization ,
- publish adult education resource materials for teachers, directors, and superintendents, and
- cooperate in planning with adult education councils, associations, and other groups interested or engaged in adult education.

These items provide a possible range from 35 points to 7 points on the Likert scale. Mean scores and stand deviations for Consultant and Advisory functions among the states are shown in Table 30.

Table 30

Scores Of Local Administrators Of ABE, HSC And GED Programs
Indicating Perceptions Of Consultant And Advisory Functions Of
State Department s of Education - Possible Range 35 To 7

State	Mean	SD
Illinois	28.43	4.045
Indiana	23.84	6.394
Michigan	20.38	4.698
Minnesota	21.20	4.732
Ohio	23.84	7.250
Wisconsin	25.61	3.220

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant differences among the states for Consultant and Advisory scores. ANOVA results are found in Table 31

Table 31

ANOVA For Differences Among The States
Consultant And Advisory Scores

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	5	1505.019	301.003	10.158	0.001
Within Groups	188	5570.901	29.632		
Total	193	7075.918			

Using the $P < 0.05$ level of significance, the ANOVA revealed that statistically significant differences existed among the states in Consultant and Advisory scores. The Scheffe post hoc contrast tests were used at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance to identify the differences. The results are shown in Table 32.

Table 32

Scheffe Post Hoc Contrast Tests For Differences Among
The States On Consultant And Advisory Scores

Michigan	Minnesota	Indiana	Ohio	Wisconsin	Illinois
20.38	21.20	23.84	23.84	25.61	28.43

The Scheffe contrast tests show Michigan < Illinois.

Communication and Interpretation Functions

Communication and Interpretation functions were identified in instrument items 2, 7, 12, 14, and 15. These Communication and Interpretation functions were

- interpret laws governing adult education,
- coordinate the delivery of adult education services on the local level,
- develop a statewide awareness and visibility for adult education,
- provide recruitment and promotional materials for adult education, and
- maintain a clearinghouse of ideas, materials, and resources for adult education.

These items provide a range possible of 25 to 5 points on the Likert scale. Mean scores for Communication and Interpretation functions among the states are shown in Table 33.

Table 33

Scores Of Local Administrators Of ABE, HSC And GED Programs
Indicating Perceptions Of Communication And Interpretation Functions
Of State Departments Of Education - Possible Range 25 To 5

State	Mean	SD
Illinois	18.92	3.215
Indiana	15.13	4.401
Michigan	13.73	3.218
Minnesota	14.62	4.274
Ohio	16.26	4.534
Wisconsin	17.00	2.384

A one way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant differences among the states for communication and interpretation scores. ANOVA results are shown in Table 34.

Table 34

ANOVA For Differences Among The States
Communication And Interpretation Scores

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	5	668.388	133.677	9.567	0.000
Within Groups	191	2668.662	13.972		
Total	196	3337.050			

Using the $P < 0.05$ level of significance, the ANOVA revealed that statistically significant differences existed among the states on Communication and Interpretation scores. The Scheffe post hoc contrast test were used at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance to identify the differences. The results are shown in Table 35.

Table 35

Scheffe Post Hoc Contrast Test For Differences Among The States
On Communication And Interpretation Scores

Michigan	Minnesota	Indiana	Ohio	Wisconsin	Illinois
13.73	14.62	15.13	16.26	17.00	18.92

The Scheffe contrasts tests show Michigan < Illinois.

Administrative and Regulatory Functions

Administrative and Regulatory functions were identified in instrument items 3, 11, and 13. These Administrative and Regulatory functions were

- gather and disseminate useful adult education program and statistical data,
- facilitate and conduct inservice training of teachers and staff in adult education, and
- provide state level accountability for adult education expenditures.

These items provided a possible range of 15 to 3 points on the Likert scale. Mean scores for Administrative and Regulatory functions among the states are found in Table 36.

Table 36

Scores Of Local Administrators Of ABE, HSC And GED Programs
Indicating Perceptions Of Administrative And Regulatory Functions
Of State Departments Of Education - Possible Range 15 To 3

State	Mean	SD
Illinois	12.94	1.669
Indiana	10.31	2.978
Michigan	8.76	2.306
Minnesota	10.80	1.398
Ohio	10.76	3.045
Wisconsin	11.95	1.700

One way analysis of variance was used to test for statistically significant differences among the states for Administrative and Regulatory scores. ANOVA results are found in Table 37

Table 37

ANOVA For Differences Among The States
Administrative And Regulatory Scores

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	5	428.959	85.791	14.558	0.022
Within Groups	193	1137.337	5.8929		
Total	198	1566.297			

Using the $P < 0.05$ level of significance, the ANOVA revealed that statistically significant differences existed among the states in Administrative and Regulatory scores. The Scheffe post hoc contrast tests were used at the $P < 0.005$ level of significance to identify the differences. The results are shown in Table 38.

Table 38

Scheffe Post Hoc Contrast Test Results For Differences Among The States On Administrative And Regulatory Scores

Michigan	Indiana	Ohio	Minnesota	Wisconsin	Illinois
8.76	10.31	10.76	10.80	11.95	12.94

The Scheffe contrast tests show Michigan < Illinois.

Independent Variable, Levels Removed -- Instrument Analysis

Research Question #3 asks, "Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communications and interpretation functions?"

In order to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the items on the survey instrument, the states were placed into two gross categories. Group 1 consisted of those states which were one level removed from the chief state school officer. They are

Illinois - 1 Level Removed - 33 districts reporting
 Indiana - 1 Level Removed - 32 districts reporting
 Michigan - 1 Level Removed - 33 districts reporting

Group 2 consisted of those states which were more than one level removed. They are

Wisconsin - 2 Levels Removed - 15 districts reporting
 Minnesota - 3 Levels Removed - 7 districts reporting
 Ohio - 4 Levels Removed - 18 districts reporting

For purposes of analysis, Student's t -test was used to compare Group 1 and Group 2. In Table 39, group comparisons are given total instrument scores in Groups 1 and 2, seeking significant statistical relationships with the independent variable, Levels Removed.

The t analysis for the total instrument shows no statistically significant relationships between consultant and advisory functions, communications and interpretation functions, and administrative and regulatory functions, and the independent variable, Levels Removed, using the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Independent Variable, Unification -- Instrument Analysis

Research Question #4 was, "Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in a state department of education, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?"

Table 39

Analysis Of Relationships Between Consultant And Advisory Functions, Communication And Interpretation Functions, And Administrative And Regulatory Functions, And Levels Separating Adult Education From The Chief State School Officer

Instrument Total		Number of Cases	Mean	S D	S E	t Value	Probability
Instrument Total	Group 1	126	50.111	12.624	1.125	-0.67	0.507
	Group 2	57	51.421	11.648	1.534		
Cons/Advise	Group 1	133	23.819	6.086	0.528	-0.12	0.903
	Group 2	61	23.934	6.036	0.773		
Comm/Inter	Group 1	135	15.688	4.201	0.362	-0.95	0.343
	Group 2	62	16.290	3.940	0.500		
Admin/Reg	Group 1	135	10.481	2.929	0.252	-1.55	0.123
	Group 2	64	11.140	2.513	0.314		

In order to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between the independent variable, Unification, and the items on the survey instrument, the states were placed into two gross categories. Group 1 consisted of those states with ABE, GED, and HSC programs administratively in one administrative unit. They are

Illinois - one administrative unit - 33 districts reporting
 Indiana - one administrative unit - 32 districts reporting
 Michigan - one administrative unit - 33 districts reporting
 Wisconsin - one administrative unit - 15 districts reporting

Group 2 consisted of those states with ABE, GED, and HSC programs administratively in two or more administrative units. They are

Minnesota - two administrative units - 7 districts reporting
 Ohio - three administrative units - 18 districts reporting

For purposes of analysis, Student's t-test was used to compare Group 1 and Group 2. In Table 40, group comparisons are given for total instrument scores in Groups 1 and 2, seeking statistically significant relationships with the independent variable, Unification.

The t-test analysis for the total instrument shows no statistically significant relationship between the consultant and advisory functions, communication and interpretation functions, and administrative and regulatory functions and the independent variable, Unification, using the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 40

**Analysis of Instrument Scores for Relationships Between
Consultant and Advisory Functions, Communication and Interpretation
Functions, and Administrative and Regulation Functions and
Independent Variable Unification**

Instrument Total		Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE	<u>t</u> Value	Probability
Instrument Total	Group 1	144	50.680	12.041	1.003	0.34	0.734
	Group 2	39	49.923	13.411	2.148		
Consultant/ Advisory	Group 1	151	24.033	5.841	0.475	0.76	0.446
	Group 2	43	23.232	6.792	1.036		
Communication/ Interpretation	Group 1	155	15.858	4.039	0.324	-0.13	0.896
	Group 2	42	15.952	4.483	0.692		
Administrative/ Regulation	Group 1	155	10.671	2.840	0.228	-0.21	0.833
	Group 2	44	10.772	2.744	0.414		

Footnote For Chapter IV

¹

Nie, Norman J., et al. Statistical Package for the Social Science. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine organizational patterns of state departments of education and to examine state department organizations for their relationship to key program factors in each of the states for which uniform data are available.

Two aspects of state department of education administrative organization for adult education were studied. The first was the vertical placement of adult education in the tables of organization of the states, measured in levels separating the highest placed person in adult education from the chief state school officer. The second was the administrative unification or separation of Adult Basic Education (ABE), High School Continuation (HSC), and General Education Development (GED) testing programs into one, two and three administrative units. These two aspects of organization constituted independent variables.

The key program factors in the states which were assessed for their relationship with the independent variables constituted the dependent variables. They were:

1. The percent of each state's target population, over age 16 with less than a high school diploma, which is participating in ABE, HSC and GED programs.
2. State matching dollars appropriated for adult education, apportioned per individual in the target population.
3. The total state budget for adult education, per individual in the target population.
4. Cost per adult education student for 100 hours of instruction.
5. The percent of the total state budget for public school education allocated to adult education.

In a second part of the study, the same independent variables were used to assess measures which were obtained from a survey instrument which indicated the perceptions of local adult education administrators concerning how their state departments of education perform certain functions.

States selected were Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. These states comprise U.S. Office of Education Region V, and were representative of administrative patterns across the fifty states.

State level functions for ABE, HSC, and GED programs on which assessments were sought were administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions.

The following research questions were asked:

Research Question 1 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the stated dependent variables?

Research Question 2 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in state departments of education and the stated dependent variables?

Research Question 3 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Research Question 4 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in a state department of education, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Data for dependent variables in research questions 1 and 2 were taken from a 1977 report issued by the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Analysis of these data included frequency counts, means, and standard deviations. One way analyses of variance were used in testing for significant statistical differences at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance. When statistical differences were found, Scheffe post hoc tests of contrast were used to identify where the differences occurred.

Dependent variables in research questions 3 and 4 were the results of a survey instrument which was sent to 154 local adult education program directors in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. Returns were received from 142 programs, a 92.2 percent return. The survey instrument listed the following services which are potentially provided by state departments of education to local agencies.

- 1 - Develop and propose methods of financing adult education.
- 2 - Interpret laws governing adult education.
- 3 - Gather and disseminate useful adult education program and statistical data.
- 4 - Assist and encourage the development of written policies pertaining to local and state responsibilities for adult education.
- 5 - Provide encouragement and assistance to schools wishing to initiate adult education programs.
- 6 - Provide encouragement and assistance to schools wishing to improve adult education programs.
- 7 - Coordinate the delivery of adult education services on the local level.
- 8 - Assist local schools with problems of adult education curriculum, teaching methods and organization.
- 9 - Publish adult education resource materials for teachers, directors and superintendents.
- 10 - Cooperate in planning with adult education councils, associations and other groups interested or engaged in adult education.
- 11 - Facilitate and conduct inservice training of teachers and staff in adult education.

- 12 - Develop a statewide awareness and visibility for adult education.
- 13 - Provide state level accountability for adult education expenditures.
- 14 - Provide recruitment and promotional materials for adult education.
- 15 - Maintain a clearinghouse of ideas, materials and resources for adult education.

Administrative and regulatory functions were identified in items 3, 11, and 13. Consultant and advisory functions were identified in items 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10. Communication and interpretation functions were identified in items 2, 7, 12, 14 and 15.

In order to identify statistically significant differences between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the functional areas used in the instrument analysis, the states were placed in two gross categories. Category one consisted of those states one level removed from the chief state school officer. These were Illinois, Indiana and Michigan. Category two consisted of those states more than one level removed from the chief state school officer. These were Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. Student t tests were used to identify statistically significant differences between the groups.

In order to identify statistically significant differences between the independent variable Unification and the functional areas used in the instrument analysis, the states were placed in two gross categories. Category one consisted of those states with ABE, HSC, and GED programs

in one administrative unit on the state level. They were Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin. Category two consisted of those states with ABE, HSC, and GED programs administratively in two or more units. They were Minnesota and Ohio. Student t tests were used to identify statistically significant differences between the groups.

Findings are summarized on the following pages, presented in the order in which the research questions were asked. All tests for significance were computed using the $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Research question 1 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the stated dependent variables?

Four of the five dependent variables measured showed no significant statistical differences at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance. These were dependent variable #1, the percent of the target population participating in the three programs, dependent variable #3, the total state budget for adult education, dependent variable #4, the cost per adult education student for 100 hours of instruction, and dependent variable #5, the percent of the total budget for public school adult education allocated to adult education.

Statistically significant differences were found for dependent variable #2, state matching dollars appropriated for adult education, apportioned per individual in the target population. The ANOVA

identified a probability of 0.003, and Scheffe post hoc tests of contrast indicated that the differences existed between states in which adult education reports directly to the chief state school officer, and all other levels.

There are two states which report directly to the chief state school officer and which together average \$3.35 per student in the target population. They are Arkansas and Utah. The matching dollars appropriated in Arkansas, \$0.11 per individual in the target population, is skewed by Utah's \$6.59 for a mean of \$3.35 between the two states. The low number of level two states, and the disparity between the two states constituting the group indicates that the significance of the findings should be viewed with extreme caution.

Research question 2 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, HSC, and GED programs into one, two, or three administrative units, and the stated dependent variables?

None of the five dependent variables showed statistically significant relationships with the independent variable, Unification, at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance. The unification of ABE, HSC, and GED programs in state departments of education did not appear to be a factor influencing the dependent variables.

Research question 3 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the placement of adult education within state departments of education, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer, and the degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Neither the administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, nor communication and interpretation functions showed statistically significant relationships at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance with the independent variable, Levels Removed, measured in levels separating adult education from the chief state school officer. The vertical placement of adult education in state departments of education did not appear to be a factor influencing perceptions of services performed in adult education by the state department of education.

Research question 4 - Do statistically significant relationships exist between the unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in a state department of education, and the perceived degree to which selected state departments of education perform key administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, and communication and interpretation functions?

Neither the administrative and regulatory functions, consultant and advisory functions, nor communication and interpretation functions showed statistically significant relationships with the independent variable, Unification, at the $P < 0.05$ level of significance. The unification of ABE, GED, and HSC programs into one, two, or three administrative units in state departments of education did not appear to be a factor influencing perceptions of services performed by the state department of education.

Conclusions

Based upon the data gathered, the following conclusions have been made:

1. For the states studied, using the quality of data available, no statistically significant relationships were established between the independent variables, Levels Removed and Unification of Services, and the dependent variables except as noted in conclusion 3.

2. A variety of administrative patterns for adult education exists in the fifty state departments of education. Differences exist both in levels separating the highest placed adult education unit from the chief state school officer, and in the unification of ABE, HSC, and GED programs.

The authors cited in Chapter I recognized the diversity of administrative organizations in state departments of education in general. The organization of adult education is consistent with the diversity found by the authors cited.

3. Only one statistically significant difference was found in the study, that between the independent variable, Levels Removed, and the dependent variable "state matching dollars appropriated for adult education, apportioned per individual in the the target population." For reasons stated, the finding was to be interpreted with extreme caution. No other statistically significant relationships were found for the independent variable, Levels Removed, and no statistically significant findings were made for the independent variable, Unification.

4. Differences have been found to exist in the areas of dependent variables. The percent of target population enrolled in the states ranged from 38 percent in California to 1 percent in Indiana. Matching dollars appropriated range from \$6.59 in Utah to .09¢ in Florida, Georgia and Texas. The cost for 100 hours of education ranges from \$15.72 in Connecticut to \$470.00 in Alaska. Despite the differences shown within the areas identified as dependent variables, no statistically significant relationships were found to exist between these dependent variables and the independent variables, Levels Removed and Unification.

5. Differences were found to exist among the states in local adult education administrators' perceptions of state department of education performance of certain consultant and advisory functions, communication and interpretation functions, and administrative and regulatory functions. No statistically significant relationships were found between the perceived performance of these functions in the states, and the states organizational patterns in terms of Levels Removed and Unification of Services.

These conclusions suggest that other variables may exist which may account for the differences identified. Possible factors may include relative influence by the chief state school officer, the governor and the state legislature. Additional influencing factors may be the professional training, experience and certification of the highest ranking adult education administrators, and the strength and influence of state level adult education professional organizations.

Recommendations For Further Research

Further research should be conducted in an effort to determine relationships between state department of education administrative structure and other factors such as those suggested in the conclusions. Many state departments of education provided tables of organization charts with the notation that the state department had recently been reorganized, or was about to be reorganized. The USOE Reports of 1927, 1940, and 1959 suggest that reorganization and changes are common in state departments of education.

Adult educators should be attuned to these changes, particularly as they effect adult education. Information gained in this study could provide baseline data which could be expanded as a part of ongoing research in state departments of education organizational structure and its relationship to adult education.

Further research might also be directed toward identifying reasons for the wide range in differences among the states in the areas of percent of target populations participating in adult education, state matching dollars appropriated, state and local dollars appropriated, cost per instructional hour, and the percent of the total state budgets for public school education allocated to adult education. If factors were identified, those states with the least success in any of these areas might improve their ability to reach higher levels of performance.

Finally, the survey instrument has apparent value for determining local adult education directors' perceptions of services provided by state departments of education. The six states which participated could use the same instrument at a later date to determine if changes in perceptions have occurred.

Other states could use the survey instrument individually. Results could be used by state departments of education in setting goals for performance in areas of need.

Further research might be directed toward finding reasons why some state departments of education are perceived as providing services more effectively than others, as neither the Levels Removed or Unification were found to be correlated significantly to the existing differences.

APPENDIX A

Dependent Variables for the

50 States

Levels Removed	State	1976 % of Target Population Enrolled	1976-Matching Dollars Appropriated per Individual in Target Population	Total State Budget for ABE/SAE per Target Population	1976 Cost per Student 100 Hours of Instruction	1976 % of ABE/SAE to Public Education Budget
1	AL	2.20	\$0.10	\$0.22	\$ 50.00	.2
2	AK	2.11	1.01	3.55	470.00	.2
2	AZ	2.05	0.19	0.79	91.00	.09
0	AR	1.73	0.11	1.19	138.00	.3
2	CA	38.2	2.98	12.35	141.50	2%
2	CO	1.6	0.16	-	70.00	--
2	CT	3.1	0.78	1.15	15.72	.3
3	DE	3.1	0.21	1.96	134.00	.2
3	FL	11.3	0.09	1.15	107.00	2%
2	GA	2.6	0.09	0.57	62.00	.1
2	HI	12.4	0.92	2.95	40.00	.6
3	ID	4.7	0.29	-	232.00	--
1	IL	1.8	0.15	2.15	225.00	.4
1	IN	1.0	0.11	0.25	149.00	.7
3	IA	2.4	1.15	-	180.00	--
2	KS	2.1	0.15	0.16	200.00	.01
3	KY	1.7	0.11	0.25	83.00	--
2	LA	2.7	0.50	1.26	105.00	2
1	ME	10.0	0.54	0.23*	100.00	.04
3	MD	2.8	0.13	0.27	44.00	.06
2	MA	17.6	0.26	0.32	135.00	8
1	MI	4.4	1.06	1.11	179.00	.3
3	MN	1.5	0.16	0.49	334.00	.05
2	MS	1.1	0.13	0.08*	60.00	.03
1	MO	1.8	0.13	0.13	96.00	.05
2	MT	1.9	0.22	0.01*	99.00	.002
2	NE	2.1	0.44	0.06*	47.00	.02
4	NV	4.9	0.38	5.72	95.55	.9
1	NH	2.2	0.25	0.08*	63.74	.08
2	NJ	2.4	0.14	1.59	77.50	.4
2	NM	2.5	0.34	0.34	250.00	.02
1	NY	2.1	0.22	0.67	150.00	.2
1	NC	4.6	0.11	0.13	89.00	.02
1	ND	1.3	0.22	---	72.50	--
4	OH	1.3	0.31	0.15*	157.00	.04
3	OK	1.8	.013	0.01	69.75	.003
1	OR	2.7	4.15	2.69*	284.00	.4
4	PA	1.5	0.11	.002*	100.00	.0006
4	RI	2.5	0.14	0.51	100.00	.2
1	SC	8.9	2.67	2.67	43.00	.8
2	SD	2.0	0.20	0.03*	127.00	.02
2	TN	2.6	0.15	0.10*	68.00	.04
3	TX	3.0	0.09	1.32	112.00	.5
0	UT	8.8	6.59	6.59	161.00	.4
2	VT	3.4	0.24	0.24	100.00	.06
3	VA	2.1	0.14	0.18	94.00	.04
1	WA	1.3	0.11	---	125.00	--
1	WV	2.2	0.40	0.40	125.00	.09
2	WI	1.2	0.92	0.32*	162.41	.02
3	WY	2.9	0.44	---	60.00	--

APPENDIX B

The Survey Instrument

High School Continuation

A review of adult education literature has identified the services listed below which are potentially provided by state departments of education to local education agencies and local program administrators. Please review each item. Place a check mark (✓) to indicate the degree to which you feel your state department of education provides the services listed.

	high				low	
	5	4	3	2	1	
1 - Develop and propose methods of financing adult education						
2 - Interpret laws governing adult education						
3 - Gather and disseminate useful adult education program and statistical data						
4 - Assist and encourage the development of written policies pertaining to local and state responsibilities for adult education						
5 - Provide encouragement and assistance to schools wishing to initiate adult education programs						
6 - Provide encouragement and assistance to schools wishing to improve adult education programs						
7 - Coordinate the delivery of adult education services on the local level						
8 - Assist local schools with problems of adult education curriculum, teaching methods and organization						
9 - Publish adult education resource materials for teachers, directors and superintendents						
10 - Cooperate in planning with Adult Education councils, associations and other groups interested or engaged in adult education						
11 - Facilitate and conduct in-service training of teachers and staff in adult education						
12 - Develop a statewide awareness and visibility for adult education						
13 - Provide state level accountability for adult education expenditures						
14 - Provide recruitment and promotional materials for adult education						
15 - Maintain a clearinghouse of ideas, materials and resources for adult education						

	Yes	No
16 - <u>Allocate state funds for adult education</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17 - <u>Establish state standards for approving adult education classes</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18 - <u>Certify teachers for adult education</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19 - <u>Publish an adult education newsletter to communicate ideas</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 - <u>Provide on-site consultant services on a regular basis</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

 School District

 State

Please indicate the programs for which you have administrative responsibility.

(✓)

- ☐ Adult Basic Education
☐ High School Continuation
☐ GED

APPENDIX C

Local Education Agencies to Whom
Survey Instruments Were Mailed

INDIANA ABE/GED/HS CONTINUATION

<u>District</u>	<u>City</u>
1. Anderson Area Vocational School	Anderson
2. Monroe County Community School	Bloomington
3. Van Buren	Brazil
4. Bartholomew Consolidated Schools	Columbus
5. Fayette County School	Connersville
6. Crawfordsville Community School	Crawfordsville
7. North Adams School Corporation	Decatur
8. School City of East Chicago	East Chicago
9. Elkhart Community Schools	Elkhart
10. Mid-Central Area Vocational School	Elwood
11. Central High School	Evansville
12. Evansville-Vandersburg School Corp	Evansville
13. Fort Wayne Community Schools	Fort Wayne
14. Four County Area Vocational Corporation	Garrett
15. Career Center	Gary
16. Lake Ridge School Corporation	Gary
17. Greencastle Community Schools	Greencastle
18. West Central Joint Services	Indianapolis
19. Indianapolis Public Schools	Indianapolis
20. Vocational Building	Kokomo
21. Tippecanoe School Corporation	Lafayette
22. Logansport Community Schools	Logans Port
23. Marion Community Schools	Marion
24. MSD of Martinsville	Martinsville
25. Michigan City Area Schools	Michigan City
26. Muncie Community Schools	Muncie
27. Brown County Schools	Nashville
28. New Albany-Floyd Consolidated Schools	New Albany
29. Pike County School Corporation	Petersburg
30. Portage Township Schools	Portage
31. Blue River Vocational Tech Center	Shelbyville
32. South Bend City Schools	South Bend
33. Wawasee High School	Syracuse
34. Vigo County School Corporation	Terra Haute
35. Southeast Indiana Vocational School	Versailles
36. Upper Wabash Vocational School	Wabash

ILLINOIS ABE/GED/HS CONTINUATION

<u>District</u>	<u>City</u>
1. Argo	Summitt
2. Belleville	Belleville
3. Black Hawk	Moline
4. Bloomington	Bloomington
5. Cairo-Egyptian	Cairo
6. Community	Worth
7. Danville J.C.	Danville
8. Decatur	Decatur
9. Dept of Corrections	Springfield
10. Evanston Twp	Evanston
11. Highland CC	Freeport
12. Highland Park-Deerfield	Highland Park
13. Illinois Eastern CC	Fairfield
14. Joliet JC	Joliet
15. Joliet Twp	Joliet
16. Kankakee CC	Kankakee
17. Lake Land College District	Mattoon
18. Lawrenceville	Lawrenceville
19. Lewis & Clark CC	Godfrey
20. Leyden Evening School District	Franklin Park
21. Tyons Twp	LaGrange
22. McHenry CC	Crystal Lake
23. Monticello Community Unit	Monticello
24. Oakton CC	Morton Grove
25. Pana Community Unit	Pana
26. Peoria Adult Cont. Center	Peoria
27. Sauk Valley College District	Dixon
28. Rockford	Rockford
29. Quincy	Quincy
30. Spoon River College District	Canton
31. Spoon River College	McComb
32. Springfield	Springfield
33. Sterling	Sterling
34. Thornton CC	South Holland
35. Triton	River Grove
36. Urbana	Urbana
37. Venice	Venice
38. Waukegan	Waukegan
39. William Rainey Harper College District	Palatine

MICHIGAN ABE/GED/HS CONTINUATION

<u>District</u>	<u>City</u>
1. Allegan	Allegan
2. Alpena	Alpena
3. Berrien Springs	Berrien Springs
4. Caro	Caro
5. Crosswell Lexington	Crosswell
6. Detroit	Detroit
7. Fenville	Fenville
8. Ferndale	Ferndale
9. Gladwin	Gladwin
10. Grand Haven	Grand Haven
11. Grand Rapids	Grand Rapids
12. Gwinn	Gwinn
13. Hillsdale	Hillsdale
14. Inkster	Inkster
15. Ironwood	Ironwood
16. Jackson	Jackson
17. Lakewood	Lake Odessa
18. Lansing	Lansing
19. Livonia	Livonia
20. Manistique	Manistique
21. Midland	Midland
22. Mt. Pleasant	Mt. Pleasant
23. Muskegon	Muskegon
24. Negaunee	Negaunee
25. Oak Park	Oak Park
26. Olivet	Olivet
27. Pontiac	Pontiac
28. Royal Oak	Royal Oak
29. Saginaw	Saginaw
30. Sault St. Marie	Sault St. Marie
31. Standish-Sterling	Standish
32. Sturgis	Sturgis
33. Tawas	Tawas City
34. Three Rivers	Three Rivers
35. Utica	Utica
36. Wayne-Westland	Wayne
37. West Branch-Rese City	West Branch
38. Wyoming	Wyoming

MINNESOTA ABE/GED/HS CONTINUATION

<u>District</u>	<u>City</u>
1. Independent School District 11	Coon Rapids
2. Independent School District 709	Duluth
3. Minneapolis	Minneapolis
4. Independent School District 622	North St. Paul
5. Independent School District 742	St. Cloud
6. Independent School District 625	St. Paul
7. Independent School District 621	St. Paul

OHIO ABE/GED/HS CONTINUATION

<u>District</u>	<u>City</u>
1. Lima City Schools	Lima
2. Hamilton City Schools	Hamilton
3. Middletown City Schools	Middletown
4. East Liverpool City Schools	East Liverpool
5. Cleveland City Schools	Cleveland
6. Columbus City Schools	Columbus
7. Cincinnati City Schools	Cincinnati
8. Great Oaks Joint Vocational School	Cincinnati
9. Findlay City Schools	Findlay
10. Willoughby-Eastlake City Schools	Willoughby
11. Bellefontaine City Schools	Bellefontaine
12. Lorain City Schools	Lorain
13. Medina County JVS	Media
14. Toledo City Schools	Toledo
15. Youngstown City Schools	Youngstown
16. Marion City Schools	Marion
17. Dayton City Schools	Akron
18. Akron City Schools	Akron

WISCONSIN ABE/GED/HS CONTINUATION

<u>District</u>	<u>City</u>
1. Area VTAE District I	Eau Claire
2. Western Wisconsin VTAE District	LaCrosse
3. Southwest Wisconsin VTAE District	Fennimore
4. Area VTAE District 4	Madison
5. Blackhawk VTAE District	Jamesville
6. Gateway VTAE District	Kenoska
7. Waukesha County Area VTAE District	Pewaukee
8. Milwaukee Area VTAE District	Milwaukee
9. Moraine Park VTAE District	Fond Du Lac
10. Lakeshore VTAE District	Cleveland
11. Fox Valley VTAE District	Appleton
12. Northeast Wisconsin VTAE District	Green Bay
13. Mid-State VTAE District	Wisconsin Rapids
14. North Central VTAE District	Wausau
15. Nicolet VTAE District	Rhineland
16. Wisconsin Indianhead VTAE District	Shell Lake

APPENDIX D
Correspondence



STATE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COLUMBUS
43215

December 28, 1976

MARTIN W. ESSEX
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

R. A. HORN, Director
DIVISION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE
933 High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

I am making a study of the organizational patterns of state departments of education, with particular emphasis on the location of adult education services in the administrative table organization.

Please send me an organizational chart of your state department of education. If you have any separate material pertaining to your state level adult education administration, that would also be helpful.

Your assistance in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

George Y. Travis
Educational Consultant

GYT/mr



The Ohio State University

Academic Faculty for
Vocational-Technical Education

160 Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Phone 614 422-5037

April 21, 1978

Dear

The Ohio State University is participating in a research project concerning state level administrative organization for adult education services. The enclosure represents our analysis of your state organizational chart as it appears in the 1977 report of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education.

Please return the enclosure to confirm that our analysis is correct, or attach a corrected interpretation along with an explanation of your organizational chart.

Your assistance is appreciated.

Sincerely,

George Y. Travis

enc.
GYT/mag

College of Education

State _____

1. Highest ranking Adult Education unit recognized on the organizational chart _____.
2. Number of levels separating highest ranking unit from the Chief State School Officer _____.
3. Intervening levels: _____

_____.
4. Is the above interpretation correct? Yes _____
No _____
5. If no, please attach a corrected interpretation and explanation.

Please return no later than

_____ to:

George Travis
The Ohio State University
160 Ramseyer Hall
29 W. Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210



The Ohio State University

Adult Education

160 Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Phone 614 422-5037

October 12, 1978

Dear:

A study of the organization of state departments of education for the delivery of adult education services is being conducted at The Ohio State University. Your assistance in this project is requested.

Three color coded copies of a survey instrument are attached. The yellow instrument is intended for the administrator of the adult basic education program, the white instrument for the administrator of the high school continuation program, and the blue one for the GED program administrator. The items are identical.

If you are responsible for all three programs you can complete only one form, and indicate your program responsibility on the bottom of the page. If you are responsible for two of the areas, complete one form and have the third instrument completed by the director of that program. If you administer only one of the three, please complete the appropriate form and have directors of the other two programs complete and return the forms.

Our data analysis is dependent upon your identification by name, district and state. Data will be reported, however, only for state totals with no individual or district identified. If you contact me I will send you a composite report for your state.

Please return the instrument within 5 working days. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

George Y. Travis

GYT/jlb

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Master Plan for School District Organization in Ohio. Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1966.
- Adult Basic Education--Meeting the Challenges of the 1970's. National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1968.
- ABE Staff Training, The Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. Washington, DC, 1970.
- Adult Education in Ohio. Columbus, Ohio: F. J. Herr Printing Company, 1925.
- Adult Education - Futures and Amendments. National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Section II, 1977.
- Adult Education Services of State Departments of Education. Washington, DC.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Miscellaneous No. 31, 1977.
- An Historical Perspective. Washington, DC.: National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1976.
- Bauman, D. A Fortran Test Analysis Package. Fredonia, New York: Teacher Education Research Center, State University College, 1973.
- Beyond the Verge. National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Section I, 1977.
- A Brief History of the State Board of Education, 1963. Issued by the State Board of Education.
- Campbell, Roald F. and Mazzoni, Tim L. Jr. State Policy Making for the Public Schools: A Comparative Analysis. The Educational Governance Project, The Ohio State University, August, 1974.
- Constitution of the United States--The Tenth Amendment.
- Evening High School Bulletin. Columbus, Ohio: State of Ohio, Department of Education, 1926.

GED Manual. Washington, DC.: The GED Testing Service, American Council on Education.

Glass, Gene U., and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970.

Hendrickson, Andrew. Improving Adult Education in Ohio's Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, The Ohio State University, Autumn, 1958.

Isaac, Stephen, and Michael, William B. Handbook of Research and Evaluation. San Diego, Calif.: Edits Publishers, 1971.

Laws of Ohio. Volume 37, 1938-39, Columbus, Ohio.

Morehead, Lewis. "A Study of Problems Confronting the Public School Adult Education Administrator," Master's Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1962.

Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

Nie, Norman J., et al. Statistical Package for the Social Science. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Public Education of Adults in the Years 1924-1926. Bulletin No. 18, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, 1927.

Report of the Education Council, 1947, submitted to the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio.

Roberts, Roy W. Vocational and Practical Arts Education, Second Edition, New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

The State Department of Education. Washington, DC.: National Council of Chief State School Officers, 1952.

State and Local Responsibilities for Education. Washington, DC.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1968.

Supervision of Education For Out of School Youth and Adults as a Function of State Department of Education, Bulletin No. 6, U.S. Office of Education, 1940.

Thurston, Lee M., and Roe, William H. State School Administration.
New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York:
McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.