1-1-1980

A study to determine the extent to which the leadership development program as a nonformal educational model served to enhance educational equity as perceived by leadership development program fellows.

Kanawha Z. Chavis
University of Massachusetts Amherst

A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AS A NONFORMAL EDUCATIONAL MODEL SERVED TO ENHANCE EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AS PERCEIVED BY LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FELLOWS

A Dissertation Presented

by

Kanawha Z. Chavis, Sr.

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Education

A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AS A NONFORMAL EDUCATIONAL MODEL SERVED TO ENHANCE EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AS PERCEIVED BY LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FELLOWS

A Dissertation Presented

by

Kanawha Z. Chavis, Sr.

Approved as to style and content by:

Barbara J. Love

Dr. Barbara J. Love, Chairperson

Dr. Atron Gentry, Member

Stephen B Oates

Dr. Stephen Oates, Member

Mario Fantini

Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend sincere appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. Atron Gentry and Dr. Stephen Oates for their assistance in the completion of this dissertation. I wish to express particular appreciation and profound gratitude to my chairperson, Dr. Barbara Love, for her total commitment and support in my doctoral work. Without her feedback, criticism and dedicated encouragement, the completion of this work would not have been possible.

Many thanks to Virginia Woodward and Marion Fraleigh for their assistance in the completion of this document. I also wish to thank Sheryl Jablonski for her assistance in the typing of the final manuscript.

Finally, I thank my wife, Geneva B. Chavis for her untiring and unceasing support during this process, and my son, K.Z., Jr. for his patience and understanding for the time I did not have to share with him while I completed this research.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated

to

Arlin K. Chavis, my mother

and to

Evelyn J. Robinson

ABSTRACT

A Study To Determine The Extent To Which The Leadership Development Program As A Nonformal Educational Model Served To Enhance Educational Equity As Perceived By Leadership Development Program Fellows

(February 1980)

B.S., Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma

M.A., North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina

Ed.D., University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine the extent to which the Leadership Development Program, as a nonformal educational model, serve to enhance educational equity as perceived by former fellows in the program. The Leadership Development Program was a Ford Foundation funded, nonformal education program organized in four regions of the United States. This study focused on the program as it was organized and implemented in the South from 1966 through 1976. The Leadership Development Program sought to provide educational and leadership development opportunities to individuals with demonstrated potential for impacting in significant ways on the quality of life in their local communities. This study evaluated the Leadership Development Program in the context of nonformal education, and sought to determine whether the fellowship experience enhanced educational equity for participants

as reflected by their personal pursuit of further formal educational experience and/or credentials, their assumption of more significant or influential professional and community service roles and by the personal assumption of professional and/or community service roles which address questions of educational equity. Further, this study sought to determine which components of the Leadership Development Program were most influential in the decision to pursue further formal educational experience and on the assumption of more significant professional and community service roles, or on the assumption of roles which address questions of educational equity.

A descriptive research model is combined with correlational techniques in this study to describe systematically the influence of the Leadership Development Program. The study population consisted of 224 former fellows in the Leadership Development Program in the southern region from 1966 through 1976. The post fellows currently reside throughout the United States and are engaged in varied professional pursuits. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to fellows to secure their perceptions of the influence of the program relative to the study hypotheses. Eighty two percent of the fellows responded to the questionnaire. The demographic distribution of the

respondents was interracial, gender mixed and included an age range from 20 to 65.

For the purposes of this study, nonformal education was defined as "an intentional and systematic educational enterprise (usually outside schooling) in which content, media, time units, admission criteria, staff, facilities and other system components are selected and/or adapted for particular students, populations or situations in order to maximize attainment of the learning mission and minimize maintenance constraints of the system." The essential dimensions of nonformal education focus on structure, organization of the curriculum, control of the learning process, resource utilization and utility. This analysis of the Leadership Development Program indicates that it met each of these essential criteria.

A major finding of this study is that a significant percentage of the fellows have acquired additional educational experience since the completion of the fellowship experience. A significant percentage of the fellows are engaged in more significant professional and community service roles since the completion of their fellowship experience. Over 90 percent of the respondents reported that the Leadership Development Program influenced both their pursuit of further formal educational experience and their assumption of more significant professional

and community service roles. Further, a high percentage of the respondents reported assumption of professional and community service roles which address questions of educational equity. The study revealed that the Internship component of the program was reported by the largest percentage of fellows as having most influenced both their pursuit of further formal educational experience as well as their assumption of more significant or influential professional and community service roles.

Finally, a significant majority of the fellows reported that the Leadership Development Program experience increased their effectiveness in a wide range of professional and community service related areas. The number of fellows serving on national boards and commissions increased sharply following the fellowship experience. The number of fellows serving in governmental positions at the local, state, regional and national levels increased sharply since the fellowship experience and the number of fellows elected to public office has also increased significantly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

C H A P T E R I

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY IN THE RURAL SOUTH

The People Left Behind

One of the most exciting challenges for education today is the development and implementation of effective strategies for providing equity in educational opportunity to those who have experienced limited access to and/or success in formal educational experiences. The rural South of the United States can be described as one frontier of that challenge. Over the past twenty five years, the educational and human development needs of the poor and minorities of the rural South have been a primary concern of educators, sociologists, economists, rural developers and organizers.

Historically the South, and particularly the rural South, has been an area abundantly rich in natural resources and potential, yet pitifully impoverished in terms of utilization and application of these resources to the individual and aggregate benefit of its population.

> According to 1975 Census data shown in Table 1, mean family income, median family income, the percentage of families below the poverty level and the percentage of the population in the South below the poverty level is well below the national average.[1]

TABLE I

Comparison of Income and Poverty in the United States and the South Region, 1975

	United States				South Region			
	Total	White	Black	Spanish	Total	White	Black	Spanish
Median Family Income	14,094	14,644	9,948	9,948	12,443	13,350	8,177	10,009
Mean Family Income	16,142	16,728	11,010	11,534	14,615	15,537	9,861	11,551
% Population Below Poverty	11.4	8.8	29.6	23.1	15.3	11.0	33.2	24.5
% Families Below Poverty	10.0	7.4	28.7	22.7	13.9	9.5	31.9	24.1

SOURCE: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 112, "Money, Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the South Region, by Divisions and States," U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1978.

Further, the levels of education, labor force participation, and other indices of economic or social welfare have been and remain lower in the South than in other regions of the country.[2] This state of affairs has been aggravated and compounded by the ongoing depletion of the very human resources that might serve to reverse the pattern through outmigration to supposed areas of greater opportunity. Rural areas of the South, which have the added burden of depressed tax bases, inflated numbers of low skilled agricultural workers displaced by technological advances, limited educational resources and virtually nonexistent job opportunities suitable to population characteristics, suffer to an even greater extent than urban areas.[3] National agricultural policies and priorities which favored urban areas over rural in the provision of various assistance programs has further intensified, rather than alleviated the problem.

Factors of racism and discrimination still play a major role in the allocation of and access to those resources that are available to Southern populations. While legislation of recent years has done much to contribute to equalization of opportunities to all citizens regardless of race, it is naive to assume that the attitudes and practices of past decades have been completely overcome. Even in instances where overt discrimination has been

eliminated, the residual effects of segregation serve to establish a kind of "de facto" discrimination against blacks in terms of job opportunities, educational advancement and general participation in the "mainstream" of social, political and economic life.[4]

The net result, and to a significant extent a major cause of these circumstances, is the wholesale underdevelopment and underutilization of the one critical resource which must be applied if any long term, meaningful and equitable development of the total Southern community is to occur. This critical resource is the human resource.

According to a report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, "There were more than 700,000 adults in rural America in 1960 who had never enrolled in school. About 3.1 million had less than 5 years of schooling and were classified as functional illiterates."[5] In 1960, more than 2.3 million rural youth, aged 14 through 24, dropped out of school before graduation. "Education in the context of rural poverty" stated the Commission, "must be recognized as an investment in human capital". Further, because of the dearth of options, either for employment or social activities for community members in rural areas, education becomes of paramount importance for all socio-economic groups.

The United States South: An Underdeveloped Area

In the preface to The Challenge of World Poverty, Gunar Myrdal observed:

> Undoubtedly there is a close parallel between the international problems of the poverty in underdeveloped countries and the poverty problems in the United States and also in the ways in which these two complexes of problems have surfaced to popular consciousness and been dealt with policy wise.
>
> . . . there are also great substantive similarities between the two complexes of problems. In a very real sense the U. S. has groups of people held apart spatially, socially, and economically from the majority of Americans who live in comfortable circumstances, and therefore have development problems similar in many ways to those in the underdeveloped world.[6]

While the plight of the poor and minority populations in the rural South may not be as desperate as that of the poor of various developing countries in absolute terms, it is clear that they are in substantial poverty as related to the circumstances of the larger population.

There are many individuals in these rural areas and communities of the South who are unobtrusively struggling to improve educational and employment training opportunities in their communities. Products themselves of isolation and inadequate services and information, they are aware of the problems but are frustrated in their efforts. Their communities lack the capacity to develop resources to keep pace with employment related changes. The lack of economic resources is a factor, but even more clearly they lack the

resources of information, ideas, imagination, awareness, and the individuals who can supply and articulate these qualities. For educators, the challenge translates into the development of strategies to enhance educational opportunities which results in the development of the leadership capabilities of the people indigenous to the area.

Nonformal Education as a Strategy for Development

In developing countries, nonformal education has been demonstrated to be an effective means of reaching individuals who have not had access to formal education. Yet in spite of the obvious parallels and similarities between educational needs of the rural poor of the South and those in developing countries, nonformal education as a vehicle for providing access to educational opportunities, and thus enhancing educational equity, has gone largely untested and unstudied in this country. In an analysis of 181 recent evaluation-research studies whose aims were behavior change, only one percent were conducted in nonformal educative settings.[7]

There is a great need for both the testing of nonformal educational approaches to the development of educational equity and the evaluation of these approaches to determine their effectiveness, particularly in human resource development in the rural South.

In its efforts to address the problems of educational leadership in rural America, the Ford Foundation funded and administered a national Leadership Development Program. The national program was organized in four geographical regions: The Northeast, the South, the Southwest and a region-at-large. The organization and implementation of the Leadership Development Program (LDP), as operated in the South from 1966 through 1976, represents one nonformal educational approach to leadership development. As such, the LDP existed in a relative vacuum as related to non-formal educational models designed specifically to address the educational needs of the rural South.

This study seeks to examine the effectiveness of the LDP as a nonformal educational model designed to address the educational needs of the developing South and enhance educational equity for rural communities. The study therefore fills a significant gap in the literature and will provide data relative to both the effectiveness of the program and its replicability.

In her study, Analysis of Nonformal Education, Lyra Srinivasan suggests that nonformal education becomes clearer as an experimental strategy when a common denominator or shared assumptions have been formulated.[8] She provides the following ten assumptions regarding the characteristics of nonformal education that she believes are acceptable by practitioners in the field:

1. Adults in rural areas are more likely to accept new ideas when they can understand them in the context of their priorities and are interrelated with other important segments of their lives.

2. Effective learning takes place most easily when there is strong motivation to learn. The motive power needs to come from inner convictions and not from mere persuasion or external incentives.

3. The individual's capacity to contribute to development requires that he be able to clarify value positions, discern cause-effect relationships, make considered judgements and take responsibility for action. Learning experiences can be structured specifically to promote these attitudes, abilities and behavior.

4. The learning experience should further enable the learner to change the way he uses himself (e.g., from passive to active, timid to confident, routine to creative). This is a fundamental growth objective.

5. Conscientization is not something that can be "done" to people--it must spring from within. However, self-concepts can be strengthened and expanded through sensitive preparation of the learning experience and environment.

6. The cultural and social milieu of the rural adult can exercise a powerful and decisive hold on the individual's ability to select options. A curriculum is not likely to achieve developmental goals unless it treats integrally the "set" and the "setting"--the mind-set and the social context.

7. In rural development, the people are often their own major resource. At every stage of the educational process, local leaders and learning group peers who can play an important role in reinforcing and legitimizing change should be trained and involved in a variety of leadership roles in support of the program. Further, a facilitator drawn from within the community or from a comparable setting will be at least as successful as an outsider, if not more so. The facilitator can help establish the climate of trust which is the first step in fostering human

development. The selection, training, and use of facilitators is therefore of vital importance.

8. Technical cooperation among a variety of technical agencies and services is essential to the success of nonformal education processes and activities. Such cooperation must be based on common understanding and appreciation of human development principles and of the complementarity of staff roles. Multi-level and joint training sessions are useful devices to achieve these ends.

9. Learning materials can be developed locally with full creative involvement of learners and can greatly increase the relevance and impact of training programs.

10. Training as well as field operations must be carefully documented, analyzed, and evaluated. The experience must then be ploughed back into program planning and further training so that future programs can benefit from our experience today.[9]

These assumptions, while not consciously utilized as the philosophical basis for the development and implementation of the Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program, serve in part as the conceptual framework around which the program operated and from which the evaluative data related to the program will be analyzed.

The Leadership Development Program

The Leadership Development Program was a nonformal education program which ran a full ten years before being phased out in late 1976.[10] This program was conceived in 1965 by Edward J. Meade, Jr., an officer of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, which then served as the educational arm of the Ford Foundation. With considerable

experience in a number of fellowship programs, Meade was primarily interested in effecting individuals. At the same time, one of the tasks the Fund had undertaken was to find ways to improve the quality of rural schools in America.[11]

By early 1967 the Leadership Development Program was organized and operating, and immediately began to expand from its original focus on teachers. It became interested in rural people of any age and any background whose indefinable qualities of enthusiasm and personal force suggested that they could influence others and thus might be able to make changes in their communities. Eventually even candidates who were teachers were measured less for their potential impact on their schools than for how they might move their communities. Toward the end of the program, candidates with the best chance for selection seemed to be community organizers. In a broad sense, they were educators since organizers succeed primarily by bringing information and raising consciousness in the community. Thus the Leadership Development Program was essentially an education program.

The fact that the program sought people without credentials was probably the most courageous aspect of the program as well as its most striking feature. It made good sense, for rural life does not turn on creden-

tials. There, the requirements for acceptance, let alone leadership, turn on personal qualities; on estimates made by homespun people after careful observation, on abilities that institutions do not teach nor diplomas prove.

As the program's aim was at individuals, so its expectation of benefit was in terms of self-development of individuals. Its ultimate intentions looked generally to improvement of schools and communities, but its primary goal always was the immediate growth of the individual fellow and the expansion of those qualities that might bear on leadership in a local situation.

Substantive Distinctions of the Leadership Development Program

The Leadership Development Program was unique in that there were no educational requirements for entry into the Program. Many applicants had been deprived of early educational opportunities, victims of the tenant farm system and the lack of compulsory school attendance laws, but were self-educated through their experience.

Another point of distinction was the individualized program development for each participant, with careful attention given to the personal needs and objectives of each individual. This created opportunity for the development of leadership skills with continuing viability, rather than the development of the leader who exists only

because they satisfy the organization's current needs. It followed that a candidate's organizational affiliation at the time of the application to the LDP had limited influence on his or her selection. Further, the needs of the organization from which the applicant came had limited influence on the fellowship experience formulated for each participant. Rather, the fellow's perception of his or her needs, modified by resource information and counsel from the Program Director and others were the decisive determinants of the shape and organization of each individual fellowship experience.

The advisory function in the Program was crucially important. Consequently, the mentor relationship at each internship site varied according to individual circumstances, but its chief purpose was to provide continuing guidance (programmatic, professional or personal) for the fellows dislocated from a familiar setting while undergoing new and changing experiences. In some cases the mentor mediated the fellow's needs and the institutional requirements of his program base. In other cases the mentor served as a leadership model for the fellow.

The LDP award was not limited in scope as are most awards, honors, scholarships, stipends, and grants. The fellows' programs usually included multiple experiences which offered a combination of academic study and internship

with relevant human development programs. Most programs included travel for observation at innovative school and project centers. In some instances, fellows changed place of internship and pattern of activity as many as eight times during the award year.

Certain modifications in occupational scope were considered. Education, increasingly seen as one component integral to the process of social, community and economic development, needed broadly prepared leaders. Therefore, more school board members and a broader selection of school administrators were sought. Other community leaders could also profit from a similarly organized program. Hence, on a trial basis, the Program was expanded to include more persons with leadership potential from other walks of life. This included the selection of rural health workers, newspaper editors, job training personnel, and county and state government officials. Such people were generally able to make use of short term or mini grant awards only.

Operational Philosophy of the Leadership Development Program

More often than not, people living in depressed rural communities lack the know-how to take advantage of available resources and to keep pace with the process of change. The lack of money and jobs is a factor. The

lack of information, ideas and awareness is also critical. These later resources can often be provided by individuals who possess them and who have the unique ability to transfer them to the larger community in a manner that provides a basis for positive action. The present leadership in these communities might be presumed to be able to provide the necessary enlightenment. Though a reasonable assumption to make, it is often not the case. They are too often leaders by default, serving to guide their constituents in comfortable but self-defeating patterns. The net result is that most rural communities steadfastly pursue the status quo with all of its shortcomings. Change and innovation is often perceived as a threat to those who could most benefit from it.

The Leadership Development Program was designed to undertake the task of finding ways to improve the quality of life in rural communities in the South through the implementation of a nonformal educational fellowship program designed to develop human potential.[12] Essentially, it was a program giving consideration to the characteristic concern of rural communities with their own affairs, while recognizing the need and providing mechanisms for introducing into those communities the ability to identify and utilize appropriate developmental concepts.

Most programs supported by foundations and government traditionally aim at institutions. While fellowship programs for individuals are not uncommon, almost all seek individuals who have already proven themselves in some competitive arena. This program did not limit itself to people with such credentials. It proceeded on the notion that those who were selected as fellows generally did not have the educational background nor the interest to pursue or profit from formal graduate training. Nor would such training have proven sufficiently relevant to the individuals in the rural situations which the program served.

This program aimed at rural human resource development through a nonformal approach. The need for the development of indigenous leadership was essentially unmet by existing rural programs and institutions, yet was critical to the development of long term solutions to problems of the rural South.

It was the lack of such solutions that drove rural people to cities where their skills were worthless. This lack deprived rural communities of the vitality of those who left. The LDP sought to diminish this trend by building local capacities to identify and implement meaningful solutions through the development of potential community leaders.

Assumptions on Which the Leadership Development Program was Based

Conceptually, the assumptions underlying the LDP objectives and goals were based upon rural improvement and human resource development efforts. Some of these can be stated as follows:

1. The supply of good leaders in rural communities, while always insufficient, can be increased by systematic recruitment and intervention, rather than by awaiting the process of natural selection.

2. Leadership development is not strictly a function of time and study where, through a fixed number of months or years of academic exposure, a measurable quantity of leadership is assured.

3. There is a special need for leadership development among and for certain rural populations (Black, White, Red and Women). Moreover, the cultivation of such leadership requires focused search for potential leaders whose efforts will significantly affect these groups as well as for those who are aware of and come from these populations.

4. No program of fellowships, scholarships, grants or special awards exists which takes account of and compensates for the geographic and cultural remoteness and restricted opportunities for growth of potential leaders in the rural South.

5. There is need in the South for leaders from the South who, fully conscious of regional as well as local traditions, histories, problems and issues, will be better able to fit the variety of experiences and information afforded by the LDP to the existing leadership needs of the region.

Objectives of the Leadership Development Program

The Leadership Development Program identified men and women in the rural South who demonstrated a potential for

leadership and a commitment to the improvement of educational opportunities and the quality of life in their communities and in the region. Through individual fellowship grants awarded to such persons, LDP sought to provide the following:

1. The expansion of the exposure to information, experiences, and expertise in the fellow's expressed areas of concentration and professional concern;

2. The development of effective leadership skills and strategies allowing for flexibility and successful functioning in a variety of situations; and

3. Where feasible and applicable, the attainment of credentials which enhance upward mobility and influence upon the fellow's return to his or her community after the fellowship period.

The abstract concept of leadership development was translated into program and performance objectives for fellows, consisting of the following:

1. To become familiar with viable and innovative approaches to problem solving in their area of professional concern through on-site internships, practicums, academic work, program site visits, and/or research;

2. To assess the development of each program site in terms of factors leading to its effectiveness, impact, and durability;

3. To examine the feasibility of transferring and adapting a similiar program or project in one's home community and to determine methods and resources necessary for implementation;

4. To evaluate leadership styles and strategies of mentors in terms of their effectiveness in promoting change, and in maintaining organizational vitality;

5. To analyze the effectiveness of one's own coping strategies in relation to a variety of situations, and to practice new leadership styles and skills;

6. To reflect on one's own personal and professional growth in acquiring skills in communication, in defining objectives, in determining appropriate strategies, in understanding how one influences others; and

7. To analyze, interpret, and reflect upon the helpfulness of individual program experiences and of the fellowship year as a whole in terms of one's own personal development.

General Description of the Leadership Development Program

The LDP staff consisted of the Program Director, Assistant Program Director, Administrative Secretary/ Financial Assistant, General Secretary, and occassional consultants who rendered services in connection with selection, training, and program development.

During its period of operation, LDP concentrated upon identification and development of individuals from ten Southern States: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. Applicants were also considered from the Bootheel area of Missouri. The large cities of the region were given a lower priority.

Persons considered eligible for a fellowship included any individual living in a rural area or small community who was concerned with upgrading the standards of his or her classroom, school or community. Beyond this general

description, LDP sought people, particularly indigenous people, committed to community improvement or those who represented the indigenous cause through their efforts, who may have been overlooked in other talent searches. These were generally people who did not have the resources to support their own development.

The LDP staff was assisted in the search for and selection of fellows by the Selection Committee, which included recognized civic and educational leaders. After the respective committees for each half of the region made their selections, the LDP staff and fellows began detailed program and itinerary planning for the award year. This subsequently was budgeted and submitted with the Program Director's approval for authorization.

The operative components of LDP were as follows:

A. Public Announcement: LDP Fellowship awards were announced through various publications and newsletters or organizations working toward social change in the region, bulletin board announcements; combined Brochure/Initial Application Forms were mailed to various post fellows, selection consultants, "friends" of LDP active in reform organizations, principals in majority black school districts, black elected officials, TRIO/ESEA Title I and Title III project directors, community and human relations

commissions, community health and mental health agencies, and others in order to reach potential applicants.

B. Recruitment: A one page application, or Initial Application Form (IAP) was distributed as mentioned above, and upon inquiry at the LDP office. When the completed IAP was returned, the completion of the program proposal form was requested. Once the Proposal was completed and returned, the applicant's file was reviewed by the Screening Committee, which determined which applicants should be field interviewed.

C. Field Interview: The field interview, conducted by the Program Director, Assistant Program Director or Program Consultant, was designed to include an observation of the applicant in both work and home atmosphere. Questions were asked of various community members in order to get an index of the community perspective of the applicant. A personal interview was conducted with the applicant in his work or home setting. These were the basis for recommendations of whether or not to invite the applicant to the Selection Meeting.

D. Selection: Candidates were selected by Selection Consultants (SMCs), who were experienced and knowledgeable individuals from throughout the region. The selection process consisted of an informal gathering and interaction the first evening between candidates and the selection

committee (usually not identified as such). There were four interviews the second day. One interview was conducted by a team of experts. These individual interviews were also conducted. Interview rating and recommendation forms were tallied and candidates were selected on a competitive basis.

E. Program Development and Budgeting: A schedule of each fellow's program activities was developed in the fellows home state, with the assistance of the Program Director, consultants and the LDP staff. A corresponding budget was determined according to the following categories: (1) travel; (2) tuitions and fees; (3) housing; (4) cultural activities; (5) books, materials and supplies: (6) other (such as conferences, childcare, and supplementary allowances); and (7) salary equivalent.

F. Program Approval: Completed Background and Program Descriptions, including budget, were reviewed and approved by the fellow and Program Director.

G. Conferences: Several conferences were planned for the fellows:

1. An orientation meeting in conjunction with the Annual Conference of post fellows in August;
2. An orientation meeting in November for further training and program reassessment after two months of internship experiences;
3. A Mid-Year Conference held in January, and

4. A debriefing/reorientation session held in conjunction with the next Annual Conference.

H. Other Fellowship Activities: Fellowships provided for up to a year of varied experiences. While most programs differed substantially from all others, they generally included some or all of the following:

1. Internships with recognized leaders or managers of local, regional, or national reputation in school districts, federal offices, state agencies, community action program organizations, and private business;

2. Practicum experiences with projects stressing educational, economic or personal development;

3. Regional workshops, seminars and individual studies of local conditions';

4. Observation of programs and special projects applicable to their fields of interest; and/or

5. Academic Study.

I. Post Fellowship Support: In addition to the fellowships, the Program also provided post fellowship support. This program component which was intended to prevent the returning fellows from being trapped by the conditions of ignorance, insularity, and poverty which they were trying to overcome. The fellowship experience generally provided a multiplicity of experiences and ideas. On return to the reality of their communities, fellows often found that the old job was not waiting; and quite often there were gaps between the innovative techniques fellows wished to implement and their ability to do so.

The post fellowship support took two forms. One form of post fellowship support consisted of small supplements to former fellows to help them start or continue an effort related to their fellowship experiences or to give them the opportunity to gain a precise personal competence in an area in which they lacked expertise. In a few instances, the capability to hire consultants to work with former fellows in their school districts/communities for a short time was provided. The second form post fellowship support took was the allocation of funds by the LDP office to hold conferences of former fellows, by states and region, to exchange views and counsel with each other and with the Program.

Through such support fellows received added technical assistance, planned projects and also advised the Program Director in his work with new fellows.

J. Post Fellows Association: LDP created a cadre of intelligent, talent and trained leaders in a variety of fields and areas. The beginnings of what could be viable organizations among the post fellows were developed on a state and regional level. Whether at conferences or outside them, fellows appeared to be expending great efforts at beating the isolation barriers, remaining in touch, exchanging information, and were beginning to build a network of skilled individuals that could potentially assist all LDP fellows in whatever efforts they might be

engaged. Most fellows learned the difficulty of carrying forward a complex project almost alone. The Post Fellows Associations provided a vital and necessary linkage among fellows and thus helped to integrate and coordinate developmental efforts within the region.

K. Monitoring: LDP staff closely monitored each fellow's program through the following:

1. Fellow's expense reports and receipts;
2. Fellow's narrative reports covering internships, activities, experiences, and personal observation and reflections;
3. Staff visits to observe and confer with fellows and mentors at program sites;
4. Mentor contact through telephone conversations and correspondence;
5. Additional contact with each fellow by phone or letter; and
6. Mentor evaluation forms returned after each internship covering the fellow's activities and performance.

In these ways, LDP staff was able to monitor and evaluate each mentor relationship and site from the viewpoints of the mentor, fellow, and staff; and to document and evaluate each fellow's progress and performance in the same manner. Such close monitoring was essential to the staff in terms of planning and evaluation. It was also beneficial to fellows, for in some cases it enabled them to receive academic credit for program experiences and thereby in-

creased their credibility and influence in their home community.

Modification and Impact

During its operation, the program expanded geographically to inlcude six additional states. The source of interest was broadened through selection of fellows whose concerns addressed rural problems in such fields as elected officials, rural munincipal services, rural comprehensive health and mental health, prison reform, and rural economic development. Fellowships provided an intensive full year of internships, study and practicum, in addition to the short term grant of three to six months and the mini grant of one to three months. Short term awards were made to individuals who did not need and/or could not afford longer periods away from their community and constituency.

Although the scope and recruitment areas were broadened, candidate for this regional program, regardless of their area of interest, must have evidenced personal and professional commitment and sincere interest in using their anticipated new knowledge and skills to improve education, social services, and equal opportunity and access for poor and disadvantaged rural Southerners.

There were other modifications of the Program in terms of recruitment and selection of fellows, due in part to

improved access to higher education. Initially, the Program looked for applicants with at least a bachelor's degree but less than a postgraduate degree. Later applicants were selected who had not completed grade school, while continuing to place less emphasis on those with postgraduate degrees. In all cases selection of fellows focused on the criteria of rural problems and leadership needs, and applicants were selected regardless of educational attainment to include fellows with Masters and Doctorate degrees as well. Thus, the recruitment and selection process evolved both in recognition of the increased availability of support for students in higher education and in acknowledgement of the general inadequacy of post-graduate studies in developing and preparing rural leaders.

Another modification resulted from the increasing frequency of direct and indirect cooperative arrangements with many agencies and institutions that included the federal, state and local, public and private sectors, and also some colleges and universities. In some cases, fellows were able to receive academic credit for LDP experiences. In others, the fellows employer agency or an organization working in the same field elected to provide salary equivalent or partial program expenses in order to support, supplement, and maximize the LDP experiences.

The mentor relationship proved to be an important feature of the internship experience. Mentors at internship sites provided time, energy, input, experience and advice to fellows as they undertook their internships, on-site visits, and studies across the country, and frequently underwrote their participating in various program related conferences, seminars and institutes.

This, in turn, enabled LDP to increase its impact during the fellowship period by affording the fellow an opportunity to earn academic credit or to gain additional experience that otherwise might have exceeded budgeted fellowship costs. The Program continued, however, to recruit and select fellows regardless of organizational or institutional leadership needs. These cooperative arrangements were the product of good will, recognition of the value of the fellowship in terms of adult education as well as professional development. They also reflected a significant shared interest in the improvement of conditions in the rural South.

The LDP fellows developed strong relationships with each other. They also developed professional and personal linkages with the network of LDP post fellows who had participated in the Program since 1966.

Statement of the Problem

Two concerns provide the focus for this study. One is the need to enhance educational equity for people of the rural South. The second is the critical lack of nonformal educational models which have been tested in this country in terms of their effectiveness as mechanisms for enhancing educational equity. The Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program (LDP), as operated in the South between 1966 and 1976, has been one of the few models of a non-formal educational approach implemented in the rural South. Accordingly, it is appropriate to attempt some assessment or evaluation of its effectiveness as an educational approach in general, and as a mechanism for enhancing educational equity in particular.

Nonformal education has had limited application in this country. One consequence is that there are no established standards by which an assessment can be conveniently made. Indeed it is virtually impossible to make any such assessment without turning directly to those who were the "subjects" of the LDP "experiment" -- the LDP fellows themselves. They are the individuals effected by the LDP experience, particularly as related to enhancing educational equity in the rural South. They alone have the combined knowledge of the LDP and the personal background information of their own experiences and abilities. This study

analyzes data solicited from past fellows to provide an assessment of the LDP as a nonformal education program.

The purposes of this study are:

1. To determine whether the LDP experience served to directly enhance educational equity as perceived and reported by the fellows themselves;

2. To determine the extent to which the LDP experience served to motivate or enhance personal pursuit of further educational experiences and/or credentials as perceived and reported by the fellows themselves;

3. To determine the extent to which the LDP experience served to motivate or enhance assumption of professional and/or community service roles which contribute to educational equity, as perceived and reported by the fellows themselves; and

4. To identify components or aspects of the LDP experience which were perceived by LDP fellows to be most important in influencing their decisions regarding formal educational pursuits and/or assumption of roles which contribute to educational equity.

The specific questions answered by this study are:

1. What were the levels of formal educational experience of LDP fellows prior to their LDP fellowship experience?

2. What are the current levels of formal educational experience of LDP fellows?

3. Did the LDP experience serve to motivate the personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials by LDP fellows?

4. What aspects of the LDP experience (i.e., selection process, individual program development process, internship experiences, conferences and workshops and post fellowship experiences) were most critical in influencing LDP fellows further pursuit of formal educational experiences or credentials?

5. What were the professional roles of LDP fellows prior to their LDP experience?

6. What are the current professional roles of LDP fellows?

7. What were the community service roles of LDP fellows prior to their fellowship experience?

8. What are the current community service roles of LDP fellows?

9. Did the LDP fellowship experience serve to motivate the personal assumption of professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity?

10. What aspects of the LDP experience were most critical in influencing assumption of professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity?

Study Hypotheses

Research of the above questions was undertaken to establish the validity of the study hypotheses as decribed below.

Hypothesis one: The Leadership Development Program experience enhanced educational equity for fellows as reflected by (1) personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials and (2) personal assumption of professional and/or community service roles which address questions of educational equity.

The sub-hypotheses were:

1. The Leadership Development Program experience motivated program participants (fellows) to assume

professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity.

2. The Leadership Development Program fellows will report that one outcome of the LDP experience was pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials.

Hypothesis two: The Leadership Development Program fellows will report the program development process as being the component of the LDP which was most important in influencing their decisions regarding formal educational pursuits and/or assumption of roles which contribute to educational equity.

Significance of the Study

The need for the development and implementation of new and effective strategies for providing educational equity to the disadvantaged and minorities living in rural areas of the country, and particularly of the rural South is evident. Nonformal education is one approach which appears to hold great potential as a vehicle for gaining equity. Thus, this study may be of value to planners who influence the design and implementation of specific educational strategies on federal, regional, state and local levels. It may be of value to colleges and universities currently involved in training programs for professional adult educators so as to facilitate the integration or coordination of nonformal education programs and techniques with the formal education system.

Furthermore, this study may be of value to various agencies or institutions which work with rural disadvantaged or minority groups in capacities other than formal education, such as community service or community development organizations concerned with upgrading the quality of life for rural residents; public health departments, welfare agencies, employment services or other government facilities charged with direct provision of services to disadvantaged and minority individuals, vocational or employment training programs whether operated by public or private sector; and private industry engaged in the creation and upgrading of a skilled workforce.

Finally, this study may be of significance as a first step in directing attention to the need and value of the further development and testing of models of nonformal education for general use in the rural South of this nation.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study exist in the two areas of the research population and instrumentation. Specifically, the research population was drawn from approximately two hundred former participants (post fellows) in the LDP program. Thus generalizations made from the results of this study must be limited to groups reflective of similar characteristics.

The second area of limitation is in the research instrument. Validity of the generalizations made from the data gathered by the study instrument will depend upon it measuring what it purports to measure. Further, validity of the generalizations made from the data gathered by the study instrument will depend upon the degree of true feelings expressed by the respondents.

Plan and Content of this Thesis

This chapter has presented a general and specific statement of the problem, along with background information on the Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program. The significance and limitations of this study were also discussed. Chapter II contains a review of specific aspects of the literature on nonformal education and provide a context for the examination of the LDP as a nonformal educational model. A description of the methodology used in the study is outlined in Chapter III. Chapter III also includes background information on the research population, a description of the development of the research instrument, and an operational definition of terms.

Chapter IV presents a compilation and analysis of the data collected in this study. The data is organized and presented according to the major study questions and related to the major hypotheses of this study. Chapter V,

the concluding chapter, contains a summary of results, conclusions and recommendations for further research.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the problems created by the poor quality of educational services available to residents of the rural South and the need for program development aimed toward enhancing educational equity and the quality of life for rural residents. Nonformal education was presented as one approach which has been used in developing countries to respond to the lack of adequate and viable educational services and community development in rural areas. It was suggested that the parallels between educational and economic conditions in the rural South and those of developing nations were distinctive and clear. At the same time, there have been few applications of nonformal education to the education and economic development needs of the rural South of the United States.

The Leadership Development Program was presented as one nonformal educational model with potential for such application. The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which the Leadership Development Program was perceived by fellows to be effective in enhancing educational equity. This chapter has presented the background for that examination.

C H A P T E R I I

ENHANCING EDUCATIONAL EQUITY THROUGH NONFORMAL EDUCATIONAL MODELS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Leadership Development Program as a nonformal educational model, in enhancing educational equity in the rural South. Data on the perceptions of the participants in that program regarding the influence of LDP in motivating their pursuit of further formal education, acquisition of degrees/credentials subsequent to their participation in the program, and their assumption of professional and community service roles is analyzed to answer questions related to the effectiveness of LDP. This chapter reviews related literature on nonformal education, and examines the Leadership Development Program as a nonformal educational model.

Defining Nonformal Education

The development of the nonformal education movement stems from a variety of concerns about effective ways of assisting rural community development in developing nations. There is also a growing recognition that human development and learning is a life long process and the right to education should not be limited to the young or the elite.

Nonformal education represents a serious and somewhat widescale attempt to respond to the human development needs of people living in underdeveloped areas of the world.

Toward the end of the 1960s, there was a convergence of thinking which brought into focus the importance of rural development to total economic development. This was true both in the United States where in 1966 Lyndon Johnson expanded his "War on Poverty" to include a rural emphasis, and among international developmentalist organizations such as the World Bank and USAID which began to shift the assistance focus to rural areas.

At the same time there was growing interest among those working with developing countries in utilizing nonformal education as a vehicle for improving living conditions in underdeveloped rural areas. Nonformal education was not a new idea for developing countries. It has been used by both private, nonprofit organizations such as missionary groups, and by governments of developing countries to improve conditions among the rural poor.[1] However, the end of the sixties seems to have seen the coming of age of nonformal education, at least among those working with developing countries.

Nonformal education emphasizes people involvement and stresses education as a developmental and continuing process open to adults as well as to youth. While there is no consensus among proponents about precisely what

nonformal education should do, there appears widespread conviction that nonformal education can be a valuable force toward improving the economic, educational, social and political conditions of the rural poor.

Part of the reason for the widespread interest in non formal education is its versatility as a mechanism for human resource development. Nonformal education, according to Lyra Srnivasan, is not a "preconceived package" to be tacked onto existing educational structures.[14] Rather, it is a learning process that has distinctive characteristics that can be distinguished from traditional formal schooling. Srinivasasn describes some of those characteristics as follows:

> Nonformal education projects are not static, they are constantly evolving, their objectives are subject to change as new insights into the learning process are gained through field experience. Instead of being inflexibly committed to a particular curriculum strategy, the tendency is to stay open to ideas and move along a continuim of developing learning theory.[15]

Phillip Coombs and Manzoor Ahmed in Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal Education Can Help, provide a useful definition of nonformal education. They also distinguish between nonformal education, formal education and informal education. They define nonformal education as:

> . . . any systematic organized, educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particular subgroups in the population, adults as well as children.[16]

They distinguish it from formal education which they define as:

> . . . the highly institutionalized, chronologically graded and hierarchically structured 'education system,' spanning lower primary school and the upper grade reaches of the university.[17]

An informal education which is:

> . . . the life long process by which every person acquires and accumulates knowledge, skills, attitudes and insights from daily experience and exposure to the environment--at home, at work, at play; from the examples and attitudes of family and friends; from travel, reading newspapers and books; or by listening to the radio or viewing films or television.[18]

While it is obvious, as indicated by LaBelle in his discussion of the Coombs and Ahmed definition, that these are more educational modes than discrete entities, nonetheless, they serve as useful distinctions for the purposes of focusing our examination of the Leadership Development Program.[19]

Kleis et. al. also make the distinction between nonformal education and informal education. They describe a continuim which includes incidental education, informal, nonformal and formal education. They see informal education as the organization, examination and implementation of those day to day direct living experiences which shape beliefs, attitudes, values and in general, how people perceive the world around them. In contrast, they see formal education as "closely integrated structurally and substantively" and define it as a system which tends to "constrain each of

its organizational, human and curricular components to its own stability or maintenance requirements. . ."[20] Thus formal education is seen to include the systematic structuring of the learning experience based on explicit statements of mission, roles and established patterns of operation. They conclude that nonformal education is:

> any intentional and systematic educational enterprise (usually outside of traditional schooling) in which content, media, time units, admissions criteria, staff, facilities, and other system components are selected and/or adapted for particular students, populations or situations in order to maximize attainment of the learning mission and minimize maintenance constraints of the system.[21]

For the purposes of this study, we have adopted the Coombs and Ahmed definition for it contains the essential characteristics posed by the proponents of NFE and allows the needed distinctions.

Nonformal Education: A Perspective on Rural Development

Nonformal education depends on forming new sets of relationships among educators and citizens. It therefore requires new administrative arrangements and attitudes and new assumptions about accountability and control that better incorporate the ideas, wants and needs of people.

The basic assumptions of nonformal education appear to tie very directly with educational developmental needs of the rural South. As a strategy, it takes a functional view of education, in contrast to the structural and institutional

approach used in most educational planning and administration. Instructional Methodologies are determined through analysis which begins with the learners and their needs and from this assessment, seeks to determine what educational means might be most appropriate for meeting those needs.

Nonformal education is based on the conviction that education can no longer be viewed as a timebound, place bound process confined to schools and measured by years of exposure. Rather, it is a concept that equates education with learning, regardless of where, how or when the learning occurs. Thus defined, nonformal education is obviously a continuing process, spanning the years from earliest infancy through adulthood and necessarily involving a great variety of methods and sources.[22]

Nonformal Education and the Rural Poor

Nonformal education has generated a great deal of interest as a vehicle to focus educational resources on the problems of improving the lot of the rural poor. To date, this interest has been concentrated on developing countries. UNESCO, WHO, FAO, the World Bank, World Education, the Academy of Educational Development and other educational and professional organizations have engaged in considerable research on the subject. Several universities, including the University of Massachusetts, University of

California at Los Angeles, Florida State University and Michigan State University, under contracts with AID, have engaged in campus and field studies and instructional programs to define and develop educational measures and to modernize educational approaches.[23]

There is growing conviction, reflected in the interest on the part of international development agencies and universities, that nonformal education has something to offer. Cole S. Brembeck, Director of the Institute for International Studies in Education at Michigan State University, stated:

> Properly designed and managed it (nonformal education) can reach remote populations not served by formal schools. It can educate the dropout. It deals directly with problems of basic subsistence, such as food production, nutrition and health.[24]

Betru Gebregziabher, Head of the Extension, Education and Cooperative Promotion Department, Arssi Rural Development Unit, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in discussing one of the experimental projects in nonformal education suggested:

> Insofar as rural development can be achieved through systematic educational efforts designed to be flexible and voluntary with provision for self-directed discovery, and inasmuch as the task involves a special endeavor tailored to the specific needs of a particular target, the name of the game is the instrumentality of nonformal education.[25]

Thus nonformal education may be seen as a flexible, learner-centered, functional approach to education, which is viewed by developmental organizations and educators as a useful tool

to promote rural development, particularly in the developing countries.

Coombs and Ahmed paint a very clear, concise picture of the problems of the rural poor in developing countries and of the role of education in perpetuating an imbalance between rural areas and other parts of society. They declared that development efforts for the most part in developing countries over the past decades had followed a lopsided pattern. The emphasis on modernization of urban areas resulted in little benefit to those living in rural areas. The consequence of the modernization thrust served only to create a wider social and economic gap between the urban and the poverty stricken rural communities of these developing countries. Coombs and Ahmed are convinced that such a lopsided thrust served to threaten the progress of these nations in ways that retarded the developmental process in the urban sectors, as well as total national development.[26]

From their viewpoint, past educational efforts served to contribute significantly to this imbalance because the dominant policy regarding developing countries had been that of helping them achieve rapid quantitative expansion of the traditional education system. It is apparent from their discussion that as the developing countries entered the 1970's they found themselves in

deepening educational distress. This distress was attributed to serious financial limitations as well as serious maladjustment.

> National development in general was suffering from this education crisis but rural people were its most serious victims for three main reasons. First, urban areas had been strongly favored in the allocation of scarce educational resources. Second, the incompatibility between what schools were teaching and what the people needed to learn was most severe in rural areas. Third, educational policies had equated education largely with formal schooling; hence, the important learning needs of children and adults outside school who constituted the great majority of the rural population, were being seriously neglected.[27]

The problem of resource allocation seems to have been attacked by the changing emphases on investment in rural areas. "The emphasis on rural poor as a main focus of AID's programs dates formally from the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973."[28] A new World Bank policy in 1973, "focused directly on improving the income and quality of life of the rural poor," in developing countries.[29] This author contends that the educational and developmental needs of the rural poor of the South may be viewed from the same perspective as those of so-called "developing countries."

With its emphasis on a non-institutional, flexible, client-centered approach to education, nonformal education is one vehicle which holds great promise as a vehicle to meet some of the developmental needs of the rural poor.

The Rural Poor in the United States South--The Opportunity

In 1974, a Task Force on Southern Rural Development, sponsored by the Southern Regional Council, brought together a group of distinguished southerners under the leadership of Alexander Heard, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, and Vivian Henderson, formerly President of Clark College, to examine the problems of the rural South.* The Task Force noted the changes that had taken place in the South from the Depression era when "President Franklin Roosevelt described the South as 'the nation's number one economic problem.'" Roosevelt was:

> . . . articulating what had been evident to scholars of the region for decades. Predominantly rural and agricultural, bound by a tradition of segregation and racial politics, the region lagged behind the rest of the nation by almost every standard.[30]

According to this Task Force, the situation was then different, with the South rapidly becoming "the nation's leading growth region." Having developed dramatically during these last decades, as a region the South was emerging as a major locus of the nation's economic, social and cultural strength.[31] The Task Force felt that the time was "right for the Southern region to solve at last

---

*Among the other members of the Task Force was Jimmy Carter, who was elected President before the Task Force had completed its work.

its remaining human resource problem, "The People Left Behind." They concluded:

> Above all else, the rural South's problem is one of wasted human resources. To the extent that millions of rural Southerners experience disproportionately high rates of poverty, unemployment, and underdevelopment, receive inadequate and inferior educations, and live under conditions that are not conducive to physical and mental growth, they are denied the chance to develop their full potential. They suffer and the society is deprived.[32]

The parallels between the problems of the rural poor in developing countries and those of the rural South are apparent. These parallels include: an economy presently or formerly based on agriculture (i.e., a significant percentage of the population currently relies on agriculture-related employment or has been displaced from agriculture-related employment because of technological advances and governmental policies effecting agricultural activity); lack of significant industrial development activity to date; and a high incidence of unemployment and underemployment; ("too many people in the rural South are poor, suffer from poor health, nutrition, housing and inadequate health care.")[33]

These same parallels extend to the formal educational system. The Task Force on Rural Development focused on the importance of education when it stated:

> Since education transmits values, Southern rural education can free the mind or confine it. It can either energize students or destroy their initiative. It can help to develop leadership that is informed, compassionate, realistic, forward looking, or

> leadership that will be less effective in meeting the requirements of Southern rural development.[34]

The track record of the formal education system to date has not been that good. Charles Silberman in Crisis in the Classroom notes that our schools are doing little to facilitate the movement of the poor and disadvantaged into the mainstream of American economic and social life. He argues the "commonness" of the common school in the U.S.A. is greatly exaggerated since public schools are middle class or upper middle class institutions.[35] Further, Silberman suggests that schools have changed but still fail to provide the kind of education that blacks, poor whites and other minorities need or deserve if they are to function in the economic and political life of the community.[36]

Testifying before the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Reverend A. J. McKnight of Louisiana described the attitude of the rural poor towards education as follows:

> To the middle class it (education) stands for the road to better things for one's children and one's self. To the poor it is an obstacle course to be surmounted until the children can go to work.[37]

According to Robert Marion in a Background paper presented for the Task Force on Southern Rural Development, the rural education system in the South is in need of change. High rates of illiteracy, excessive numbers of dropouts and push-outs, an imbalance of vocational skills, and very low levels of educational achievement are indicative of the formal education system's failure.

Schools have had a negative rather than a positive effect on the lives and aspirations of Southern youth.[38]

The National Advisory Commission summarized the problem as the inability of rural communities to prepare people to participate in the modern economy. Just as underdeveloped countries have been credited with a lack of understanding of and appreciation for the entrepreneurial attitudes and behavior of developed nations, so it is theorized that a "culture of poverty" exists in this country, isolating and imprisoning the poor in a set of attitudinal and behavior patterns that preclude integration into the "mainstream" of American life.[39] Gustav Ranis, in a discussion entitled "Economic Dualism at Home and Abroad" states:

> There exist pronounced real-world similarities between the situation of the poor countries abroad trying to achieve self-sustaining growth with the help of the rich, and the largely black urban minority at home trying to join the rest of a prosperous society with the help of the federal exchequer.[40]

John Donavan, in The Politics of Poverty, goes so far as to discuss an internal "nation of the poor" comprised of over 35 million individuals. He points out that of more than eighty nations on the State Department's list of under-developed nations, only six had more than 35 million people, and that a nation of 35 million people would in fact constitute the fifteenth largest country in the world.[41] He states that:

> As a social phenomenon, poverty in this country means poor schools, bad neighborhoods, some of the worst housing in Western industrialized civilization, poor health, and extraordinarily poor prospects for effecting any fundamental change in the system.[42]

The economic and social conditions of the United States South typifies Donavan's description. Yet, social institutions in the south show no indication of ability to respond to those needs. In particular, school systems have failed to prepare people for jobs and help them to become productive members of society.[43]

In spite of the recognition of the limitations of the formal education system, it is not being suggested that nonformal education should substitute for formal education. What is being suggested is that nonformal education is a legitimate education and human development process which may be of particular benefit to those individuals and groups who have not met with success within the formal system.

In the next section, consideration will be given to some of the current theories in education and psychology which would seem to support nonformal education as a legitimate education process.

Supporting Theories for Nonformal Education

Based on the preceeding discussion, we can summarize the basic assumptions of nonformal education as a functional rather than an institutional approach, with learning rather

than certification as its goals; as client centered, tailored to specific needs; and as aiming at increasing the individual's capacity to be self directed. It is not time bound, but rather education for life.

There are a number of current trends and ideas which are supportive of the assumptions inherent in nonformal education. The "anti-credentialing" trend evidenced in writings of Jencks has received widespread attention. In Inequality, Jencks reports:

> There has always been a conflict in American education between the idea that academic credentials should measure competence and the idea that they should reward effort.
>
> Many schools and colleges have ended up awarding credentials primarily for effort rather than performance. Thus, high schools have largely abandoned the idea that students should have to know anything in particular in order to earn a diploma. The student who has spent twelve years in attendance is generally felt to have 'earned' some kind of diploma, and it seems 'unfair' to send him away empty-handed.[44]

He states that research indicated that "neither credentials nor examination scores predict performance in most lines of work very accurately."

In The Farther Reaches of Human Nature, Abraham Maslow expresses some amazement at the importance placed on credentials over learning.[45] He suggests that students have been steeped in attitudes of extrinsic learning and respond to grades and examinations as chimps respond to poker chips. He feels the phrase "earning a degree" summarizes the evils

of extrinsically oriented education: students automatically get degrees after investing prescribed numbers of hours. Leaving college before completion of one's senior year is considered to be a waste of time by the society regardless of the learning that may have taken place, since only the final degree is considered to have any real value.[46] Maslow expressed some satisfaction with the following story about Upton Sinclair:

> When Sinclair was a young man, he found that he was unable to raise the tuition money needed to attend college. Upon careful reading of the college catalogue, however, he found that if a student failed a course, he received no credit for the course, but was obliged to take another course in its place. The college did not charge the student for the second course, reasoning that he had paid once for his credit. Sinclair took advantage of this policy and got a free education by deliberately failing all his courses.[47]

Here was appreciation for an interest in learning without credentials in spite of the larceny involved.

In describing education as functional rather than institutional, Illich speaks in favor of equal education opportunity but does not wish to see this limited to formal education:

> Equal educational opportunity is, indeed, both a desirable and a feasible goal, but to equate this with obligatory schooling is to confuse salvation with the Church . . .
>
> (He feels that the) first article of a bill of rights for a modern humanistic society (would be) 'The State shall make no law with respect to the establishment of education.'[48]

As an organized approach to providing equity to access, nonformal education would not seek to eliminate formal education. Rather it would seek to establish quality of the learning involved and equal access as key criteria, as opposed to issues such as use of formal structure and control of credentialing devices. Further, it would adhere to the type of broad definition of learning implied when a goal of education is seen as capacity building or increasing the individual's ability to be self directed.

The human capacity building and human resource development goals of nonformal education are echoed in the writings of the "humanistic education" school represented by Maslow, Rogers and Knowles. Maslow, associated with "self-actualization" of a person, the becoming fully human, the development of the fullest height that the human species can stand up to or that the particular individual can come to. In a less technical way, it is helping the person to become the best that he is able to become.[49] For these humanistic educators, human resource development is not a precondition for education, it is an important goal or outcome of education. This is true also for nonformal education.

The view that education is a life-long experience, not one limited to the time the individual spends in a formal classroom, it obviously important for nonformal education. This is particularly so if its target groups are those who are past the age for formal schooling, are dropouts, or, as

in the case of the developing world, have never been to school.

In the United States, the closest movement to nonformal education is the adult education movement with which Malcolm Knowles is associated. Adult education shares many of the concerns of nonformal education, particularly the concept of lifelong education. In The Modern Practice of Adult Education, Knowles stated:

> The problem is that education is not yet perceived as a lifelong process . . . One mission of the adult educator, then, can be stated positively as helping individuals to develop the attitude that learning is a lifelong process and to acquire the skills of self-directed learning.[50]

This sentiment is repeatedly echoed in the writings of other thinkers who wish to separate learning and schooling.

Coombs states:

> The long-term goal must be developed in each country and area a comprehensive, flexible and diversified open-access rural learning system, one that affords a wide range of continuous learning systems--informal, nonformal and formal--to rural people of all ages, suitable to their roles, ambitions, interests and basic needs.[51]

Dimensions of Nonformal Education

An examination of the literature on nonformal education revealed several dimensions of NFE which appeared significant to this assessment of the Leadership Development Program. These dimensions focus on structure, organization

of the curriculum, control of the learning process, resource utilization and utility.

Limited structure is one dimension of NFE, with programs demonstrating almost unlimited flexibility. There is no fixed curricula and the learning opportunities facilitated by NFE are not time bound or place bound. NFE encourages shifting from one setting or activity to another as opportunities for learning take on new patterns.[52] There is flexibility in method as well as timing.[53] The focus in NFE is on the needs of the individual learner. The low level of structure enables programs to be innovative in accomodating those needs and responsive in adjusting to changing needs and demands.[54]

The organization of the curriculum in NFE is not fixed. As cited earlier, Srinivasan defines NFE as not being committed to a particular curriculum strategy.[55] Rather, according to Evans and Etling a "Cafeteria curriculum" should characterize the organization for learning, including options and choices.[56] The interests, motivations and wishes of the participants should be the starting point in curriculum development, even when those "initial prime interests do not match what the program architects might wish."[57] In contrast to formal education, curriculum planning in NFE takes advantage of opportunities and activities already in existence rather than creating new

experiences to fill learner needs.[58] NFE curricula includes participatory learning and requires the active involvement of the individuals in the process.

Evaluation of learning in NFE is more often cumulative and informal, and requires continuing interaction between the learner and the curriculum organizers. A performance based model is inherent in the view of NFE as a learner centered approach to education. Emphasis in NFE "is on acquisition of skills and the criterion for mastery or competency is often defined by the learner."[59]

Learner control of the learning process is a significant dimension of NFE. The learner centered nature of the process means that "learners create their own environments for learning," rather than having it imposed by the structure or by the curriculum development experts. Further, learners participate in determining objectives as well as content and method.[60] Again, according to Evans & Etling, self awareness and power to control the environment are key to NFE.[61] Educational goals which are practical and related directly to the needs of the learners are central.[62] The pedagogy presented by Paulo Friere places strong emphasis on learner control of the direction, content and outcome of the learning process.[63] In particular, Freire stresses the need for peer relationships between the learner and educator, and suggests that the role of facilitator best denotes the desired

peerness. Coombs suggests that self instruction may be the more effective strategy and that teachers might be best viewed as guides and coaches.[64]

The ways in which available resources are used is another significant dimension of NFE. As an educational strategy, NFE operates outside the formal schooling structure. NFE should not then, compete with those institutions for resources. Neither should it attempt to duplicate the ways schools expend resources. In most cases, NFE relies on special funding sources and alternative utilization of existing resources. Most of the literature related to NFE has been concerned with its applications in developing countries. Consequently most suggestions center around warnings against pilot projects which cannot be duplicated; the implementation of costly projects which cannot be maintained; investments in substantial capital expenditures; and excessive dependence on costly personnel.[65] Paulston suggests that some of the cost of nonformal education may be borne by the learners.[66] In any case, NFE must, for the most part, rely on innovative strategies to secure required resources, particularly personnel and facilities.

Another dimension of NFE is the immediate utility of learning. According to Brembeck, NFE emphasizes "functional learning that bears an immediate and direct relationship to the life style of learners."[67] The focus in NFE is on the acquisition of specific knowledge, understandings and

competencies which have immediate application to the resolution of specific issues and problems. Learning activities in NFE tend to have a present time orientation. Increased economic well being, productivity, and more effective participation in the life of the community are goals of the learning process. This dimension is of particular importance since the clientele for NFE programs more often tend to be those who have been bypassed by formal schooling and may have low tolerance for future oriented learning experiences.[68]

Nonformal Education in the Rural South

With the exception of the Leadership Development Program, nonformal education has been virtually untried in the rural South in spite of the obvious parallels and similarities between the rural poor in the South and those in developing countries. The Adult Education movement mentioned above does have some similarities. This movement, however, is conceptually tied to implementation through institutions of formal education and/or to dealing with people who have succeeded within these formal institutions.

One reason for the lack of experimentation with NFE models may be the apparent success of the United States' education system when compared with that of the developing countries. In this country, the opportunity for education

is theoretically held out to all. In practice, however, large numbers of the population are often either denied or fail to take advantage of education opportunities. In the rural South, the appropriate educational opportunities simply may not, in many instances, exist. To the extent that they do exist, they are often not responsive to the needs of the people, or delivery mechanisms may not be appropriate to match available opportunities to those most in need of utilizing them.

Those in a position to suggest nonformal approaches are perhaps reluctant to do so lest it be considered an invitation to a dual education system. Yet, nonformal education should be viewed as a supplement to rather than a replacement of existing education systems. As Coombs observed in his discussion of rural learning systems, "the two should have many common denominators and there should be many avenues of transfer from one to the other."[69] In fact, nonformal education holds possibilities for success in the rural South to an even greater extent than in developing countries because of the greater availability of resources, including those offered by the present education system, and the likelihood that facilitators for the education process could be readily identified.

The Leadership Development Program As A Nonformal Educational Model

This study employs the Coombs and Ahmed definition of nonformal education as "any organized, systematic, educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal (schooling) system to provide selected types of learning to particular subgroups in the population, adults and children." This section examines the Leadership Development Program according to the distinctive characteristics and significant dimensions of nonformal education discussed in the literature and provides the context for a consideration of LDP as a tool for enhancing educational equity in the rural South.

The LDP was a relatively unstructured educational model. The central focus of the program was to find ways to improve the quality of life in rural communities in the South through the development of human potential. While the overall focus of the program remained constant, the program objectives for each individual fellow were different and were subject to change during the course of a program year.

Immediately after its inception, the program expanded from its original focus on teachers to include rural people of any age and background who could effect change in their communities. The clientele then included community organizers, school board members and administrators from schools

and other human service agencies. There were no educational requirements for entry into the program. While the program included individuals with degrees, LDP targeted those who have had limited access to or limited success in formal schooling. Many applicants had been deprived of early educational opportunities, but were self educated through their experiences.

There was both flexibility and substantial learner control of program objectives for project participants. Individualized programswere developed for each fellow built around their needs and interests. Some program activities, including orientation meetings and annual conferences, were experienced by all participants in common. Further, while most programs included some combination of internship and practicum experiences, each of these were shaped and determined by the participants. It can be said then, that LDP offered a "cafeteria" of curriculum options for participants to develop programs around their own interests, wishes and motivations. When an experience desired by a participant was not on the existing list of learning options, a new option was developed. Learners exercised control over time units in addition to content and media.

In addition to learner control over the program design including statements of objectives, content of learning

activities and media for delivery, LDP participants were essentially involved in self-directed learning. While there were mentor at each intership site, LDP focused on empowering individuals and was organized so as to eliminate heirarchal relationships. Mentors played the role of model and enabler rather than evaluator or agent of control. Mentors provided guidance for fellows and in some cases, mediated the fellows needs and the institutional requirements of the program base.

The LDP was non institutional, and non credentialed. The program was not anti-institutional and indeed some of the internship sites were in formal school settings. Further, the program was not anti-credential. In some cases, fellows received academic credit for some of their program experiences and in a few cases, received degrees. The focus of LDP however, was on functional learning, human capacity building, and human resource development. The aim was on increasing the individuals capacity to be self directed rather than on the attainment of credentials or credits. Inherent in program development was the notion that fellows generally did not have the educational background nor the interest to pursue or profit from formal graduate training. Further, that such training would not have proven sufficiently relevant to the individuals in the rural situations which the program served.

Another dimension of the LDP which was discussed in the literature on nonformal education was innovative and nontraditional resource utilization. The LDP maintained a small core staff in offices in the region. This staff maintained administrative responsibility for the program. The bulk of the personnel for the program consisted of recognized leaders or managers of local, regional or national reputation in school districts, federal offices, state agencies, community action program organizations and private business. These persons assisted LDP in information dissemination, recruitment and selection of fellows, monitoring and supervision of fellows, and in provision of follow-up support for post fellows. The use of internship and practicum sites meant minimal expenditures on facilities.

In addition, fellows were often provided resources beyond the budget of LDP when mentors and other agencies underwrote their participation in various program related seminars, conferences and institutes. In some cases, the fellows employer agency or an organization working in the same field elected to provide salary equivalent or partial program expenses in order to support, supplement and maximize the LDP experience. The primary investment of LDP resources was in the capacity building of the fellows rather than in facilities and program personnel.

Finally, learning in LDP was utilitarian in nature. The focus was on functional learning with immediate and direct applicability. The methodologies were determined through analysis of learner needs, were not time or place bound, and were flexible and voluntary.

Taken as a whole, the program was not bounded by traditional organizational forms. For everything one says about it, there are exceptions. For every direction it took, it seemed also to take a counter direction. There was never one central purpose which directed all activity. As a result there were numerous activities on the part of program developers to impose definition upon the program. These activities were effectively counter-balanced by an understanding that limiting definitions would probably destroy the program, or at the minimum, subvert the philosopy and goals of the program. Though the LDP operated in considerable ambiguity, this characteristic finally proved to be one of its greatest strengths. Further, there were three aspects of the program, which remained unambiguous and unchanging for the duration of the program. The program aimed at rural life in the South and focused primarily on effecting individuals.

Summary

The literature indicates that in developing countries, nonformal education has been demonstrated to be an effective means of reaching individuals who have not had access to formal education, of imparting specific skills and knowledge appropriate to individual and community needs, and of providing flexible, ongoing education opportunities through a functional rather than an institutional approach.

In this chapter, the literature examined establishes the rural South as an area sharing many common characteristics with underdeveloped countries. Furthermore, the inequity of our present education system is providing opportunities for access and participation to the poor and minorities of the rural South has been documented.

Accordingly, the literature reviewed suggests that nonformal education is an approach with promises, which would address the problems of educational equity in the rural South by augmenting the existing system in a manner that would increase access to and participation in appropriate educational opportunities. In short, it is a tool that can be used to further human resource and economic development efforts.

C H A P T E R I I I

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This chapter will describe the procedures, design and methodology used in this study. The primary purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the Leadership Development Program, as a model of non-formal education, served to enhance educational equity as perceived by fellow the Leadership Development Program. To gather the perceptions of fellows related to the study hypotheses, a questionnaire was developed and administered to former program fellows. This chapter will describe the questionnaire development process, the design of the study, the study population and the procedures for analysis of the data. A glossary of key terms used in this study is also included.

Design of the Study

The specific questions answered by this study are:

1. What were the levels of formal educational experience of LDP fellows prior to their LDP fellowship experience?

2. What are the current levels of formal educational experience of LDP fellows?

3. Did the LDP experience serve to motivate the personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials by LDP fellows?

4. What aspects of the LDP experience (i.e., selection process, individual program development process, internship experiences, conferences and workshops and post fellowship sessions) were most critical in influencing their further pursuit of formal educational experiences or credentials?

5. What were the professional roles of LDP fellows prior to their LDP fellowship experience?

6. What are the current professional roles of LDP fellows?

7. What were the community service roles of LDP fellows prior to their LDP fellowship experience?

8. What are the current community service roles of LDP fellows?

9. Did the LDP experience serve to motivate the personal assumption of professional and/or community service roles which addressed issues of educational equity?

10. What aspects of the LDP experience (i.e., selection process, individual program development process, internship experiences, conferences and workshops and post fellowship sessions) were most critical in influencing their assumption of professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity?

Accordingly, the following hypothesis were formulated for the study:

Study Hypotheses

A. The Leadership Development Program experience enhanced educational equity for fellows as reflected by (1) personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials and (2) personal assumptions of professional and/or community service

roles which address questions of educational equity.

The sub-hypotheses were:

1. The Leadership Development Program experience motivated program participants (fellows) to assume professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity.

2. The Leadership Development Program fellows will report that one outcome of the LDP experience was pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials by program participants (fellows).

B. The Leadership Development Program fellows will report the program development process as being the component of the LDP which was most important in influencing their decisions regarding formal educational pursuits and/or assumptions of roles which contribute to educational equity.

Description of the Research Instrument

To secure data responding to these study questions, a questionnaire was developed for completion by LDP graduates.

The questionnaire, devised by the investigator, consisted of three parts: (a) Part I sought information regarding the respondents' personal and professional qualifications and certification in a general manner before and after the fellowship experience; (b) Part II sought information about component areas of the Leadership Development Program that influenced the respondents to pursue further formal education and/or credentials or to assume

professional and/or community service roles; and (c) Part III sought a listing of the respondents' most influential LDP experience regarding their present educational status, occupations and community service roles.

Two procedures were used in establishing the validity of the questionnaire used in this study. First the questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of experts consisting of professors in education at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts; a professor of rural development at Tuskegee Institute in Hampton, Virginia; and professors of rural educations and non-formal education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Blackburg, Virginia. After analysis by this panel, comments and criticisms were incorporated into a revised version of the questionnaire based on their own Leadership Development Program experience. They were further requested to suggest revisions in the questionnaire related to achieving greater clarity, inclusiveness of ideas and ease of response. Suggestions made by these respondents were used as the basis for a final revision of the instrument.

The reliability of the questionnaire to be used in this study is influenced by the following factors: (1) the validity of the items; (2) the annonymity of the respondent; and (3) the professional attitudes that could be expected of the respondent. While all these factors no

doubt contribute to the reliability of the instrument, no direct information is available to assess their effect.

The instrument (questionnaire) is usable and appropriate for this study because: (1) it facilitates the collection of large amounts of objective data with a minimum of expenditures of time and effort; and (2) it is the only instrument for this study at the present time.

Research Population

The instrument was administered to 224 former participants (post fellows) in the LDP program in the southern region from 1966 through 1976, who were asked to participate in this study. The post fellows currently reside in various states across the nation and are engaged in varied professional pursuits.

On the 224 questionnaires, mailed, 161 responses were received, for a response rate of 71.88 percent. Eighty-nine (89) or 55.28 percent of the respondents were male. Seventy-two (72) or 44.72 percent were female. Forty-one (41) were white, one hundred-eighteen (118) black, and two (2) "other" racial or ethnic identity, reflecting a percentage distribution of 25.47 percent, 73.29 percent and 1.24 percent respectively. Current age of fellows reporting ranged from a high of 69 to a low of 25. Reported ages of fellows at the time of fellowship award

ranged from a high of 65 to a low of 20. These results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 2

General Characterists of Population Surveyed

AGE:	Average Current Age	37 Years
	Average Age at time of Fellowship Award	32 Years
	Oldest Current Age Reported	69 Years
	Oldest Age Reported at Fellowship Award	65 Years
	Youngest Current Age Reported	25 Years
	Youngest Age at time of Fellowship Award	20 Years

RACE:	# Reporting	% of Total (N=161) Respondents (161)
Black	118	73.29%
White	41	25.47%
Other	2	1.24%
TOTAL	161	100.00%
SEX:		
Male	89	55.28%
Female	72	44.72%
TOTAL	161	100.00%

Procedure

The investigator obtained access to records of the LDP for purposes of developing a preliminary contact address and telephone number for all post fellows. Informal preliminary contacts were made for purposes of updating and correcting addresses and telephone numbers to the greatest possible extent and to alert subjects as to the purpose of the study and the need for their participation. Copies of the questionnaire, along with complete instructions and a self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to all post fellows for whom current addresses were obtained. Follow-up contact by mail and/or telephone was made with all subjects who did not respond within ten working days (two calendar weeks) to encourage maximal response.

Data Analysis

Upon return of at least 70 percent of the questionnaires, the responses were tabulated and analyzed according to each of the study questions and in response to the major hypothesis of the study. Participant responses were recorded on a master sheet grouped according to educational experience and credentials and professional and community service roles.

Definition of Terms

To facilitate the readability of this study, the following terms are defined here. Others will be defined when they initially appear.

Leadership Development Program: A Ford Foundation administered project which awarded fellowships to individuals from rural background for the purpose of helping them gain experience and skills for the purpose of working to upgrade their schools and their communiites.[70]

Nonformal Education: Any organized, systematic, educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particular subgroups in the population, adults, as well as children.[71]

LDP Fellows: An individual selected and awarded a Leadership Development fellowship grant for the purpose of his/her professional and personal development through an individually designed program of study and internships through one of several Ford Foundation sponsored programs.[72]

Rural South: The state of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia.[73]

Questionnaire: A list of planned written questions related to a particular problem, with space provided for indicating the response to each question, intended for submission to a number of persons for reply: commonly used in normative survey studies and in the measurement of attitudes and opinions.

Significance of the Study

The need for the development and implementation of new and effective strategies for providing educational equity to the disadvantaged and minorities living in rural areas of the country, and particularly of the rural South, is evident. Nonformal education is one approach which appears to hold great potential as a vehicle for gaining such equity. Thus, this study may be of value to educational planners who influence the design and implementation of specific educational strategies on various levels. It may be of specific value to colleges and universities currently involved in training programs for professional adult educators so as to facilitate the integration or coordination of nonformal education programs and techniques with the formal education system.

Furthermore, this study may be of value to various agencies or institutions which work with rural disadvantaged or minority groups in capacities other than formal educa-

tion. This included organizational community service or community development organizations concerned with upgrading the quality of life of rural residents; public health departments, welfare agencies, employment services or other government facilities charged with direct provision of services to disadvantaged and minority individuals; vocational or employment training programs whether operated by the public or private sector; and private industry engaged in the creation and upgrading of a skilled work force. The study may be of significant value as a first step in directing attention to the need and value of the further development and testing of models of nonformal education for general use in the rural South and the nation.

Limitations of the Study

Limitation of the study exist in the two areas of the research population and instrumentation. Specifically:

1) The research population will be drawn from approximately two hundred former participants (post fellows) in the LDP program. Thus, generalizations made from the results of this study must be limited to groups reflective of similar characteristics.

2) Validity of the generalizations made from the data gathered by the study instrument will depend upon it measuring what it purports to measure.

Summary

This chapter has described the procedure, design and methodology employed in the completion of this study. The major question to be answered by the study were listed in conjunction with the major hypothesis for study. A description of the development of the research instrument was provided along with a description of the data collected and the analysis procedure utilized in the study.

Some general characteristics of the research population were presented including some preliminary analysis of data related to the research population. To facilitate reader comprehension of the presentation and analysis of data which follows, a glossary of key terms used in the study was provided. The following chapter will include a presentation and analysis of primary data for this study.

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN ENHANCING EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

A description of the Leadership Development Program, a definition of nonformal education and a discussion of its key dimensions has been provided in the preceeding chapters. An analysis of the LDP as a nonformal education program has also been provided. This chapter provides an analysis of data related to the impact of the LDP in enhancing educational equity for program participants. This data was collected in response to a questionnaire distributed by the researcher to 224 post fellows. One hundred sixty one post fellows completed and returned the questionnaire representing a 71 percent response rate (71.88%). The data is analyzed in the context of the Leadership Development program as a nonformal education model.

To respond to the major hypotheses of the study, data are analyzed according to the following study questions:

1. What were the levels of formal educational experience of LDP fellows prior to their LDP fellowship experience?

2. What are the current levels of formal educational experiences of LDP fellows?

3. Did the LDP experience serve to motivate the personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials by LDP fellows?

4. What aspects of the LDP experience (i.e., selection process, individual program development process, internship experience, conferences and workshops and post fellowship sessions) were most critical in influencing their further pursuit of formal educational experience or credentials?

5. What were the professional and/or community service roles of LDP fellows prior to their LDP fellowship experience?

6. What are the current professional and/or community service roles of LDP fellows?

7. Did the LDP experience serve to motivate the personal assumption of professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity?

8. What aspects of the LDP experience (i.e., selection process, individual program development process, internship experience, conferences and workshops and post fellowship sessions) were most critical in influencing their assumption of professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity?

Impact of the Leadership Development Program on Educational Development of Participants

A major hypothesis of this study was that "The LDP experience enhanced educational equity as reflected by 1) personal pursuit of further formal educational experience and/or credentials. . .". To respond to this hypotheses requires first determining whether there was, in fact, an increase in the educational attainment of LDP fellows following participation in the program and second, determining the extent to which follow perceive that the LDP motivated the pursuit of further formal educational experience and/or credentials.

The Leadership Development Program experience included four primary components, each consisting of several parts. The research instrument requested respondents to indicate the degree to which specific aspects of the LDP experience influenced pursuit of further formal educational experience. Fellows were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the 15 separate aspects of the LDP experience served to influence their pursuit of formal educational experience and/or credentials by checking a five point grid: (1) Influenced great degree, (2) Some degree, (3) A small degree, (4) No influence to pursue further formal education, or (5) Undecided as to the felt influence to pursue further formal education.

To establish the rate of change in educational attainment of past fellows, it is useful to review the levels of formal educational experience of LDP fellows prior to their participation in the program. This data is reported in Table 3.

A significant majority, over 78 percent of respondents, held the Bachelor's degree at the time of the fellowship award. Twenty-two percent held a Master's degree and three respondents (1.86%) held a terminal degree. Eight percent of the participants reported the high school diploma or less as their highest level of educational attainment at the time of the fellowship award. None of the

Table 3

Levels of Formal Educational Experience
of LDP Fellows Prior to LDP Fellowship

N=161
Multiple items were checks by some respondents

Formal Educational Attainment	Number Responding	Percentage of Total
A. High School Graduate or less	13	8.07
B. Technical Course(s) completed	0	0
C. Credit Hours toward Associate Degree	5	3.10
D. Associate Degree	4	2.48
E. Some study toward's Bachelor's Degree	12	7.45
F. Bachelor's Degree	58	36.02
G. Some study towards Master's Degree	26	16.15
H. Master's Degree	36	22.36
I. Some study toward Doctoral Degree	7	4.35
J. Doctoral Degree	3	1.86
K. Post Doctoral Study	6	0

Table 3 (continued)

Formal Educational Attainment	Number Responding	Percentage of Total
L. Special Certification	6	3.72
M. Special professional services rating	1	.62
N. Other	1	.62

respondents reported having completed technical courses and four reported the associate degree as the highest level of educational attainment. Six reported special certification and only one reported holding special professional service rating

Analysis of the data reveals a significant improvement in the educational attainments of fellows subsequent to their fellowship experience. To determine the rate of improvement, a comparison was made of the highest level of educational attainment at the time of the fellowship award and the reported levels of educational attainment at the time of this study. This comparison is shown in Table 4.

The area showing the greatest absolute rate of change was in the number of participants reporting the Bachelor's degree as the highest level of educational attainment. Whereas, 58 to 26 percent of the respondents held the BA only at the time of the fellowship award, only 11 or six percent currently report the BA as the highest level of educational attainment. This represents a minus 47 percent change. The area showing the second highest rate of change was "some study towards Doctorate degree." Whereas, only seven participants reported study towards the doctorate at the time of the fellowship award, this number had increased to 36 at the time of the study, a 29 percent

Table 4

A Comparison of Levels of Educational Attainment of the Time of the Fellowship Award with Current Educational Status

Status Category	Current Status		Status at Time of Fellowship Award		Change		
	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	Number	% Change	% of Total Respondents (161)
1. High School Graduate or Less	4	2.48	13	8.07	- 9	- 69.23	- 5.59
2. Technical Courses Completed	5	3.11	0	0	+ 5	-	+ 3.11
3. Credit Hours Towards Associate Degree	6	3.73	5	3.11	+ 1	+ 20.00	+ 0.62
4. Associate Degree	0	0	4	2.48	- 4	-100.00	- 2.48
5. Some Study Towards Bachelors Degree	8	4.97	12	7.45	- 4	- 33.33	- 2.48
6. Bachelors Degree	11	6.83	58	36.02	-47	- 81.03	- 27.19
7. Some Study Towards Masters Degree	23	14.29	26	16.15	- 3	- 11.51	- 1.86
8. Masters Degree	43	26.71	36	22.36	+ 7	+ 19.11	+ 4.35
9. Some Study Towards Doctoral Degree	36	22.36	7	4.35	+29	+111.29	+ 18.01

Table 4 (continued)

Status Category	Current Status		Status at Time of Fellowship Award		Change		
	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	Number	%* Change	% of Total Respondents (161)
10. Doctoral Degree	23	14.29	3	1.86	+20	+666.67	+12.42
11. Post Doctoral Degree	4	2.48	0	0	+ 4	-	+ 2.48
12. Special Certification	29	18.01	6	3.73	+23	+383.33	+14.29
13. Special Professional Service Rating	9	5.59	1	.62	+ 8	+800.00	+ 4.97
14. Other**	11	6.83	1	.62	+10	+1000.00	+ 6.21
TOTAL	212	131.68	172	106.83	+40	+ 23.26	+24.84

* Expressed as Increase (+) or Decrease (-) of Number Currently Reported Over Number Reported at Time of Fellowship Award.
** Multiple Items Checked by Some Respondents.

increase. Only three reported having a doctoral degree at the time of their fellowship, while 23 report doctoral status and an additional four report post-doctoral study.

Examination of the bottom category of "high school graduate or less" only four of the original 13 reported currently remaining at the level. None of the participants had completed technical courses at the time of the fellowship award as compared with five who had done so at the time of the study. All of the participants who reported the associate degree as the highest level of educational attainment at the time of the fellowship award had completed further study at the time of this study. Twenty-three participants have received special certifications since their LDP program experience representing a 23 percent increase. Categories such as "some study towards master degree" which appear to reflect little change (16.15 percent at the time of fellowship and 14.29 percent currently) in fact reflect great change inasmuch as few of those reporting this level of educational attainment at the time of their fellowship remained at this level currently, but rather moved on to be "replaced" by those having a bachelors degree and less at the time of their fellowship. The validity of this analysis is further verified in a subsequent question regarding pursuit of formal educational training. To the question "Have you

pursued further formal educational training since the completion of your fellowship year?", 134 or 83.23 percent answered yes, and only 25 or 15.53 percent answered no.

Table 5

Number and Percent of Fellows Reporting Pursuit of Further Formal Educational Training Since Completion of Fellowship Year

	Number Reported	Percent of Respondents (161)
Further Formal Educational Training Pursued	134	83.23%
No Formal Educational Training Pursued	25	15.53%
No Response	2	1.24%
TOTAL	161	100.00%

The data presented in Table 5 has that more than 83 percent of the fellows pursued further formal education/ training subsequent to their participation in the Leadership Development Program. We must now establish whether or not and the extent to which the LDP was perceived by participants as a motivating factor in the pursuit of further study.

Table 6 presents data responding to the first part of this question.

Table 6

Influence of the LDP on the Pursuit of Further Formal Education/Training of LDP Fellows

N=161

	Total	To a Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	Total Influence	None	Undecided
Number	161	102	37	4	143	11	7
Percent	99.9	63.35	22.98	2.48	88.8	6.83	4.35

More than 88 percent of the respondents indicated motivation to pursue further formal study. It should be pointed out, however, that of the 143 fellows reporting felt motivation, only 134 did in fact pursue further study. The research instrument did not solicit data which would reveal the reasons for failure to act on the felt motivation reported. Of those fellows reporting felt motivation, 102 fellows (04 63.35 percent) reported that the LDP experience influenced them to pursue further formal educational experiences and/or credentials to a great degree. An additional 22.98 percent (37 fellows) reported some degree of influence in this regard, and 2.48 (four fellows) reported influence to a small degree.

Respondents were discriminating in their identification of program components most and least influential in pursuing further formal educational experience. Their ratings of the degree of influence of each program component is summarized in Table 7.

Mentor relationships, travel and independent research, all in the "internship experience" category, received the three highest ratings regarding felt influence to pursue formal education, with 54.04 percent, 53.42 percent and 51.55 percent respectively. An additional 28.57 percent, 26.09 percent and 30.43 percent respectively indicated that these three aspects of the program provided some

Table 7

Summary of Perceived Influence of Specific Aspects of LDP Experience on Pursuit of Further Formal Education/Training and/or Credentials

	Reported Degree of Influence											
	Great Degree		Some Degree		Small Degree		None		Undecided		Total	
Selection Process	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1) Development of Initial Proposal	57	35.40	47	29.19	20	12.42	24	14.91	13	8.07	161	100
2) Field Interviews	43	26.71	62	38.51	21	13.04	20	12.42	15	9.32	161	100
3) Selection Conference Interviews	44	30.43	56	34.78	23	14.29	19	11.80	11	8.70	161	100
Individual Fellowship Development Process												
1) Planning Fellowship Activity Program	71	44.10	55	34.16	10	6.21	10	6.21	15	9.32	161	100
2) Orientation and Briefing Conference	55	34.16	65	40.37	12	7.45	15	9.32	14	8.70	161	100
3) Make Initial Contact with Mentor	79	49.07	40	24.84	9	5.59	19	11.80	14	8.70	161	100
Internship Experiences												
1) Mentor Relationships	87	54.04	46	28.57	9	5.59	8	4.97	11	6.83	161	100
2) Travel	86	53.42	42	26.09	17	10.56	8	4.97	8	4.97	161	100
3) Independent Research	83	51.55	49	30.43	11	6.83	8	4.97	10	6.21	161	100
4) Course Work	75	46.58	40	24.84	6	3.73	27	16.77	13	8.07	161	100
5) LDP Work Conferences	71	44.10	55	34.16	9	5.59	15	9.32	11	6.83	161	100
6) Preparing Narrative Reports	40	24.84	59	36.65	20	12.42	28	17.39	14	8.70	161	100
7) Preparing Financial Reports	32	19.86	49	30.43	29	18.01	38	23.60	13	8.07	161	100

Reported Degree of Influence

Selection Process	Great Degree		Some Degree		Small Degree		None		Undecided		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Post Fellowship Activities												
1) Annual LDP Conference	60	37.27	45	27.95	20	12.42	22	13.66	14	8.70	161	100
2) Relationship with Selection Committee Members	52	32.30	53	32.91	20	12.42	22	13.66	14	8.70	161	100
3) LDP Network Relationships	60	37.27	46	28.57	26	16.15	16	9.94	13	8.07	161	100
Overall Influence to Pursue Further Formal Educational Experiences and/ or Credentials	102	63.35	37	22.98	4	2.48	11	6.83	7	4.35	161	100

degree of influence. At least one specific aspect within each of the four broad categories (Selection process, Individual fellowship Development process, Internship experiences and post fellowship experiences) was reported to have influenced pursuit of further formal education by more than 50 percent of fellows responding to the questionnaire.

The preparation of financial reports and narrative reports, were the two lowest ranking aspect of the LDP program in terms of reported influence on further educational pursuits. Yet even these primarily administrative and monitoring procedures were reported by 32 percent and 40 percent of respondents respectively to have influenced pursuit of further formal education to a great degree. The third item least frequently reported as greatly influencing formal educational pursuit was the field interview. Only 26.71 percent (43 fellows) reported great influence of part of the selection process.

Responses indicating no influence of the various identified program aspects were generally consistent with the above patterns: the three aspects of "mentor relationships," "travel" and "independent research" received the lowest incidence of responses indicating no felt influence of the LDP on pursuit of further formal education (4.97 percent, or 8 fellows in each case). The

three categories of "preparing narrative reports" and "preparing financial reports" and "course work" received the highest incidence of responses indicating no such felt influence (17.39 percent or 28 fellows, 23.60 percent or 38 fellows and 16.77 percent or 27 fellows respectively).

The high incidence of fellows reporting no influence of coursework on pursuit of further formal education is attributed not to the fact that coursework was necessarily uninfluential in this regard, inasmuch as 75 fellows, or 46.58 percent of respondents indicated that it influenced them to a great degree. Rather it is attributed to the fact that a number of fellows chose not to include coursework as a part of their fellowship programs and, therefore, it had no influence because it played no role in certain individual fellowship experiences.

In summary, a significant percentage of fellows (83.23) did pursue formal education subsequent to their LDP experience and an even higher percentage (88.8) reported that the LDP motivated them to pursue further study. Finally, respondents were discriminating in identifying those aspects of particular program components which exerted more or less influence on their motivation to pursue further study.

Impact of LDP on Professional and Community Service Roles of Post Fellows

Sub-hypothesis two of the first study hypothesis stated: "The Leadership Development program experience motivated program participants (fellows) to assume professional and/or community service roles which addressed questions of educational equity." This question is included in the study to provide an opportunity to test the notions that the LDP, as a nonformal educational model, had impact on the achievement of educational equity beyond the immediate educational, professional, and career benefits which resulted for individual participants. This section examines the extent to which participants become involved in or continued their involvement in activities which impact directly and indirectly on educational equity for the community as a whole.

This issue will be addressed in two parts. The professional and community service roles of fellows at the time of the fellowship award will be compared with roles reported at the time of the study to determine the extent of changes in the roles of participants. This will be followed by an analysis of data reported on the perceived degree of influence of LDP program aspects are the assumption of more significant roles.

Professional and Community Service Roles of Fellows

Respondents were asked to report on the assumption of more significant professional and/or community service roles. Ninety four of the post-fellows reported that they had assumed more significant roles since the completion of the fellowship year. Only five or less than four percent indicated that they had not assumed more significant roles. Four participants did not respond to this item. This data is reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Fellows Reporting Assumption of More Significant Professional and/or Community Service Roles Since Completion of Fellowship Year

	# Reported	% of Respondents (161)
More Significant Roles Assumed	152	94.41%
No Significant Roles Assumed	5	3.11%
No Response	4	2.48%
TOTAL	161	100.00%

In order to identify program or service areas in which the fellows' effectiveness was enhanced by the LDP experience, twenty-five areas of service were listed with additional space for writing in other areas as follows:

Administration

Adult Education

Budgeting and Fiscal Management

Child Care

Early Childhood Education

Economic Development

Health

Higher Education

Housing

Law and Justice

Organizational Development

Organizational Policy

Participation in Community-Base Organizations

Participation in National Organizations

Participation in regional and/or State Organization

Planning

Public School Education

Recreation

Serving as Appointed Public Official

Service as Elected Public Official

Serving on Local Boards

Serving on State/Regional Boards

Staffing and Staff Development

Welfare

Youth

A detailed listing of the participation of fellows in all identified professional and community service roles is provided in Appendix B. For this analysis, the listing of areas of service has been categorized into seven broad areas of occupational and professional fields: 1) education; 2) community service/Community development; 3) health; 4) employment/ 5) law and justice; 6) elected official; 7) other government official/and other. A summary of this data is presented in Table 9.

The area showing the greatest net change was education. Ninety-one or slightly more than half of the participants were in education at the time of their fellowship award. This number had decreased by 17 or more than 10 percent at the time of the study. Further, there were significant changes in participation within education. Whereas, 42 percent of all participants were in elementary and secondary education at the time of the fellowship award, this number had decreased by 15 percent at the time of the study. In contrast, only six participants were in college and university positions at the time of the fellow award. This number had tripled by the time of this study to a total of 18.

Table 9

A Comparison of the Occupations/Professional Roles of Fellows at the Time of the Study with Roles at the Time of the Fellowship Award.

N=161

Occupations/Professional Roles	Currently		At Time of Fellowship Award		Change	
					Percentage	Net
A. Education						
1. Preschool	3	1.8	6	3.7	1.8	- 3
2. Elementary and Secondary	44	27.	69	42.	15.	-25
3. College and University	18	11.1	6	3.7	7.4	+12
4. Extension Services	2	1.2	6	3.7	2.4	- 4
5. Other	7	4.3	4	2.4	68.	+ 3
6. Total, All Education	74	45.	91	56.	10.5	-17
B. Community Service/Community Development	29	18.	28	17.	.06	+ 1
C. Health	13	8.0	12	7.4	.06	+ 1
D. Employment	9	5.5	2	1.2	4.5	+ 7
E. Law and Justice	7	4.3	2	1.2	3.1	+ 5
F. Elected Officials	5	3.1	2	1.2	1.8	+ 3

Table 9 (continued)

N=161

Occupations/Professional Roles	Currently		At Time of Fellowship Award		Change	
					Percentage	Net
G. Other Government Officials	8	4.9	5	3.1	1.8	+ 3
H. Other Occupations/Professions	16	9.9	19	11.	1.8	- 3
TOTAL, ALL FIELDS	161	-	161	-	-	0

Finally, the number of participants in both preschool and in extension service roles had decreased by the time of this study.

Participants reported increases in all other specified categories. There was a decrease of three in the number holding roles other than those identified by the researcher. The greatest increase was in those holding positions in employment related fields followed by an increase of five participants moving into positions related to law and justice. Only two participants reported serving as an elected government official prior to the fellowship and five who served in other capacities as a government official. These numbers had increased to five and eight, respectively, by the time of this study. In addition, while only eight participants reported serving on National boards and commissions prior to the fellowship experience, this number had increased to 22 at the time of this study, a 63 percent increase. The data also reveals a 225 percent increase in the number of participants serving as appointed government officials. The number of participants serving as a volunteer with a local community-based service organization decreased by more than 23 percent. Analysis of the data suggests that community service by LDP fellows has not necessarily decreased but that they have moved into other aspects of providing service i.e., in official and/or

professional capacities, as opposed to participation in voluntary community service activities. Further, the increase in elected official, board member, and national board member and commission indicate that some of those formerly involved in a volunteer capacity are now serving in more formalized community service roles.

This data appears to support the hypothesis that participants have assumed more significant professional and community service roles. In addition to the participants' own assertion that they do hold more significant roles and their examination of changes in roles held, analysis of the nature of position held, characteristics of the population served by participants, and salary levels will provide further correlation of the significance of the positions held by participants following their LDP fellowship experience.

Administrative Roles of Fellows

A wide range of occupational and professional roles were reported by participants, at the time of the fellowship award as well as at the time of the study. In addition to grouping these roles into the seven categories described above, the description of duties and responsibilities provided by participants was used to further identify roles as administrative and nonadministrative. While designation

of a position as administrative as a single criterion does not indicate the significance or degree of influence of a professional or service role, considered in combination with other factors, this designation can provide valuable insight into whether fellows, or a group, did indeed assume more influential and significant roles following completion of the fellowship experience.

Administrative positions, for purpose of the analysis, were taken to include jobs which involved the apparent exercise of influence or control over policy formulation, design or selection of strategies for policy implementation, or management and supervision of other staff members, Non-administrative positions included those such as teachers, instructors, counselors, community workers, etc.

An overall trend was observed toward assumption of more influential administrative/leadership roles in the various professions taken as a whole and within each professional field individually. A total of 104 fellows reported currently holding positions which the investigator identified as administrative, while only 69 fellows reported holding such position at the time of the fellowship award. This represents an increase of 50.72 percent over the number holding such positions at the time of the fellowship award.

Occupational/professional participation in education is examined in five categories: preschool, Elementary,

Extension services and other. Overall, there was a net decrease of 17 in the number of participants identifying education as their primary occupational/professional field. This figure includes a net decrease of 25 in participation in non-administrative positions and a net increase of 8 in administrative positions. Thus, while fewer total participants are in education, a significantly larger percentage are functioning in administrative roles. At the time of the fellowship award, 60 percent of those in education were in non-administrative capacities and 39 percent in administration. At the time of the study almost 60 percent of participants in education were in administration and 40.5 percent were in non-administrative roles as shown in Table 10. Further, the only categorical increases in non-administrative positions was in college/university service where a 300 percent increase was reported. All other categories of non-administrative positions decreased. In administrative positions, increases were reported in all areas except preschool and extension service.

Among other occupational categories, the area of community service/community development revealed the largest percent change. Participants serving in administrative roles increased from 11 percent at the time of the fellowship award to 16 percent at the time of the study. The next largest increase in assumption of administrative roles

Table 10

Comparison of Administrative Roles of Fellows at the Time of the Study and at the Time of the Fellowship Award

Occupation/Professional Field	(1) Administrative			(2) Non-Administrative			Total		
	Currently	At Time of Fellowship	Change	Currently	At Time of Fellowship	Change	Currently	At Time of Fellowship	Change
A. Education									
1. Preschool	3	5	- 2	0	1	- 1	3	6	- 3
2. Elementary/Secondary	24	20	+ 4	20	40	-20	44	60	-35
3. College/University	10	4	+ 6	8	2	+ 6	18	6	+12
4. Extension Services	1	4	- 3	1	3	- 1	2	6	- 4
5. Other	6	3	+ 3	10	1	0	7	4	+ 3
6. Total, All Education	44	36	+ 8	30	55	-25	74	91	-17
B. Community Service/ Community Development	27	18	+ 9	2	10	- 8	29	28	+ 1
C. Health	5	4	+ 1	8	8	0	13	12	+ 1
D. Employment	5	4	+ 1	4	1	+ 3	9	2	+ 7

Table 10 (continued)

Occupation/Professional Field	(1) Administrative			(2) Non-Administrative			Total		
	Currently	At time of Fellowship	Change	Currently	At time of Fellowship	Change	Currently	At time of Fellowship	Change
E. Law and Justice	5	2	+ 3	2	0	+ 2	7	2	+ 5
F. Elected Officials	5	2	+ 3	0	0	0	5	2	+ 3
G. Other Government Official/Employee	8	2	+ 6	0	3	- 3	8	5	+ 3
H. Other Occupations/ Professions	5	4	+ 1	11	15	- 4	16	19	- 3
TOTAL, ALL FIELDS	104	69	+35	57	92	-35	161	161	0

* Includes teachers, professors, counselors, instructors.

was in the category "other government officials/employees." The number increased from one percent of all fellows to four percent of the fellows holding administrative positions in this field.

The category "Employment" revealed the next largest net increase in fellow assumption of administrative roles. At the time of the fellowship award, only one fellow held an administrative position. At the time of this study, five fellows reported administrative roles in "Employment," a 400 percent increase. The number of fellows in administrative roles in "Law and Justice" more than doubled, moving from slightly more than one percent to more than three percent of all fellows. In each of the remaining categories, the number of fellows in administrative positions increased and the number of non-administrative roles either remained constant or declined.

Characteristics of the Populations Served by Fellows

An examination of the characteristics of the population served by program participants provided further corroboration of the hypothesis that fellows assumed more significant roles following completion of the fellowship experience. Responses indicated a slight "urbanization" of populations served by LDP fellows subsequent to completion of their fellowship year, as reflected in Table 11. This is

Table 11

Characteristics of Population Served by LDP Fellows

Characteristics of Population	Current Population		Population at Time of Fellowship		Change		
	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	Number	%* Change	% of Total Respondents (161)
Rural	54	33.54	77	47.83	-23	-29.87	-14.29
Urban	22	13.66	16	9.94	+ 6	+37.50	+ 3.73
Urban and Rural	85	52.80	68	42.24	+17	+25.00	+10.56
TOTAL	161	100.00	161	99.99	0	0	0

*Expressed as Increase (+) or Decrease (-) of Number Currently Reported Over Number Reported at Time of Fellowship Award.

attributed in part to increasing urbanization of the community served and, to a greater extent, to the assumption of broader areas of jurisdiction, including urban centers, by fellows in their professional capacities. Numerous respondents, for example, reported currently holding administrative positions on a state, regional or national level, whereas they previously reported working in single rural communities at the time of their fellowship awards.

Salary Level of Post Fellows

While salary compensation or income was not included in our discussion of educational equity, an examination of changes in economic status can legitimately be considered one aspect of increased equity. Further, while salary level taken alone does not provide adequate indication of the significance of the role, taken together with other data persented can help provide a more informed response to the study hypothesis. The participants in this study reported dramatic increase in annual income after the fellowship experience. Sixty-three point thirty-six percent (102 fellows) reported annual earnings less than $10,000 at the time of the fellowship award, while only 8.08 percent (13) reported incomes in this range at the time of this study. Conversely, only 1.24 percent (2 fellows) reported incomes of $20,000 or greater at the time of their

fellowships, while 35.40 percent (59 fellows) reported current income in this range at the time of this study. This data is presented in Table 12.

Participants were asked to respond to six salary categories, beginning with less than $5,000 and moving to $25,000 and over through increments of $5,000 each. The data reveals significant changes in each category except the $10,000 to $14,999 range. In this category, the number decreased from 44 at the time of the fellowship award to 41 at the time of the study. In the two lower categories, the number decreased by 92 percent and 60 percent respectively. In the higher categories, the number increased by 345 percent and 1,250 percent. The most dramatic increase was in the top category of $25,000 and above. Zero percent of the fellows reported salaries in this category at the time of the fellowship award whereas 30 reported salaries in this category at the time of this study. This is an increase of nearly 20 percent.

These data demonstrates from all perspectives considered, including the participants' own affirmation, that LDP fellows assumed more significant professional and community service roles following completion of their LDP fellowship experience. This analysis has not answered the question regarding the degree of influence of the LDP on this assumption of more significant roles. For the next section,

Table 12

Annual Salaries as Reported by Respondents

Salary Range	Current Salary		Salary at Time of Fellowship Award		Change		
	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	# Reporting	% of Total Respondents (161)	Number	%* Change	% of Total Respondents (161)
Less than $5,000	6	3.73	15	9.32	- 9	- 60.00	- 5.59
$5,000-$9,999	7	4.35	87	54.04	-80	- 91.95	-49.69
$10,000-$14,999	41	25.47	44	27.33	- 3	- 6.82	- 1.86
$15,000-$19,999	49	30.43	11	6.83	+38	+ 345.45	+23.60
$20,000-$24,999	29	16.77	2	1.24	+25	+1250.00	+15.53
$25,000 and Over	30	18.63	0	0	+30	-	+18.63
No Answer	1	.62	2	1.24	- 1	- 50.00	- 0.62
TOTAL	161	100.00	161	100.00	0	0	0

*Expressed as Increase (+) or Decrease (-) of Number Currently Reported Over Number Reported at Time of Fellowship Award.

participant's assessment of the degree of influence of the LDP is assuming more significant roles will be considered.

Impact of LDP on Assumption of More Significant Professional and Community Service Roles

This assessment of the impact of the LDP on the professional and community service roles of fellows is based on respondents reporting of perceived influence of the LDP. More than 90 percent of the respondents indicated that the LDP ". . . raised" their professional and community service roles. Two percent indicated that the LDP "had no effect" on their roles and six percent were "undecided" about the influence of LDP on their roles. Further, as shown in Table 13, 85 percent of the fellows reported that they felt the LDP favorably influenced their colleagues perceptions of their roles.

Participants were discriminating in their overall assessment of the degree of influence of LDP components as well as in their ratings of the influence of specific aspects of each program component. These data are presented in Tables 14 and 15. Utilizing the same breakdown of LDP program aspects as discussed in the assessment of influence on educational attainment, fellows were asked to indicate the extent to which each program component and aspect influenced or equipped them to assume more significant professional or community service roles.

Table 13

Impact of LDP on Professional and Community Service Roles of Former Fellows

A. Personal Feelings reported by Fellows	#	%
1.) No Effect	4	2.48
2.) LDP Raised Status	146	90.68
3.) Undecided	11	6.83
TOTAL	161	100.00

B. Fellows' Perception of Colleagues Feelings		
1.) No Effect	4	2.48
2.) Status Favorably Affected	137	85.09
3.) Status Unfavorably Affected	3	1.86
4.) Undecided	17	10.56
TOTAL	161	100.00

Table 11

Rating of Overall Influence of LDP Components on Assumption of More Significant Professional and/or Community Service Roles.

	Selection Process		Individualized Planning Fellowship Program		Internship Experience		Post Fellowship LDP Activities		Total	
Rating	# Reported	% of Total Respond.	# Reported	% of Total Respond.	# Reported	% of Total Respond.	# Reported	% of Total Respond.	# Reported	% of Total Respond
0 (No Influence)	12	7.15	3	1.86	3	1 86	15	9.32	33	5 12
1 (Little Influence)	22	13.66	7	4.35	5	3.11	27	16.77	61	9.47
2 (Moderate Influence)	47	29.19	29	18.08	11	6 83	23	14.28	110	17.08
3 (Much Influence)	43	26.71	55	34.16	31	19.25	38	23.60	167	25 93
4 (Very Much Influence)	34	21.12	65	10.37	108	67.08	55	34.16	262	10 68
5 No Responce	3	1.86	2	1.24	3	1 86	3	1.86	11	1 71
TOTAL	161	100 00	161	100.00	161	100.00	161	100.00	644	100.00

Table 15

Summary of Perceived Influence of Specific Aspects of IDP on Assumption of More Significant Professional and Community Service Roles

	Reported Degree of Influence											
	Great Degree		Some Degree		Small Degree		None		Undecided		Total	
A. Selection Process	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1) Development of Initial Proposal	10	30.43	73	15.31	19	11.80	10	6.21	10	6.21	161	100
2) Field Interviews	15	27.95	79	49.07	20	12.42	11	6.83	6	3.73	161	100
3) Selection Conference Interviews	55	34.16	68	12.24	16	9.94	11	8.70	8	1.97	161	100
B. Individual Fellowship Development Process												
1) Planning Fellowship Activity Program	69	42.86	61	37.89	13	8.07	8	1.97	10	6.21	161	100
2) Orientation and Briefing Conference	64	39.75	66	40.99	13	8.07	11	6.83	7	4.35	161	100
3) Make Initial Contact with Mentor	71	45.96	17	29.19	19	11.80	11	6.83	10	6.21	161	100
C. Internship Experiences												
1) Mentor Relationships	101	62.73	30	18.63	12	7.15	8	4.97	10	6.21	161	100
2) Travel	104	64.60	31	19.25	15	9.32	5	3.11	6	3.73	161	100
3) Independent Research	89	55.28	43	26.71	12	7.45	10	6.21	7	4.35	161	100
4) Course Work	71	44.72	37	22.98	8	1.97	31	19.25	13	8.07	161	100
5) IDP Work Conferences	85	52.80	48	29.81	10	6.21	7	1.35	11	6.83	161	100
6) Preparing Narrative Reports	45	27.95	56	34.78	30	18.63	21	13.01	9	5.59	161	100
7) Preparing Financial Reports	43	26.71	41	25.47	35	21.71	33	20.50	9	5.59	161	100

Table 15 (continued)

D. Post Fellowship Activities	Reported Degree of Influence: Great Degree #	Great Degree %	Some Degree #	Some Degree %	Small Degree #	Small Degree %	None #	None %	Undecided #	Undecided %	Total #	Total %
1) Annual LDP Conference	71	44.10	48	29.81	14	8.70	18	11.18	10	6.21	161	100
2) Relationship with Selection Committee Members	60	37.27	45	27.95	21	13.04	20	12.42	15	9.32	161	100
3) LDP Network Relationships	68	42.24	49	30.43	20	12.42	13	8.07	11	6.83	161	100
E. Overall Influence to Pursue Further Formal Educational Experiences and/or Credentials	125	77.64	26	16.15	4	2.48	2	1.24	4	2.48	161	100

The internship experience was the most highly rated program component. Over 86 percent of the respondents indicated that this program component had "much" and "very much" influence on their roles. Less than five percent indicated that this component had "little" or "no" influence on their roles. The individualized planning component was the second most highly rated program component. Seventy-four percent of the respondents indicated that this component had "much" to "very much" influence while only six percent responded that it had "little" or "no" influence. The remaining two program components received mixed ratings from participants on perceived degree of influence. The post fellowship program component was rated by 57 percent of the respondents as having "much" to "very much" influence. Almost half as many reported that it had "little" to "no" influence. The same response pattern was reported for the selection process component. Forty-seven percent of the respondents felt that this program component had "much" to "very much" influence. At the same time, 21 percent, almost half as many, reported that it had "little" or "no" influence.

The same general pattern was observed in the assessment of the influence of specific aspects of program components as was recorded in fellow assessment of influence on educational status. An even higher overall influence was

reported on role assumption than on educational pursuit. Specifically, mentor relationships, travel, and independent research in the internship experience category were the three program aspects most frequently reported to have had a great degree of influence on assumption of more significant roles by LDP fellows. Sixty-two point seventy-three percent (101 fellows) reported this to be the case for these three aspects. Preparing financial reports was the program aspect least frequently reported as having a great influence on significant role assumption (26.71 percent or 43 fellows), closely followed by preparation of narrative reports and field interviews (27.95 percent or 45 fellows each). "Coursework," "preparing narrative reports," and "preparing financial reports" were the three specific program aspects most frequently reported as having no influence on subsequent assumption of more significant professional and/or community service roles.

Areas of Enhancement

The LDP has been reported to have significantly influenced the Fellows assumption of more influential professional and community service roles. In addition, the degree of influence of specific program components and aspects of program components has been discussed. Participants further identified areas in which they felt their

effectiveness was enhanced as a result of their participation in LDP. This data is reported in Table 16.

At least 50 percent and more of respondents reported feeling that their effectiveness was enhanced in the 11 areas of participation in community based organizations, planning, organizational development, participation in regional and/or state organizations, administration, staffing and staff development, public school education, organizational policy, youth, economic development, and participation in national organizations. "Participation in community based organizations" was the most frequently reported area in which fellows felt their effectiveness had been enhanced, with 80.75 percent (130 fellows) checking this item. The least frequently reported area was "serving as elected public official", with 21.12 percent (34 fellows) checking this item. Forty-two additional areas were identified by fellows are are included in Table 16.

A large number of fellows noted other areas in various phases of personal or human development or relationships, suggesting it would have been appropriate to have included similar areas among the choices given. The extremely wide range of areas noted is reflective of the unique diversity of the LDP with its individually tailored fellowship experiences.

Table 16

Program or Service Areas in Which Fellows Reported Feeling Their Effectiveness was Enhanced by Their LDP Experience (Listed in Order of Frequency Reported)

Program or Service Area	# Reported	% of Respondents (161)
Participation in Community Based Organizations	130	80.75
Planning	118	73.29
Organizational Development	110	68.32
Participation in Regional and/or State Organization	108	67.08
Administration	104	64.30
Staffing and Staff Development	103	63.98
Public School Education	97	60.25
Organizational Policy	88	54.66
Youth	85	52.80
Economic Development	83	51.55
Participation in National Organizations	81	50.31
Serving on Local Boards	76	47.20
Budgeting and Fiscal Management	74	45.96
Adult Education	71	44.10
Higher Education	68	42.24
Early Childhood Education	59	36.65
Child Care	57	35.40
Health	51	31.68
Housing	50	31.06
Law and Justice	48	29.81

Table 16 (continued)

Program or Service Area	# Reported	% of Respondents (161)
Group Dynamics	1	
Guidance	1	
Handicapped	1	
Human Resource Development	1	
Interpersonal Relationships	1	
Local Government	1	
Mental Health	1	
Overall Competence in Field	1	
Planning Strategies to Achieve Goals	1	
Political Involvement	1	
Power Mobilization	1	
Programming	1	
Provision of Community Services	1	
Public Relations	1	
Resource Allocation	1	
School/Community Relations	1	
Self Identification and Assertiveness	1	
Social Services	1	
Social Systems Analysis	1	
Social Welfare Policy	1	
Statewide Policymaking	1	

Table 16 (continued)

Program or Service Area	# Reported	% of Respondents (161)
Welfare	46	28.57
Serving on State/Regional Boards	44	27.33
Recreation	38	23.60
Serving as Elected Public Official	36	22.36
Serving as Appointed Public Official	34	21.12
Other: Proposal Writing/ Grantsmanship	4	2.48
Human Relations	3	1.86
Communications	2	1.24
Fund Raising	2	1.24
Leadership Development	2	1.24
Personal Growth and Development	2	1.24
Personal Maturation	2	1.24
Resource Utilization	2	1.24
Working with CETA	2	1.24
Association with Public	1	
Behavior Modification	1	
Church Activities	1	
Community Influence	1	
Congressional Appearances	1	
Counseling	1	
Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation	1	
Elderly	1	
Family Relationships	1	

Table 16 (continued)

Program or Service Area	# Reported	% of Respondents (161)
Team Teaching	1	
Tolerance and Endurance	1	
Values Clarification	1	

Overall Influential LDP Experience

The final study hypothesis stated: The Leadership Development Program fellows will report the program development process as being the component of the LDP which was most important in influencing their decisions regarding formal educational pursuits and/or assumptions of roles which contribute to educational equity.

Analysis of data reported above reveals that the significant majority (89 percent) of fellows did pursue further formal educational experiences. Further, a significant percentage of respondents in the study reported the assumption of more significant professional and community service roles.

The data does not support the hypothesis that the program development component would be rated as most influential in either decisions regarding formal educational pursuits or in the assumption of roles which contribute to educational equity. In both influence on educational pursuits as well as influence on roles, the program development component ranked second after the internship experience. Seventy one percent of the fellows rated the program development component as having "much" to "very much" influence on pursuit of education as contrasted with eighty percent of the fellows rating the internship experience as highly influential. Further, on role assumption,

74 percent of the fellows rated the program development component as highly influential as contrasted with 86 percent rating the internship experience as highly influential.

Impact of Leadership Development Program on Overall Personal Development of Former Fellows

The leadership development program has been presented as a non-formal educational model which served to enhance educational equity for participants. Educational equity has been defined to include both the professional and personal development of the participants. Study participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt the LDP experience served to directly enhance their personal development. Participants responded on a five point scale of (1) to a great degree, (2) to some degree, (3) to a small degree, (4) none, and (5) undecided. A summary of participant responses is included in Table 17.

An overwhelming majority or 85.09 percent of the respondents indicated that the LDP served to directly enhance their personal development to a great degree. An additional 6.83 percent of the respondents indicated that the LDP experience served to enhance personal development "to some degree." While 6.83 percent of the respondents were undecided about the impact of the LDP on their overall personal development, none (Zero percent) of the

Table 17

Impact of LDP on Overall Personal Development of Fellows

N = 161

	DEGREE OF INFLUENCE					
	To a Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided	Total
Number	13.7	11	2	0	11	161
Percent	85.09	6.83	1.24	0	6.83	99.9

respondents indicated that the LDP had no impact at all on their overall personal development.

Summary

Overall Evaluation of Leadership Development Program Experience. This chapter has presented data which supported the major study hypothesis that the LDP experience enhanced educational equity for fellows as reflected by personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials and their personal assumption of professional or community service roles which address questions of educational equity. The data did not support the hypothesis that fellows would report the program development process as being the component of the LDP which was most important in influencing their decisions regarding pursuit of further formal educational pursuits and/or assumption of roles which contribute to educational equity. The internship experience was identified by the largest percentage of participants as that program component having the most influence in both areas.

Over 90 percent of respondents reported feelings that the LDP experience raised their educational status and favorably affected their professional and/or community service roles. A slightly smaller but still very high percentage (over 85 percent) of respondents reported that they perceived that their colleagues in their communities

also felt the LDP experience favorably affected the fellows' educational status and professional and/or community service roles. Only 3.11 percent or less of all respondents reported no effect on educational status or professional and/or community service roles. No fellows reported feeling that colleagues perceived the LDP experience to have had a negative effect on educational status. Three fellows, or 1.86 percent reported perceptions that colleagues felt the LDP experience unfavorably affected professional and/or community service roles, but this was qualified for the most part with observations that they encountered reactions such as jealousy, resentment of fellows' efforts to introduce change, or fear of loss of authority as a result of new skills and/or attitudes developed by fellows pursuant to the LDP experience. While this may have posed a hardship on fellows in terms of comfortable working relationships, it cannot necessarily be construed as a weakness of the program in terms of overall effectiveness.

The overall increased levels in educational attainments, professional responsibility and activity in various community services roles reflected in this data suggested that the LDP experience, which all respondents shared in common, in some way prepared or motivated LDP fellows in this regard.

C H A P T E R V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has been an examination of the Ford Foundation Leadership Development Program. As the title of the study indicates, this examination sought to determine the extent to which the Leadership Development Program, as a nonformal educational model, served to enhance educational equity as perceived by former fellows. This chapter will summarize key findings of the study, present conclusions based on these findings and will present recommendations for further study.

The LDP was a Ford Foundation funded program which was organized in four geographical regions: the Northeast, the South, the Southeast, and a Region-at-large. This study focused on the program as it was organized and implemented in the South from 1966 through 1976. As a nonformal educational model, the Leadership Development Program sought to provide educational and leadership development opportunities to individuals with demonstrated potential for impacting in significance ways on the quality of life in their local communities. Thus while the primary goal of the program was the personal development of the individual fellows and the expansion of those qualities that might bear on leadership in a local

situation, the ultimate intention of the program looked generally to improvement of schools and communities.

The focus of the study has been on educational equity in the rural South. The South has been discussed as an underdeveloped area in a highly developed post technological nation. Human resource development was presented as one key to the developmental needs of the area. The LDP was important because it has been one of the few programs which focused on developing indigenous leadership rather than importing developed human resources from other areas.

Historically the South and particularly the rural South, has been an area abundantly rich in natural resources and potential, yet pitifully impoverished in terms of utilization and application of these resources to the individual and aggregate benefit of its population. Per capita income, levels of education, labor force participation, and other indices of economic or social welfare have been and remain lower in the South than in other regions of the country. This state of affairs has been aggravated and compounded by the ongoing depletion of the very human resources that might serve to reverse the pattern through outmigration to supposed areas of greater opportunity. Rural areas of the South, which have the added burden of a depressed tax bases, inflated numbers of low skilled agricultural workers displaced by technological advances,

limited educational resources and virtually non-existent job opportunities suitable to population characteristics, suffer to an even greater extent than urban areas. National agricultural policies and priorities for urban areas over rural in terms of various assistance programs has further intensified, rather than alleviated the problem.

Factors of racism and discrimination still play a major role in allocations of and access to those resources that are available to Southern populations. While legislation of recent years has done much to contribute to equalization of opportunities to all citizens regardless of race, it is naive to assume that the attitudes and practices of past decades have been completely overcome. Even in instances where overt discrimination has been eliminated, the residual effects of segregation serve to establish a kind of "de facto" discrimination against blacks in terms of job opportunities, educational advancement and general participation in the "mainstream" of social, political and economic life. To the extent that non-farm economic growth is occurring in rural Southern communities, blacks have not shared proportionately. The LDP has been one of the few nonformal educational models designed specifically to address the human resource development needs of the rural South, with attention paid to issues of equity.

This study was concerned with assessing the LDP program as a nonformal educational model in terms of its effectiveness as an educational approach in general and specifically as a mechanism for enhancing educational equity. Chapter Four reported on the collection and analysis of data to determine:

1) Whether the LDP experience served to directly enhance educational equity as perceived and reported by the fellows themselves;

2) The extent to which the LDP experience served to motivate or enhance personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials as perceived and reported by the fellows themselves;

3) The extent to which the LDP experience served to motivate or enhance assumption of professional and/or community service roles which contribute to educational equity, as perceived and reported by the fellows themselves; and

4) Identification of components or aspects of the LDP experience which were perceived by the LDP fellows to be most important in influencing their decisions regarding formal educational pursuits and/or assumptions of roles which contribute to educational equity.

Findings of the study.

1. The results of the study clearly support the validity of the following hypotheses:

   a) LDP fellows perceive the LDP experience as having enhanced educational equity as reflected by (1) their personal pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials and (2) their personal assumptions of professional and/or community service roles which address questions of educational equity.

b) LDP fellows report that the LDP experience motivated program participants (fellows) to assume professional and/or community service roles which address questions of educational equity.

c) LDP fellows report that one outcome of the LDP experience was pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials by program participants (fellows).

2. The findings did not support the hypothesis that participants would report that the program development component as the most influential in motivating pursuit of further educational formal experience.

3. The findings did not support the study hypothesis that participants would report the program development component as most influential in the assumption of more significant professional and community service roles.

4. The Internship was that program component rated most highly by the largest percentage of fellows as having most influence on both their pursuit of further formal education and the assumption of more significant/ influential community service and professional roles.

5. Fellows reported that the LDP favorably influenced the pursuit of further formal educational experiences.

6. An overwhelming majority of the fellows did in fact pursue further formal education following completion of their fellowship experience.

7. A significant majority of the fellows reported that the LDP favorably influenced them to assume more significant/influential professional and community service roles.

8. A significant majority of the fellows reported that the LDP experience increased their effectiveness in a wide range of professional and community service related areas.

9. A significant majority of the fellows reported that they have assumed more significant professional roles since completion of their fellowship program.

10. The number of fellows serving on national boards and commissions increased sharply following the fellowship experience.

11. The number of fellows serving in government positions at the local, state, and regional level increased sharply since the fellowship program.

12. The number of fellows elected to public office increased sharply since the fellowship program.

No attempt was made in this study to explore other impacts the LDP program may have had on the lives of LDP fellows, but results of this study suggest they were significant. Numerous notes and letters were returned with the questionnaires, although no such response was in any way solicited, directly or indirectly. While such responses do not lend themselves to objective analysis for a number of reasons, they do provide some subjective insights as to the nature of the LDP program and its effect on the lives of those who participated in it. Selected comments from several respondents are presented here in an effort to "round out" the picture presented by the data and technical discussions presented elsewhere in this report.

> No questionnaire could possibly describe what the opportunity to participate in the LDP actually meant to me...Without a doubt, the experiences afforded me through the LDP training program have been a significant factor in the state leadership I have been privileged to provide...It helped me to understand some of the same problems as I have worked with other school systems and as I have helped to prepare training programs for new school board members all across the state...It provided me not only with the opportunity, but the motivation to provide at least a measure of leadership in the field of school board activity which would have been impossible without this assistance...It has afforded me an opportunity for professional growth and achievement and has opened doors to a world I never knew existed.

> I have found words inadequate to fully explain the eye-opening experience to be found in the program.
>
> The LDP experience was the most profound influence and indepth analysis of my personal worth, weaknesses and limitations. The program's unique concept allowed me to systematically incorporate my talents into the total leadership structure of my community as a competent professional
>
> It's hard to try to reduce my feelings about LDP to the limitation of your questionnaire. As I look back through the questionnaire, it reads like not too much happened to me. It doesn't tell that six years ago I was a street punk with a headful of ideas but little or no skills in implementing ideas, and little direction in life. It doesn't show that after I got off the LDP fellowship I not only knew a fair amount of new skills, but also had been handed the contacts I needed to get my life moving again. It doesn't show that I had been motivated enough to tuck three years of undergraduate work and three years of law school into the last four and a half years. And it doesn't show that I have had a healthy hand in helping (a community based development organization) secure several million dollars in federal funds, which in turn created hundreds of jobs and helped many more people through a few bends in the road.
>
> I believe this (the LDP experience) was the single most valuable year of a personal/professional preparation in a career that now totals 22 years.
>
> The questions actually do not give me the space to fully acknowledge the grant I got. There was no apsect of the process that was not absolutely phenomenally valuable and each aspect of the process has touched the course of my life absolutely.

Clearly the LDP, a nonformal educational model, had significant and far-reaching impact on fellows participating in the program. Educational equity as related to the fellows themselves was enhanced through direct provision of educational experiences and through motivation of fellows to pursue further formal educational experiences. It has

been further enhanced by the subsequent pursuit of formal educational experiences and credentials and assumption of more significant professional and community service roles by LDP fellows, with consequent increased supply of competent and sensitive community leaders and professionals functioning in areas of service of critical importance to disadvantaged and minority-groups.

The questionnaire approach to data collection utilized in this study did not lend itself to identification or detailed discussion of specific instances or examples of how participation in the LDP program resulted in changes in the conditions of peoples' lives. Limited assumptions can be made regarding observed increases in reported levels of income, participation in community service activities and educational attainment. More direct conclusions regarding the positive impact on fellows' educational and professional development are supported by responses to Parts II, III and IV of the questionnaire.

Based upon the combined responses to the questionnaire considered in light of additional comments spontaneously submitted by numerous fellows and the author's personal knowledge of the current endeavors of various fellows, it is fair to say that the impact of the LDP program extended not only to the lives of fellows participating in the program, but to the lives of individuals with and among whom they worked.

One fellow related the essence of the messages of many of the respondents in stating "a thousand Norman Vincent Peales could not have motivated me any more than LDP did; especially in the areas of wanting to continue my educational studies and wanting to dedicate my life to positive community and educational changes." The following sketches of fellows all of whom reported varying degrees of positive influence of LDP on their assumption of professional or community service roles, are representative of the LDP fellows as a group, and of the impact that they have had collectively and individually on the lives of countless others.

A woman who characterized herself as having "a fairly good education, but with very limited experience" prior to her LDP fellowship went on to become a member and ultimately president of her state school board association as a result of contacts and experiences involved in her fellowship program. In that capacity she reported being a part of the process which selected new leadership and restructured the program of a state organization, and influenced national legislation favorable to public schools.

A former cooperative extension services worker has assumed a major leadership role in a rural community housing development, managing a unique 150 unit HUD program that provides affordable housing to low income

families which previously had no access to quality housing.

Two individuals concerned with provision of health services obtained their nurse practitioner training as a result of their LDP fellowship and now serve the rural poor in southern states, working with several community health centers.

A third individual pursued further training during and subsequent to her LDP fellowship and organized, established and now directs a rural community health services delivery program.

One former fellow currently directs a state police academy, training sheriffs, deputies and other law enforcement officers on a statewide basis. Another is a professor of criminology at a state university currently on leave to the governor's office.

Numerous fellows have assumed directorships or assistant directorships of community action or other community service organizations, many of which were organized by the fellows themselves. Fellows are active in areas ranging from child development to gerontology. They serve on various state and federal boards, on commissions including state reorganization commissions, and director of minority affairs for a White House Conference. They have been appointed or elected to various political offices including

county school superintendent, mayor, county commissions, tax assessor, probate judge and state legislator. They serve as legislative aides and in state governors' offices as advisors and directors of various departments. Individuals who were classroom teachers at the time of their fellowships are now assistant principals, principals, and other education administrators. One former school district office employee now directs a state office of teacher certification.

A model alternative education program for juveniles and out-of-school youth was developed by a former LDP fellow, as was the first rural OIC (Opportunities Investment Corporation). This later fellow is now recognized on an international level as an expert in rural OIC's and employment training strategies.

Clearly, the impact of the LDP on its fellows, and their subsequent impact on their respective individual and professional communities has been far reaching. The LDP provided fellows not only with information and skills that could be utilized in their respective personal and professional lives, but also provided them with a heightened sensitivity and awareness of racial, ethnic and other "minority" issues. The program reached across a cross-section of individuals, involving blacks and whites, male and female, old and young, in a network of cooperation and

exchange. Out of this experience, new respect and understanding was developed, and new abilities to deal honestly and objectively with issues of prejudice grew.

Summary

The Leadership Development Program was presented as a model for nonformal education. For the purposes of this study, the definition of nonformal education presented by Coombs and Ahmed was used as the basis for analysis. They define nonformal education as "any intentional and systematic educational enterprise (usually outside of traditional schooling) in which content, media, time units admissions criteria, staff facilities, and other system components are selected and/or adapted for particular students, populations or situations in order to maximize attainment of the learning mission and minimize maintenance constraints of the system."

Our analysis of the Leadership Development Program indicates that it meets each of these essential criteria. The program was organized outside the formal school system. Though some fellows elected to include some formal schooling as part of their fellowship program, the formal schooling experience constituted a limited part of the fellowship experience. The population of the LDP was limited to adults, and for the most part, focused on those who had

experienced limited access to and limited participation in the formal educational system.

As organized and operated in the Southern region, the LDP was highly organized and totally individualized. Each internship experience was developed by the participant in conjunction with the project staff, based on the needs of the participant as defined by the participant. The program as a whole provided unlimited options for participants in determining what to include in their program and in developing the process for the organization and implementation of the fellowship experience.

The hierarchial structure which characterizes formal schooling was eliminated in the LDP. Each participant had complete control over the learning process which they had created for themselves. A focus of the program was to increase the individuals capacity to be self directed. Human capacity building and human resource development were viewed by the staff as important objectives of the program, with emphasis on empowering the individual in the process.

While the LDP was not anti-credentialing, learning rather than certification was a keystone of the program. The LDP was not time or place bound, and relied on innovative, non traditional resource utilization in order to be able to provide the wide array of learning experiences which participants felt were needed to achieve their individually

defined objectives. Finally, learning in the LDP was at all times viewed as utilitarian in nature, with participants expected to develop understandings and skills which could be applied in their home settings once the fellowship experience was complete.

Conclusions

The LDP aimed at finding potential leaders in rural school situations and giving them experiences that might enlarge their leadership capacities. It would find people in rural schools who had the capacity to assume local leadership and give them a range of experiences that would accelerate that leadership process. It would be a fellowship program, but it would avoid graduate schools and traditional academic experiences. Instead, it would expose fellows to practical people doing exciting new things in their fields. It would seek people with some constituency and accomplishment and it would expect them to go home at the end of their fellowship, and as the opportunity arose, to begin to implement in their own communities and schools the things they had learned.

The LDP generally succeeded with a highly experimental approach. At the same time, evaluation of the program is difficult because of its experimental nature, its insistence

on moving empirically, and its intense focus on the individual aims and needs of fellows.

The expectation that the fellow would work as an intern wherever he visited, rather than merely observing, aimed at giving the fellow material that could be translated into action at home. This material was not so much specific skills as it was personal expansion, increased awareness of possibilities, a better understanding of the nations larger symbols, systems and methods. To an unusual extent, the burden was on the fellow to make something out of the fellowship experience. Nothing specific was required of the fellow. There was no grading, no final exam, no degree award. There was no reporting requirement beyond an accounting for expense money spent and a quarterly narrative describing where they had been.

The program operated on an unprovable but exciting proposition, that if you give an individual a new tool they can do new work and produce real change. It tried to cut through to do directly what institutions try more generally, to give individuals new equipment. The difficulty of measuring it follows from the reason that it tried so much so broadly. Though it cannot be measured precisely, this study has brought to light significant information about it and the people it touched.

In providing an assessment of the impact of the LDP on specific aspects of the lives of the fellows, this study has provided valuable insights to educators and educational planners, particularly those charged with the responsibility for the design and implementation of educational strategies, and for the training of education professionals on all levels. It may also be of value to "non-educators" such as private businessmen and varied providers of social services, all of whom must necessarily impart specific attitudes, information and/or skills to their respective clientele if they are to perform effectively. Hopefully this study's greatest value will be not in the questions it answers but rather in the questions it raises in the minds of educators everywhere, as it directs their attention to the need and value of further development and testing of models of nonformal education.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study has presented data assessing the effectiveness of the Leadership Development Program as a nonformal education model in enhancing educational equity as perceived by former fellows. Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that further research be conducted to determine:

1. Specific factors of design and or administration of the LDP program that contributed to its apparent success as a nonformal model;

2. The degree and nature of impact of the LDP on other aspects of the success of post fellows including organizational development, community development and systems change.

3. Analysis of the nature of the internship experience of the fellows to determine what specific factors contributed to the success of the internship.

4. The specific factors in the program planning process which led participants to rate this program component as an important contributing factor in their success.

It is also recommended that further study be conducted to identify and analyze other nonformal educational models which have been implemented in the rural South which aimed at increasing educational equity. Finally, it is recommended that study be conducted to determine the extensiveness and effectiveness of the Post Fellowship Network.

FOOTNOTES

1. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, NO112. "Money, Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the South Region, by Divisions and States," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

2. President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 8.

3. Ibid.

4. Land and Minority Enterprise: The Crisis and The Opportunity, June, 1976, Department of Commerce.

5. The People Left Behind, p. 10.

6. Myrdal, Gunar. The Challenge of World Poverty, A World Anti-Poverty Program in Outline. Pantheon Books, New York, 1970, Preface xii and xiii.

7. Bock and Pappagiannis, 1973, pp. 5-6.

8. Lyra Srinivasan, Prespectives on Nonformal Adult Learning (New York: World Education, 1977), p. 15.

9. Ibid, pp. 1-15.

10. Leadership Development Program: Final Report, Ford Foundation, 1978, p. 3.

11. Ibid., p. 5.

12. Ibid., p. 10.

13. Richard O. Neihoff (ed.), Non-Formal Education and the Rural Poor (Michigan State University, 1977), p. 29.

14. Srinivasan, p. 18.

15. Ibid.

16. Philip Coombs with Manzoor Ahmed, Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal Education Can Help (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), p. 8.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Thomas J. LaBelle, "Liberation, Development and Rural Non-Formal Education," in Neihoff, p. 212.

20. Kleis, et. al. 1973, p. 6.

21. Ibid.

22. Neihoff, p. 27.

23. Neihoff, p. vii.

24. Labelle, pp. 215-216.

25. Betru Gebregzaibher, "A Case Study of the ARSSI Rural Development Unit (ARDU), in Neihoff, p. 75.

26. Coombs, pp. 2-3.

27. August Schumacher, "World Bank Policies for Rural Development," in Neihoff, p. 32.

28. Curtis Farrar, "Aid's Policies for Education and Rural Development," in Neihoff, p. 36.

29. Schumacher, p. 36.

30. Task Force on Southern Rural Development, Increasing the Options, Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Council, 1977), p. 7.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., pp. 70-71.

33. Edmund S. Phelps, ed., Problems of Modern Economy: The United States and the Developing Economies, (W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York, 1973).

34. Increasing the Options, p. 33.

35. Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Vantage Books, 1971), pp. 53-54.

36. Ibid., p. 62.

37. The People Left Behind, p. 12.

38. Robert L. Marion, "Rural Education in the South: Past and Present," Report prepared for Task Force on Southern Rural Development (January 1976), p. 79.

39. Increasing the Options, p. 89.

40. Gustav Ranis.

41. Donovan, John C. The Politics of Poverty (Pegasus: New York, 1967), p. 96.

42. Ibid., p. 94.

43. Silberman, p. 63.

44. Christopher Jencks, Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972), pp. 143-144.

45. A. H. Maslow, The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (New York: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 174.

46. Ibid., p. 175.

47. Ibid., p. 162.

48. Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 15-16.

49. Coombs, p. 253.

50. Malcolm Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy, (New York: Association Press, 1977), p. 23.

51. Coombs, p. 254.

52. Brembeck, C. S. New Strategies for Educational Development: Cross Cultural Search for Nonformal Alternatives, Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973, p. 27.

53. Paulston, R. G. "Nonformal Educational Alternatives," in Brembeck, New Strategies for Educational Development p. xxii.

54. Coombs, p. 63., Brembeck, p. 73.

55. Srinivasan, p. 4.

56. Evans, D. and Etling, A. "Don't Look Now Chairman Mao: We're Preparing Facilities to be Nonformal Educators." MEforum, Fall, 1974.

57. Coombs, pp. 94-95.

58. Brembeck, p. 127.

59. Evans and Etling, pp. 3-4.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid.

62. Ward, T., Dettoni, J. and McKenney, L. "Designing Effective Learning in Nonformal Modes" in Brembeck, C. A., New Strategies for Educational Development," p. 112.

63. Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York, Herder and Herder, 1972, p. 23.

64. Coombs, p. 95.

65. Anderson, C. A. "Fostering and Inhibiting Factors," in Brembeck, C. A., New Strategies for Educational Development, Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973.

66. Paulston, p. 72.

67. Brembeck, p. 54.

68. Paulston, p. xii.

69. Hilliard, J. F. "Elements of an Action Program" in Brembeck, C. S., New Strategies for Educational Development, Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973.

70. The Ford Foundation Fellowship News Bulletin, 1969, p. 2.

71. Coombs, p. 2-3.

72. News Bulletin, p. 2.

73. Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, C.A., "Fostering and Inhibiting Factors," in New Strategies for Educational Development. Ed. by C.A. Brembeck, Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973.

Bane, Mary Jo and Jencks, Christopher, "The Schools and Equal Opportunity," Saturday Review, September 16, 1972.

Bernstein, Basil, Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions. Vol. 111, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Bock, John and Papagiannis, George, Demystification of Nonformal Education: A Critique and Suggestions for a New Research Direction. Issues In Nonformal Education, N. 11. Center for Nonformal Education, UMass, Amherst. 1976.

Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert. Nightmares and Visions: Capitalism and Education in the United States. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Brembeck, C.S., New Strategies for Educational Development: Cross Cultural Search for Nonformal Alternatives. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973.

Brondy, Harry S. Paradox and Promise: Essays on American Life and Education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961.

Brubacher, John F. A History of the Problems of Education. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1966.

Burner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Carnoy, Martin. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: McKay Company, Inc., 1974.

Coleman, James S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coombs, Philip with Manzoor Ahmed. Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal Education Can Help. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Counts, George S. Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? New York: John Day Co., Inc., 1932.

Dahl, Robert A. Modern Political Analysis. Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1920.

Donovan, John C. The Politics of Poverty. Pegasus: New York, 1967.

Evans, D. and Etling, A. "Don't Look Now Chairman Mao: We're Preparing Facilitators to be Nonformal Educators." Meforum, Fall, 1974.

Fantini, Mario and Weinstein, Gerald. Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Curtis, Farrar. "Aid's Policies for Education and Rural Development," in Nonformal Education and the Rural Poor. Ed. by Richard Niehoff. Ann Arbor: Michigan State University, 1977.

The Ford Foundation Fellowship News Bulletin, New York, 1969.

Freire, Paulo. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Seabury, 1973.

_____. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York, Herder and Herder, 1972.

_____. "Cultural Action and Conscientization," Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 40, #3, August 1970.

Goodlad, John. "The Schools vs. Education," Saturday Review, April 19, 1969.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1964.

Illich, Ivan. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Jencks, Christopher. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.

Katz, Michael. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger, 1975.

Knowles, Malcolm. The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Androgagy Versus Pedagogy. New York: Association Press, 1977.

Kozol, Jonathan. Death at an Early Age. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

LaBelle, Thomas J. "Liberation, Development and Rural Non-Formal Education," in Nonformal Education and the Rural Poor. Ann Arbor: Michigan State University, 1977.

Leadership Development Program: Final Report, Ford Foundation, 1978.

Marion, Robert L. "Rural Education in the South: Past and Present," Report prepared for Task Force on Southern Rural Development, January 1976.

Maslow, A.H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (New York: Penguin Books, 1972.

Maslow, Abraham. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1962.

Miller, Harry L. and Woock, Roger R. "The Opportunity Structure," in Social Foundations of Education. Ed. by Miller and Woock. Hinsdale: The Dryden Press, 1970.

Myrdal, Gunar. The Challenge of World Poverty, a World Anti-Poverty Program in Outline. Pantheon Books, New York, 1970.

Neihoff, Richard O. (Ed.). Nonformal Education and the Rural Poor. Ann Arbor: Michigan State University, 1977.

Phelps, Edmund S. (Ed.). Problems of the Modern Economy: The United States and the Developing Economies. W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York, 1973.

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Rist, Raymond. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education," Harvard Educational Review 40 August 3, 1970.

Ryan, William. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

Rossman, Michael. On Learning and Social Change. New York: Random House, 1969.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1971.

Smith, William A. The Meaning of Conscientizacao: The Goal of Paulo Freire's Pedagogy. Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1976.

Srinivasan, Lyra. Perspectives on Nonformal Adult Learning. New York: World Education, 1977.

Stanwick, Mary E. Patterns of Participation. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1975.

Task Force on Southern Rural Development, Increasing the Options. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Council, 1977.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 112, "Money, Income, and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the South Region, by Divisions and States," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1978.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Land and Minority Enterprise: The Crisis and the Opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report on the Condition of American Education 1975. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Whitehead, Alfred North. The Aims of Education. New York: Mentor Books, 1949.

Wilson, Lightfoot, Thomasyne. "Notes Toward a Process of Afro-American Education," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, #3, August 1972.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

"A Study to Determine the Extent to Which the Leadership Development Program as a Non-Formal Educational Model Served to Enhance Educational Equity as Perceived by Leadership Development Fellows"

Kanawha Z. Chavis, President
Associates for Resource Linkage and Institutional Networks, Inc.
P.O. Drawer "A"
Red Oak, North Carolina 27868

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about the following things:

1. Part I requests general information about you, your duties and/or responsibilities, and your formal professional training and community service roles before and after your LDP fellowship.

2. Part II requests you to evaluate the LDP experience in terms of its impact on your educational status.

3. Part III requests information about component areas of the LDP experience which you feel influenced you to pursue further formal educational experiences and to assume more significant professional and/or community service roles.

4. Part IV requests that you rate the various components of the LDP in terms of the extent to which each has influenced your pursuit of formal educational experiences and assumption of significant professional and/or community service roles. It further askes that you indicate those categories of professional and/or community service activity that were most enhanced by the LDP experience.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Directions: Please indicate your response to each item as it applied to you by writing in the information required (usually a statement and/or number or by placing a check (x) in the appropriate space) to complete the item.

Part 1: Section A

1. Current Age:_____
2. Age at time of Fellowship Award:_____
3. Sex: _____Male _____Female
4. In what year did you begin your LDP Fellowship?_____
5. Ethnic/Racial Identity: White_____ Black_____

   Other_____

Part 1: Section B

1. a: My current occupation/profession is:_____

   b: Brief description of duties/responsibilities:_____

   _____

   _____

   c: My current annual salary range is:

   _____ Less than $5,000

   _____ $ 5,000 - 9,999

   _____ $10,000 - 14,999

   _____ $15,000 - 19,999

Questionnaire
Page 2

_____ $20,000 - 24,999

_____ $25,000 and above

d: The characteristics of population I currently serve is best described as:

_____Rural _____Urban _____Rural & Urban

Part 1: Section C

1. a: My occupation/profession at the time I received the Fellowship was: _____

b: Brief description of duties/responsibilities: _____

_____

_____

c: My annual salary at the time I received the Fellowship was:

_____ less than $5,000

_____ $ 5,000 - 9,999

_____ $10,000 - 14,999

_____ $15,000 - 19,999

_____ $20,000 - 24,999

_____ $25,000 and above

d: The characteristics of population I served at the time I received the Fellowship can best be described as:

_____Rural _____Urban _____Rural and Urban

Questionnaire
Page 3

Part 1: Section D

Directions: Please check the boxes that appropriately label your current educational status and your educational status at the time you received the LDP Fellowship.

1. Education	Current	At the Time of Fellowship Award
a. High School Graduate or less		
b. Technical Course(s) Completed		
c. Credit hours Toward Associate Degree		
d. Associate Degree		
e. Some Study Toward Bachelor's Degree		
f. Bachelor's Degree		
g. Some Study Toward Master's Degree		
h. Master's Degree		
i. Some Study Toward Doctoral Degree		
j. Doctoral Degree		

Questionnaire
Page 4

Education (Cont.)	Current	At the Time of Fellowship Award
k. Post Doctoral Study		
l. Special Certification (Please Specify)		
m. Special Professional Service Rating		
n. Other (Please Specify)		

Please check the boxes that appropriately label your current community service roles and your community service role at the time you received the LDP Fellowship.

2. Community Service Roles	Current	At the Time of Fellowship Award
a. Elected Government Official		
b. Appointed Government Official (Housing Authority member, etc.)		
c. Board Member or Other Office Holder of Community or State Organization		

Questionnaire
Page 5

Community Service (cont.)	Current	At the Time of Fellowship Award
d. Active participant or Volunteer with Local Community-Based Service Organization		
e. National Boards or Commissions		
f. Other (Please Specify)		

PART II: EVALUATION OF THE LDP EXPERIENCE

1. How did you personally feel that your Fellowship experience affected your educational status (check one)?

___It had no effect, that is, my status did not change.

___It raised my educational status.

___I am undecided about whether or not the LDP Fellowship affected my educational status.

2. What is your perception of the way in which your colleagues in your community felt about how the Fellowship experience affected your educational status (check one)?

___It had no effect, that is, they felt my educational status had not changed.

___They felt it favorably affected my educational status.

___They felt it unfavorably affected my educational status.

___They are undecided or have no opinion about whether or not the LDP Fellowship affected my educational status.

3. How did you personally feel that your Fellowship experience affected your professional or community service roles (check one)?

___It had no effect, that is, my status did not change.

___It raised my professional and/or community service roles.

___I am undecided about whether or not the LDP Fellowship affected my professional or community service roles.

4. What is your perception of the way in which your colleagues in your community felt about how the Fellowship experience affected your professional or community service roles (check one)?

___It had no effect, that is, they felt my roles did not change.

___They felt it favorably affected my professional or community service roles.

___They felt it unfavorably affected my professional or community service roles.

___They are undecided or have no opinion about whether or not the LDP Fellowship affected my professional or community service roles.

PART III: IMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL STATUS AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ROLES

1. Have you pursued further formal educational training since the completion of your Fellowship year?
Yes_____ No_____

Directions: Please indicate your reactions by placing a check mark (x) in the appropriate spaces under Column 2 to indicate the degree to which you were or were not influenced to pursue further formal education by the LDP experience listed in Column 1. If you are are undecided as to the extent of the influence it had, place a check mark under Column 3. Please respond to these questions even if your answer to question #1 above is No.

Questionnaire
Page 7

1	2				3
	Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	Felt Influence to Pursue Formal Education				
		To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To Small Degree	None	Undecided
2.	The LDP Experience influenced me to pursue further formal educational experiences and/or credentials.					
3.	Please inicate the extent to which the following general and specific aspects of the LDP Fellowship experience served to influence your pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials:					

Questionnaire

PART III: IMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL STATUS AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ROLES

1. Have you pursued further formal educational training since the completion of your Fellowship year? Yes_____ No_____

Directions: Please indicate your reactions by placing a check mark (x) in the appropriate spaces under Column 2 to indicate the degree to which you were or were not influenced to pursue further formal education by the LDP experience listed in Column 1. If you are undecided as to the extent of the influence it had, place a check mark under Column 3. Please respond to these questions even if your answer to question #1 above is No.

1	2				3
Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	Felt Influence to Pursue Further Formal Education				
	To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided
2. The LDP experience influenced me to pursue further formal educational experiences and/or credentials.					
3. Please indicate the extent to which the following general and specific aspects of the LDP Fellowship experience served to influence your pursuit of further formal educational experiences and/or credentials:					
A. Selection Process					
1) Development of Initial Proposal					
2) Field Interviews					

Questionnaire

1	2				3
	Felt Influence to Pursue Further Formal Education				
Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided
3) Selection Conference Interviews					
B. Individual Fellowship Development Process					
1) Planning Fellowship Activity Program					
2) Orientation and Briefing Conference					
3) Making Initial Contact with Mentor					
C. Internship Experiences					
1) Mentor Relationships					
2) Travel					
3) Independent Research					
4) Course work					
5) LDP Work Conferences					
6) Preparing Narrative Reports					
7) Preparing Financial Reports					

Questionnnaire

1	2				3
Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	Felt Influence to Pursue Further Formal Education				
	To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided
D. Post Fellowship Activities					
1) Annual LDP Conference					
2) Relationship with Selection Committee Members					
3) LDP Network Relationships					

4. Have you assumed more significant professional and/or community service roles since the completion of your fellowship year?
Yes_____ No_____

Directions: Please indicate your reactions by placing a check mark (x) in the appropriate spaces under Column 2 to indicate the degree to which you were or were not influenced to assume more significant professional and/or community service roles by the LDP experience listed in Column 1. If you are undecided as to the extent of the influence it had, place a check mark under Column 3. Please respond to these questions even if your answer to question #4 above is No.

1	2				3
Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	Felt Influence to Pursue Further Formal Education				
	To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided
5. The LDP experience influenced or equipped me to assume more significant professional and/or community service roles.					

Questionnaire

1	2				3
	Felt Influence to Pursue Further Formal Education				
Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided
6. Please indicate the extent to which the following general and specific aspects of the LDP fellowship experience served to influence or equip you to assume more significant professional or community service roles:					
A. Selection Process					
1) Development of Initial Proposal					
2) Field Interviews					
3) Selection Conference Interviews					
B. Individual Fellowship Development Process					
1) Planning Fellow Activity Program					
2) Orientation and Briefing Conference					
3) Making Initial Contact with Mentor					
C. Internship Experience					
1) Mentor Relationships					

Questionnaire

1	2				3
Leadership Development Program Experiences and/or Component Areas	Felt Influence to Pursue Further Formal Education				
	To Great Degree	To Some Degree	To a Small Degree	None	Undecided
2) Travel					
3) Independent Research					
4) Course Work					
5) LDP Work Conferences					
6) Preparing Narrative Reports					
7) Preparing Financial Reports					
D. Post Fellowship Activities					
1) Annual LDP Conference					
2) Relationship With Selection Committee Members					
3) LDP Network Relationships					
7. Overall, I feel that the LDP experience served to directly enhance my personal development.					

Questionnaire

PART IV: OVERALL INFLUENTIAL LDP EXPERIENCES

1. Below are four categories of LDP experience. Using the scale below, rate each of the categories from 0 to 4 in terms of its overall influence on your pursuit of further formal educational experience.

No Influence	Little Influence	Moderate Influence	Much Influence	Very Much Influence
0	1	2	3	4

Rating	Categories of LDP Experience
_____	Selection Process
_____	The Individualized Planning Experience of the Fellowship Program Activities
_____	Internship Experience
_____	Post Fellowship LDP Activities

2. Below are four categories of LDP experience. Using the scale above, rate each of the categories from 0 to 4 in terms of its influence on your assumption of more significant profession and/or community service roles.

Rating	Categories of LDP Experience
_____	Selection Process
_____	The Individualized Planning Experience of the Fellowship Program Activities
_____	Internship Experience
_____	Post Fellowship LDP Activities

Questionnaire

3. Please check (x) the program or service areas in which you feel your effectiveness was enhanced by your LDP experience.

a) Housing _____

b) Recreation _____

c) Health _____

d) Child Care _____

e) Youth _____

f) Economic Development _____

g) Adult Education _____

h) Public School Education _____

i) Higher Education _____

j) Early Childhood Education _____

k) Law and Justice _____

l) Welfare _____

m) Participation in Community-Based Organizations _____

n) Participation in Regional and/or State Organization _____

o) Participation in National Organizations _____

p) Serving as Elected Public Official _____

q) Serving as Appointed Public Official _____

r) Serving on Local Boards _____

Questionnaire

s) Serving on State/Regional Boards _____

t) Administration _____

u) Planning _____

v) Budgeting and Fiscal Management _____

w) Organizational Development _____

x) Organizational Policy _____

y) Staffing and Staff Development _____

z) Other (please list) _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

APPENDIX B

Reported Occupations/Professions of Fellows Currently and at Time of Fellowship Award

Reported Occupations/Professions of Fellows Currently and at Time of Fellowship Award

	Current	Prior
A. Education		
1. Preschool/Headstart		
Day Care Director (1)*	2	0
Director of Education (1)	1	0
Headstart County Project Officer (1)	0	1
Headstart Director (1)	0	2
Headstart Director of Education (1)	0	1
Headstart Education Coordinator (1)	0	1
Headstart Teacher (2)	0	1
2. Elementary and Secondary		
Administrative Assistant to Superintendent of Schools (1)	3	0
Assistant Principal (1)	5	2
Central Office Employee (1)	0	1
Curriculum Coordinator, Dropout Program (1)	0	1
Dean of Development and Continuing Education (1)	1	0
Director of Adult Education (1)	1	0
Director of Federal Programs (1)	0	1
Director of Instruction (1)	1	0
Director of Testing and Research (1)	0	1
Education Administration, Unspecified (1)	7	4
Educational Planner (1)	0	2
Educational Supervisor (1)	0	1

*(1) denotes administrative; (2) denotes non-administrative.

	Current	Prior
Guidance Counselor (2)	3	1
Librarian (2)	1	0
Parent Organizer (2)	0	1
Principal (1)	4	5
Social Worker (1)	0	1
Superintendent of Schools (1)	2	1
Supervisor of School Psychology Personnel (1)	0	1
Teacher (2)	16	46
3. College/University		
Assistant Director of Admissions (1)	0	1
Assistant/Associate Professor (2)	5	0
Associate Director, Alcohol and Drug Studies (1)	1	0
College President (1)	1	0
Coordinator for Continuing Education Programs (1)	0	1
Counselor (2)	0	1
Department Chairman (1)	1	0
Director of Continuing Education (1)	1	0
Director of Public Information (1)	1	0
Director of Special Programs (1)	0	1
Director of Student Financial Aid (1)	1	0
Financial Aid Counselor (2)	1	0
Instructor (2)	0	1
Professor (2)	1	0
Public Relations Staff Writer (1)	0	1
Technical College Instructor (2)	1	0
Unspecified Administrative Positions (1)	4	0

	Current	Prior
4. Extension Services		
Administrator (1)	1	0
Career Development Coordinator (1)	0	1
Coordinator of Academic Extension Programs (1)	0	1
District Program Leader (1)	0	1
Food and Nutrition Specialist (2)	0	1
Nutritionist (2)	1	1
Program Director (1)	0	1
5. Other		
Associate Director, Upward Bound (1)	0	1
Community School Director (1)	0	1
Consultant to Boards of Education (1)	1	0
Counselor (2)	1	0
Director of Curriculum and Instruction (1)	1	0
Director of Education, State Level (1)	1	0
Director, Office of Certification, State Level (1)	1	0
Director, Special Services Program (1)	1	0
Director, State School Boards Association (1)	0	1
Electricity Instructor (2)	0	1
Learning Coordinator, Career Education Program (1)	1	0
B. Community Service/Community Development		
Administrative Assistant (1)	1	1
Assistant Coordinator (Neighborhood Center) (1)	1	0

	Current	Prior
Assistant Director/Deputy Director (1)	2	0
Community Developer (1)	0	1
Community Development Coordinator (1)	1	0
Community Development Worker (2)	1	0
Community Organizer (2)	0	2
Community Services Worker Trainee (2)	0	1
Consultant, Economic Development (1)	0	1
Consultant, Training (1)	0	1
Consultant, Program Development (1)	1	0
Director of Consumer Research (1)	1	1
Director of Development (1)	0	1
Director of Economic Development (1)	1	1
Director of Field Services (1)	0	1
Director, Neighborhood Services Project (1)	0	1
Director, State Coalition (1)	1	0
Director, Youth, Community Center (1)	0	1
Director, Youth Regional Level (1)	0	1
Executive Director/Program Director (1)	5	2
Field Representative (2)	0	4
Grantswriter (1)	1	0
Housing Specialist (1)	0	1
Human Relations Specialist (1)	0	1
Human Resource Development Instructor (1)	1	1
Intake Worker (2)	0	1
Minister (1)	5	2
Planner (1)	3	0

	Current	Prior
Program Manager, Urban Programs (1)	1	0
Program Specialist (2)	1	0
Project Administrator, Area Development Center (1)	1	0
Research Developer (2)	0	1
Social Welfare Worker (2)	0	1
Vicar for Social Services (1)	1	0
C. Health		
Administrative Coordinator, Mental Health Services (1)	0	1
Administrator, Mental Health (1)	2	0
Administrator, State Department of Mental Health (1)	0	0
Administrator, Health Center (1)	0	1
Assistant Director, Mental Retardation Program (1)	0	1
Director of Consultation and Education (Mental Health Program) (1)	1	0
Health Field Training, Headstart (1)	0	1
Laboratory Assistant (2)	0	1
Medical Technologist (2)	1	0
Mental Health Counselor (2)	0	1
Mental Health Professional (1)	1	0
Nurse, Emergency Room (2)	0	1
Nurse, Headstart (2)	0	1
Nurse, Practitioner (2)	2	0
Nurse, Public Health (2)	0	1
Nurse, Registered (2)	1	0
Psychiatric Social Worker (1)	1	0
Rolfer (2)	1	0

	Current	Prior
Social Worker, Community Mental Health Center (2)	0	1
Speech Clinician (2)	0	1
Speech Pathologist (2)	2	1
Speech Therapist (2)	1	0
D. Employment		
Career Development Coordinator (1)	0	1
Employment Interviewer (2)	1	0
Employment Rehabilitation Counselor (2)	1	0
Equal Opportunity Specialist (1)	1	0
Project Director, Job Placement (1)	1	0
Recruiter/Counselor (2)	1	1
Regional Executive Director, Manpower Training Program (1)	1	0
State CETA Director (1)	1	0
Vocational Counselor (2)	1	0
Youth Coordinator (1)	1	0
E. Law and Justice		
Attorney (1)	3	0
Coordinator of Information and Public Relations and Legal Services Newsletter Editor (1)	1	0
Juvenile Crime Prevention Training Specialist (1)	0	1
Law Student (2)	1	0
Legal Assistant (2)	1	0
Police Academy Director (1)	1	1
F. Elected Officials		
City Alderman (1)	1	0
County Commissioner (1)	1	0

	Current	Prior
Mayor (1)	1	0
Probate Judge (1)	1	0
Tax Assessor/Collector (1)	1	1
Tax Collector (1)	0	1
G. Other Government Officials/ Employees		
Chief of Staff Education, State Division of Youth Services (1)	1	0
Director of Minority Affairs, White House Conference on Small Business (1)	1	0
Director of Research and Statistics, Department of Social Services (1)	1	0
Housing Authority Executive Director (1)	1	0
Legislative Advisor (1)	1	0
Legislative Aid (1)	1	1
Program Director, State Housing Finance Agency (1)	1	0
Recreation Director, Local City Government (1)	0	1
Social Worker (Children and Family Services) (2)	0	2
State Research Analyst (1)	1	0
Transportation Analyst (2)	0	1
H. Other		
Actress (2)	1	1
Advertising (2)	1	0
Art Program Director (1)	0	1
Custodian (2)	0	1
Customer Relations (1)	1	0
Editor/Relations (1)	1	0
Engineer, Junior (2)	0	1

	Current	Prior
Farmer (2)	0	1
Folklorist (2)	1	1
Housing Rehabilitation Assistant (1)	1	0
Housewife/Community Worker (2)	1	3
Insurance Agent (2)	1	0
Management Executive, Housing Development (1)	1	0
Marketing Business Specialist (1)	0	1
Office Clerk (2)	0	1
Personnel Specialist (1)	1	0
Plant Manager, Manufacturing (1)	0	1
Real Estate Broker (2)	1	0
Sales, Sales Clerk (2)	2	3
Security Officer (2)	1	1
Secretary (2)	1	1
Seminar Coordinator (1)	0	1
Warehouseman (2)	0	1
Writer, Free Lance (2)	1	0