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Problem

It is difficult for schools to make sound decisions regarding whether to use external programs to address teenage pregnancy, AIDS, substance abuse, or any other social issue. Questions arise as to which administrative factors impact decisions to use an external program and also what indicators influence successful program implementation. The effects of central office support for a program, staff training, and ample funding are administrative factors to be examined before a program is selected.
Method

The research was conducted across several school districts within Indiana. Data collection involved the distribution of a questionnaire developed for this study. School administrators comprised the largest portion of the sampled population. Surveys were distributed in elementary, middle, and high schools in public and private settings. A few external program providers were also sampled. A correlation matrix was produced for social issues needing external expertise for implementation in schools. Items on the survey were used to test for significant differences in external and internal factors and indicators relating to administrative decisions to adopt external programs.

Results

The number of external programs used in schools increased from 1970 to 1990. The data analysis revealed that child abuse topped the list of issues viewed as needing external expertise. The data also generated lists of external and internal administrative factors related to program adoption and administrative indicators of successful implementation of external programs. Internal program initiation and internal implementation were the factors most significantly impacting administrative decisions to adopt external programs (p<.001). External funding was also a significant factor (p<.05). External funding was the most significant indicator of successful
implementation of external programs (p<.001). Internal initiation and internal implementation were also significant indicators of successful implementation (p<.01).

Conclusions

External expertise is perceived to be most needed to address the social issues of child abuse and substance-abuse prevention and least needed in the areas of decision-making and values clarification. This study shows that decisions to adopt external programs are influenced more when the programs are initiated by internal forces and implemented by internal personnel.
Mom, for you, with love
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With the recent trend toward fast-paced living, personal values, morals, and other social issues have increasingly become a focus for social change. Various programs, activities, and projects target specific populations to address these issues in diverse settings. Wherever large groups of individuals are accessible, programs addressing social issues are likely to be available, and those involving children have been identified as especially viable vehicles for social change. Thus, there has been growing pressure in recent years to add new programs addressing social issues to existing school curricula. Such programs typically deal with child and drug abuse prevention, sexuality, drug abuse, gang involvement, the spread of AIDS and other health issues. These programs are often delivered by external personnel and/or managed externally while operating within school settings, and thus become difficult to administrate. This study investigated effective "administrative factors" impacting decisions to use "externally managed programs"
that address "social issues" and explore "administrative indicators" of successful implementation of such programs.

As society becomes more aware of the problems associated with busy lifestyles, the quantity and variety of preventive efforts increase. For example, current widespread efforts promote physical fitness, drug abuse prevention, and many other comprehensive approaches to fostering healthy lifestyles. Prevention programs often concentrate on young people and are most effectively carried out in school settings; but since schools are not always equipped to address social issues, externally managed programs are often used.

Some external programs may be derived from local organizations such as police or recreation agencies. The PAL (Police Athletic League) is an example of such a program. Some agencies and organizations also provide external personnel who implement programs inserted within the school setting.

Other programs, although externally managed, may in time become an integral part of a school's total curriculum. One such program is Project I-STAR (Indiana Students Taught Awareness and Resistance), Incorporated, in the Indianapolis, Indiana, area. This program addresses substance abuse prevention through a multi-faceted approach including a curriculum for middle and junior high school students. Classroom teachers are trained by external
project trainers to execute a prescribed curriculum and implementation is observed by external staff to monitor the integrity of the content delivered. Necessary materials are all provided by Project I-STAR. This program requires use of externally developed curricula and materials, external trainers, and external monitoring within existing school curricula. School administrators with Project I-STAR must advocate, support, and manage the program within the total school setting.

Streshly and Schaps (1988) reported on a comparable external program that was part of a school's curriculum and dealt with general moral values. As an example of the recent increase in external programs, Knarr (1988) reported over 40 external partnerships operating within a single school district. His study further demonstrated the need to examine the administrative indicators that foster the success of such programs.

Statement of the Problem

Schools have been inundated with a variety of external programs proposing to address societal problems. In general, teachers have been expected to possess expertise in many areas. Specifically, teachers must have knowledge of curriculum content and development, and at the same time, must assume responsibility for addressing numerous social issues that are generally thrust within their realm of duties. It is not feasible to expect every teacher to
be well-versed in specific subject-area content and also able to deal effectively with all social problems. Consequently, externally managed programs seem to be increasing as societal awareness of social issues expands. Many different social issues have generated crusades and resulted in external programs in school settings. This investigation is limited to external programs that successfully address social issues in school settings.

It is difficult to make sound decisions regarding whether to utilize external programming to address teenage pregnancy, or AIDS, or substance abuse, or any of the other numerous pressing issues. Some external programs addressing social issues appear to be effective, while others fail to achieve their stated objectives. With scores of such programs imposed on public and private schools, the question arises as to which administrative factors impact a decision to use an external program. Central office support for a program, staff training, and ample funding, are some administrative factors to be examined before a program is selected. Other critical concerns include administrative indicators influencing effective implementation of these programs. Building level support for a program, internal funding and proven success are administrative indicators which may influence program implementation.
Importance of the Study

With the wave of programs emerging to address assorted social ills, administrators must ensure that such efforts are justified and that programs undertaken are successful. It is extremely difficult for administrators to implement all programs they are pressured to bring into schools. Pressure for programming sometimes comes from parents who may have expanded their expectations of a school's responsibilities. The community at large often thrusts programs within school settings to address social issues. Educators have also pressed administrators for programs involving external expertise to fill voids in their ability to address societal problems. Another source of pressure comes from external professionals connected with community agencies and organizations who provide programs. With pressure from many directions, it is important for all concerned to be aware of administrative factors impacting decision-making and the indicators of successful management of external programs. Thus this study examined such factors with a representative sampling of public school administrators in a specific geographic region—central Indiana.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study arose from its problem statement. The research identified administrative factors impacting a decision to use external programs to address
social issues. It was also the purpose of this study to
determine which of these factors are indicators of
successful program implementation.

The following questions were addressed:

1. Has there been an increase in external programs
addressing social issues in public and parochial schools?
2. What administrative factors impact decisions to
use externally managed programs?
3. What administrative indicators relate to
successful implementation of externally managed programs?

Limitations

The following limitations were present in the study:

1. Success indicators and implications may vary
depending on the social issues to be addressed by a program
such as substance abuse prevention, child abuse, teen
pregnancy, and the like.
2. Differences in school district enrollment sizes
may also cause variations in administrative decisions and
program implementation.

Delimitations

1. This work identified the most prevalent social
issues addressed by external programs in schools requiring
the attention of administrators.
2. The study also examined survey results by
respondent position to determine administrative impact
differences. Three respondent group categories were used to define respondents and their perspectives on the questions addressed in this research. The categories include the following:

a. External provider—Limited number surveyed

b. Combined group—Limited numbers of teachers, counselors, central office, and other school personnel.

c. Building administrators—Largest group surveyed.

3. Several academic external programs have been employed by schools, such as Head Start, Chapter 2, etc. These programs have been viewed as auxiliary to the schools' purpose and, therefore, generally have been accepted. Programs addressing social issues, however, must first jump the hurdle of the realm of schools' responsibility. This study dealt only with external programs addressing difficult social issues.

Definition of Terms

1. Administrative Factors: administrative considerations and responsibilities impacting a decision to adopt an external program.

2. Administrative Indicators: administrative actions and responsibilities that may affect the success of external programs. ("Indicators" used instead of
duplicating "factors" to limit confusion throughout the paper.)


4. Externally Managed Program: a program operating within a school but initiated, developed, financed, implemented, monitored, and/or managed by personnel or resources from outside the school setting.

5. Outsiders: school program providers not employed by a school.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 is the introduction and includes the problem statement, importance and purpose of the study, limitations, delimitations, definition of terms, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 contains a literature review that discusses administrative implications impacting decisions to use external programming. Implementation factors affecting success are also explored. Specific topics covered are social issues in schools, program administration, program implementation, and institutional change. A summary of chapter 2 recapitulates the information presented.

Chapter 3 presents the study's methodology. Following an introduction, chapter 3 describes the target population, survey instrument, and survey distribution process. A
review of the research questions and data analysis procedures concludes this chapter.

An analysis of data received through the study's questionnaire process is reported in chapter 4. A description of the survey returns and an analysis of the research questions is presented through tables and narrative. Data regarding the above-stated research questions are also examined in this chapter.

The significance of this study is addressed in chapter 5 through presentation of a summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Initial efforts to review available literature on administration and implementation of external school programs addressing social issues were discouraging. However, the limited information found on this topic demonstrated the need for studies such as this one. In the progression of the literature review, the study's topic was expanded to include related areas that were well represented in the literature. Searches within extended topics were then refined to assure that pertinent elements of this study's topic were included.

A search of the Education Index revealed no available information on the specific topic of administration and implementation of external programs addressing social issues within school settings. Some information was available regarding program administration and management. ERIC searches yielded limited research related to administration and implementation. Early searches of University Microfilms International (UMI) Dissertation Abstracts endiscs (1961-80, 1980-1984) yielded only a few
studies on potentially similar topics that were not easily accessible. More recent UMI Dissertation Abstract (1985-1988, 1989-91) searches spanned related topics in greater depth. Library card catalogs and vertical files were also used extensively.

The libraries at Andrews University, Indiana University at Bloomington, and Indiana University/Purdue University (Indianapolis) were all used to provide a foundation for this study with many works being perused to gain a global perspective on the research topic. Individual researchers were also contacted for information on the study's topic.

The literature review revealed related information but little that addressed the specific topic of this study. The search for information on externally managed school programs addressing social issues yielded little focus on processes related to administrative decision-making and/or indicators of successful program implementation. By contrast, information found on successful administrative indicators (actions and responsibilities) did not address management of external programming.

The literature search focused on a series of questions that must be examined if schools are to proceed on a path of continued improvement while including external programming. The following questions were explored:
1. Is the number of externally managed programs addressing social issues increasing in schools?

2. What administrative factors contribute to a decision to use an external program in the school setting?

3. What are the administrative indicators (actions and responsibilities) of successfully implemented external programs?

4. What social issues are successfully addressed through external programming in schools?

The literature review and related information are presented in chapter 2 under several topic headings. The first topic, social issues in schools, reviews which social issues have been addressed. The second topic, program administration, covers leadership characteristics of principals and the schools' relationship with external consultants. Program implementation is then reviewed with subheadings of social issues within the curricula, external programs, program initiation, and implementation/institutionalization. The next topic, institutional change/improvement, is reviewed through three subheadings: institutional change, school improvement, and successful programming. A summary section concludes chapter 2.

Social Issues in Schools

Education has been viewed traditionally as the ideal institution through which to initiate, develop, and support social change. Educators have often discussed the impact of
schools on the individual, the family, the community, and its potential for their societal change. Schools offer a captive audience that is a viable vehicle for social change. Social issues, therefore, may be addressed easily in school settings with an accessible and functional population. This fact has placed extensive pressure on schools to increase efforts to deal with a variety of social issues. Because classroom teachers are generally not trained to effectively address social concerns, external experts are increasingly sought to operate such programs in school settings.

Difficulties with schools cannot be separated from the general malaise of American society. Marin (1970), head of a "free school," wrote:

We open the classroom a bit and loosen the bonds. Students use a teacher's first name, or roam the small room, or choose their own texts. But what has it got to do with the needs of the young? We devise new models, new programs, new plans. We innovate and renovate, and beneath it all our schemes always contain the same vacancies, the same smells of death as the schools. One speaks to planners, designers, teachers, and administrators, and one hears about schedules and modules and curricular innovation. It is always materials and technique, and chronic American technological vice. It is all so progressively right—and yet so useless, so far off the track. One knows there is something else altogether, a way of feeling, access to the soul, a way of speaking and embracing, that lies at the heart of yearning or wisdom or real revolution. It is that, precisely, that has been left out. It is something the planners cannot remember, the living tissue of community. (p. 71)

Students, teachers, and administrators are all part of American life: a life complete with alienation and lack of
supportive community, pervasive racism, political polarization, violence, apathy, repression, the steady continuance of the threat of war, and the threat of ecological collapse. In the face of all this—fully documented and visible daily to everyone through the mass media—it seems ridiculous to suppose that minor tinkering or the issuance of "replacement parts" for school districts would create competence in coping with the social demands faced by schools.

A comparative analysis of social change in education between 1840 and 1920 was conducted by Reese (1980). His study highlighted the complexity of human motivation and action, the historical importance of volunteerism in school policy, and the role that radical, liberal, and conservative forces have had in guiding change. Reese asserted that social change in education during the period studied was the product of numerous competing forces: efficiency versus democracy, socialism versus capitalism, female agitation versus male educational leadership, and other contradictory developments.

According to Burger (1968, p. 16), cultural patterning also interceded in attempts at acculturation and social transformation. He acclaimed that man was not a stimulus-response machine as theory presupposes. A single stimulus might produce entirely different behaviors depending on type and degree of acculturation. Thus humanistic
psychologists and social scientists maintained that a large part of behavior—play and exploratory activities, creativity, and culture in general—simply do not fit into the stimulus-response scheme, which assumes that organisms, humans included, respond only to external stimuli. In other terms, organisms do nothing if not stimulated or driven by needs. The consequence of such theorizing was that child behavior is conceived essentially as coping with an adverse environment, and the task of educators was to make this process as painless as possible by reducing stresses imposed by scholastic requirements.

Another layer of learning separating stimulus from response is that of culture, which from birth implants certain norms. When one culture uses its norms and stimuli on children from other cultures, it evokes inappropriate responses. One such stimulus-response situation occurs in the most sacred of school rituals, the administration of intelligence tests.

Burger (1968, p. 22) further stated that educators must "teach," although possibly in a society differing from one's own. Teaching may even occur in a society not considered for adoption. For example, many Japanese have been educated to delight in the taste of raw fish. Or a Moslem might be repulsed at the thought of eating pork. Some Americans eat even the secretions of an insect's esophagus (honey). Yet all of these people survive and
thrive on their foods. Burger stated that diversity comes from cultural, not genetic, inheritance. Since formal schooling is only a fraction of life, it must adopt the rewards and patterns of the society and cannot simply expect society to adopt its rewards.

Any discussion of social issues must consider how ethnic patterns are altered when two or more societies come into contact. Such a situation occurs when a school board and a teacher of one culture imposed their values on the children of an ethnic minority. For example, just 1 month after a "successful" 6-week project, student behaviors undesirable to teachers had returned (Burger, 1968, p. 19). As soon as the project ended, normal conditions of the culture returned to the pre-experimental level, swamped by the cultural pattern. Based on these results, Burger concluded that there could be no individual learning without cultural change and that without post-testing at least 6 months after an experiment, claims of acculturation success were scientifically questionable.

Hershey (1988) examined the increased demand for human service organizations to address such issues as the rise in child abuse, substance abuse among teens, and teen pregnancy. Although his focus was on a specific training module, Hershey concluded that a new response to schools from leaders of nonprofit human service agencies and organizations was necessary, indicating that a more
cooperative link with schools could prove successful with social problems.

Furney (1989) also examined the role of schools in the health education of youth. Regarding the question of whether schools should address social issues, he concluded that American schools must maximize their potential for reducing rates of premature death and disability and help to meet the nation's health objectives for the 1990s. He implied that schools had unlimited potential to contribute to the health education of the nation's future citizens.

More specifically, Bradley (1989) has asserted that schools could play a major role in early drug abuse prevention through education in the elementary grades. She highlighted two major external program components: developing social skills and nurturing self-esteem at the elementary level. These components have frequently been the focus of successfully implemented external programs. Substance abuse prevention programming in early grade levels generally contains the above-mentioned components.

Weinstein (1989) was explicit in encouraging schools (health educators specifically) to take on the responsibility of education for health. She focused on AIDS and sex education, and the theme throughout her writing was that educators should be more aggressive in addressing difficult social issues. Weinstein reviewed the bulk of program initiatives stemming from outside public
and private agencies and suggested that educators assume the lead in curriculum development and program implementation. To supply the expertise, time, and financial resources necessary to address social issues would be a costly endeavor for schools. Increased curricula developed by educators could, however, reduce the growing need for some external involvement in school programming.

The purpose of a study by Walker (1980) was to investigate the impact of a children's hypertension education program on parents' preventive attitudes and behaviors. The study focused on parental modification of smoking, dietary salt, and high blood pressure. Parents perceived their children to be an influential factor in their modification of preventive health attitudes and behaviors toward cardiovascular risk factors (smoking, dietary salt, and high blood pressure). Walker's study supported the premise that school curricula could impact the community they served.

At the Fourth Delbert Oberteuffer Symposium 1988, Miller (1988) also asserted that America's schools must address the challenge of health education. He felt it was a life-and-death matter. Similarly, Nelson, Jr. (1988) reported that drug abuse and AIDS were two heated topics of discussion throughout the nation and communities in all
parts of the country looked to schools to take the lead in combatting these problems.

At the same Symposium, Joki (1988) referred to external programming in suggesting that external consultants provided services in Drug Assessment and Employee Assistance Programs. Députat and Pavlovich (1988) indicated that external involvement was necessary for a comprehensive health education model to be successful. Most other contributors at the Symposium implied that schools could, and should, assume total responsibility for health education.

Some external programming within schools was referred to as a cooperative effort between school and community by Berdiansky, Brownlee, and Joy (1988). These writers encouraged the use of community agency programs, presuming that students sometimes need special help outside the school environment. With students accessible in schools, providing outside help in the school setting has become an extensive administrative burden on program scheduling, personnel supervision, and monitoring program implementation integrity.

**Program Administration**

Viewing the administrative impact on external programs prompted this writer to survey two levels of administration: central office (board, superintendent, and/or other central office positions) and building level
(principal and/or assistant). The success or failure of a program has often been traced to the administrator responsible for it.

Research on job satisfaction included some of the same administrative factors (actions and responsibilities) as those impacting the success of external programming in schools. For example, a study by Brown (1981) sought to measure job satisfaction. The most satisfying aspects (in rank order) of the jobs surveyed were: interpersonal relationships, curriculum responsibilities, student-related involvement, challenge and opportunities, and authority and prestige. The least satisfying aspects included: routine administration, organizational policy, time demands, budget restraints, and interpersonal relationships. Brown also found that satisfaction of job responsibilities often impacted job performance in fulfilling these obligations.

Burrello (1986) studied perceptions of successful special education administrators (central office) and found that they valued administrative factors more than did other random respondents, such as teachers and other school personnel. This finding indicated that program implementors (teachers) did not see administrative factors as being important to the success of a program as opposed to the special education administrators themselves.

Gibbens (1986) analyzed administrative impact on program success and listed several administrative (building
level) factors that were barriers to program implementation, among which were program commitment, resistance to central office directions, and financial constraints.

Extensive research in the past focused on administrative characteristics and their impact on general program success. Vacca (1984) explored patterns of leadership as they affected the process of implementing a new program. Her study indicated that an administrator's leadership pattern made a significant difference in the process of program implementation. Similarly, a study by Hoffman (1991) found several key factors in the institutionalization process in educational organizations. Three of the four factors that Hoffman listed were directly related to the administrative factors examined in the present study: (1) leadership that encompasses initiation, guidance, and support of purposeful change, (2) communication that assists in program coordination and encouragement of program participants, and (3) a caring environment that keeps programs focused on student success.

Joki (1982, 1984) linked the characteristics of a good principal with managerial leadership, accountability, and school district policy. He encouraged school boards to have strong written policies for these categories of characteristics that impact successful educational programming. However, Joki did not identify administrative
characteristics (actions and responsibilities) unique to successful external programming.

Educational decision making involves use of the professional skills of many educators. By analyzing participatory decision-making methods in building-level decision processes, Peigh (1982) discovered that the same school personnel were involved by both high and low participatory principals in most decision areas. Four areas were exceptions to this trend between the two groups of principals: (1) determining teacher assignments, (2) implementing curriculum and scheduling revisions, (3) evaluating school programs, and (4) setting long-range goals for the school system. The findings of this study implied that high participatory principals involved a broad base of school personnel in most building-level decisions.

The degree of teachers' willingness to comply with principals' administrative decisions was the focus of a study by Klein (1980). Perceived leadership behaviors of principals were related to teachers' degree of compliance. Klein concluded that with the greatest probability of compliance with decisions, the principal was perceived by teachers as engaging in task achievement behaviors and group maintenance behaviors.

According to Wollenberg (1986), an effective evaluation process was a vital part of the administration of any program. If evaluation was to be used
appropriately, three cycles of program growth must be addressed: conceptual, developmental, and institutional. Often an evaluation process for implementation did not consider all three cycles of programming. External programs were often conceptualized and developed externally. However, institutionalization must frequently be advocated, supported, and evaluated by school administrators.

Leadership

Recognizing that strong educational leadership was pivotal to successful school improvement programs, three school districts joined together during the 1988-89 school year to establish the AWE Leadership Academy. Each of the first 2 years of the academy included an intensive summer training session followed by monthly sessions focusing on various aspects of administration and school improvement. Lyman (1989) described the academy's development in such a way that it might be replicated. Subsequently, several states have similar training programs.

Despite interest in building principals as important keys to effective schools, little is known about what principals do, the nature of their work, which factors they could affect and which were beyond their control, or even how they fit into the school organization or change process. Similar to other studies, Phillips (1984) found the principal's role to be more reactive and administrative
in nature than the images of the proactive educational leader portrayed in the literature. Rational decision making, human relations skills, and involvement sometimes proved to be difficult to implement in a disorderly and ambiguous world characterized by competing organizational goals and role conflict.

Barriers to leadership performance were researched by Owens (1983). She assessed South Carolina public school principals', teachers', and central office administrators' perceptions of the constraints on principal instructional leadership performance. Following identification of major inhibitors, Owens made the following recommendations: (1) provide inservice to increase principals' skills in time management, task delegation, and teacher evaluation and dismissal procedures; (2) provide sufficient administrative and clerical assistance to principals; (3) determine the relevancy and necessity of required paperwork; (4) make instructional leadership a top priority in job descriptions and evaluative criteria; (5) involve principals more substantially in the decision-making process regarding curricular and instructional matters; (6) examine the relevance of college courses, certification requirements, and inservice opportunities to the development of principals' skills in instructional leadership; and (7) continue to inform the public of the need for adequate financial support of public education and, in particular,
schools' instructional programs. These recommendations also impacted administrative leadership exhibited in managing external programs.

Leadership performance has also been related to job satisfaction. Wills (1982) reported that both male and female groups described job security to be their source of highest satisfaction. Educational leaders in recent years have enjoyed little job security, which might have impacted their performance.

External Consultants

The number of consultants available in communities for external school programming has increased. A guide to consulting in higher education designed for consultants and college personnel interested in engaging consultants was provided by Wergin (1989) and several colleges and universities. In 1980, the Association of American Colleges (AAC) began a consulting service for member organizations. Institutions expected consultants to be objective and sensitive to their individual characters. In turn, consultants have expected institutions to be open about their goals and role expectations in order to perform their duties effectively.

The Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) study found that external facilitators were especially helpful in making school people aware of new practices, helping them choose among a range of
alternatives that matched local needs, working with local administrators to arrange for and conduct training, ensuring that resources and facilities were available, and helping to plan implementation and continuation support for projects (Cox, 1983a, 1983b). Cox also reported that local facilitators spent more time on teacher support and implementation activities when external facilitators were involved than when they worked without outside help. And in sites with both external and internal facilitators present, the impact on change in teacher practice was greatest.

Selection and use of internal and external consultants was of great importance. The consultant with a new program "adopted" could do more harm than good if little effective implementation followed. Effective implementation involved the development of individual and organizational commitment to change. Consultants facilitated the development of that commitment as they interacted with school personnel.

Miles (1987), in studying the planning and implementation of new schools, identified the dilemma of "expertise-seeking vs. self-reliance." He found that school districts did not seek much external knowledge. Even when confronted with the opportunity to take advantage of matching funds from a project to bring in external consultant help, districts refused on the grounds that "district resource staff would provide all the help that
was needed." However, in analyzing the planning and implementation process, Miles found that internal help was not used or was not adequate to the tasks.

The district faced a dilemma, as Miles identified. Some external consultants were not good; others offered packaged "solutions"; and still others were inspiring, but nothing came of their ideas once they left. Not to seek any outside help was to be more self-sufficient than the demands of educational change would allow. The primary task of the school district was to develop its own internal capacity to assist and manage both the content and the process of change, relying selectively on external assistance to train insiders and to provide specific program expertise in combination with internal follow-through.

Most research showed that external consultants were effective only when there was an internal consultant or team that supported their activities. External change agents who were interested in facilitating genuine educational change established some ongoing relationships with internal district administrators, consultants, and teachers who acted collectively to follow through on the change. External agents, like internal change facilitators, needed both technical and change process expertise.
Program Implementation

Several narratives were available in the behavioral and managerial literature describing, evaluating, and theorizing about innovative organizational change (Alderfer, 1977; Franklin, 1973; T.R. Mitchell, 1979). Public policy makers who made judgments about funding innovations showed concern about the durability of organizational changes in the human service arena. This concern grew more important during an era with shrinking fiscal capacities and growing social conservatism. It was unfortunate that too often valuable innovations in human services were not sustained, financially and/or enthusiastically, beyond initial program implementation (Franklin, 1976; Glaser & Backer, 1980; Kahn, 1974). Some investigation of the durability of organizational innovations was conducted. Franklin (1976) investigated characteristics that would differentiate successful from unsuccessful organizational change and identified three general factors in this process: internal change agents, amount of involvement by executive level managers, and characteristics of the environment.

Fuqua and Gibson (1980) followed the construct of Dunn and Swierczek (1977) as they described organizational innovations as standardized and unstandardized strategies for altering the structure, behavior, technology, and climate of organizations. Their study, however, did not
address the impact of administrative decisions and/or administrative indicators of the success of organizational activities such as inservice training, reorganization, and other management processes.

Failure to monitor program implementation is a serious handicap in educational research. In response to this problem, Zoref (1981) sought to establish a reliable instrument for documenting and understanding the implementation of structured educational programs. The art of doing this has expanded greatly (i.e., "Innovation configuration" work of Hall & Hord, 1987).

Several studies examined factors inhibiting and/or facilitating implementation of an innovation in an educational setting. In one such study by Langone (1984) with the State of Georgia's parenting education program, eight factors were found to influence program implementation: school structure, support, decision-making power, advisory committees, role of inservice workshops, resources, teacher commitment, and demands on teachers. These factors were all affected by administrative decisions and involvement.

An examination of extent of compliance with the New Jersey State Board of Education's drug and alcohol Administrative Code (N.J.A.C. 6:29-9) was comparable to investigating program implementation issues. Grandey (1988) found that to ensure effective program
implementation, an ongoing official monitoring process was needed. Although not usually used in school settings, external programs often had some means of measuring implementation effectiveness. Effective external programs continually monitored the integrity of program implementation. This study suggested that administrative involvement in program monitoring was vital, whether external or internal.

Guberman (1986) sought to determine the factors contributing to the development of teacher commitment, which was established in her study as a crucial variable to successful implementation of programs addressing social issues. The following factors correlated significantly with teacher commitment: (1) school grade level; (2) experience in teaching health; (3) comfort with social issues within the curriculum; (4) commitment to program goals; (5) adequate pre-implementation training/teaching strategies; (6) networking/peer support; (7) support of non-implementing teachers; (8) a program that works; and (9) ongoing training. The majority of the above-mentioned teacher commitment factors were affected either positively or negatively by administrative decisions, actions, and responsibilities.

Teacher empowerment related to motivation, feeling of ownership, job satisfaction, productivity, and job commitment. Washington (1991) studied principals' and
teachers' perceptions of power and its effects. Principals were found to express feelings of being empowered by virtue of their position. They were willing, however, to share their power and felt that teachers should share in their decision-making process. However, it was recognized that some decisions had to be made solely by principals.

Staff involvement was a key ingredient in commitment to, and the success of, change processes. The primary purpose of a study by Smith (1991) was to measure staff satisfaction in the Detroit Effective Schools Project (DESP). She found that this school improvement program provided a good framework in which staff members could work together, and therefore, produced satisfaction with improvement implementation. Thomas (1991) also studied school improvement processes. Her research also revealed that a shared vision and collective action model of school improvement was an effective process to emulate.

Principals faced an organizational dilemma involving rapport with teachers, plus new policies, programs, and procedures. Along with the conflicting demands and problems described by principals, taking on a change agent's role seemed most problematic. Principals were being asked to change their role and become active in curricular leadership in schools. Despite these constraints, the principals' change agent role had become a focus of attention.
Berman and McLaughlin (1977) found that projects that had active support from principals were most likely to succeed. A principal's actions seemed to carry the message as to whether a change was to be taken seriously and served to support teachers.

The Principal-Teacher Interaction (PTI) Study provided detailed observation data on the number and nature of interaction principals undertaken in relation to innovations (Hall & Hord, 1987). The PTI study identified three different styles of leadership among principals. Responder, manager, and initiator styles were described in detail. A principal's style as change facilitator was correlated with overall implementation success. Schools with initiator-style principals were the most successful; manager-led schools were next, and responder-led schools least successful. The interventions noted in the study were classified according to major functions including (1) developing supportive organizational arrangements, (2) training and ongoing information support, (3) consultations and reinforcement, (4) monitoring and evaluation, and (5) other.

Social Issues Within Curricula

Howell (1987) concluded that although teachers were aware that they were expected to be involved in critical thinking, dialogue, and action regarding social issues, more importantly they needed to be aware of the value of...
including social issues in the curriculum. Teacher perceptions of expectations, anticipated practices, and actual practices all differed. The constraints by teachers suppressing the consideration of social issues in the curriculum were the lack of a stated goal priority by the administration, absence of adequate training, socialization, and perceived bureaucratic constraints. These constraints also appeared to affect program implementation and effectiveness. Again, the importance of this writer's examination of administrative factors impacting implementation of external programs addressing social issues was reinforced by findings of previous research.

**Staffing External Programs**

Elementary school principals were faced with a myriad of tasks in the performance of their duties as instructional leader and administrative head. One of the primary responsibilities of the principal was the improvement of basic academic skills. In order to achieve this goal, the principal coordinated resources from a variety of sources. Beckwith (1983) reported on the St. Louis Public Schools' (Missouri) Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs. He concluded that principals apportioned a certain amount of time and energy in the supervision and coordination of these programs. Many principals reported that supervision of Title I, ESEA
programs took a disproportionate amount of their time in the supervision and administration of the total school program. Although there was a significant impact on the principals' time, the majority agreed that the program was beneficial and should not be eliminated. Beckwith's findings indicated that external programming requires "extra" effort from the administrator.

*Use of paraprofessionals.* Conflict between educators and "outsiders" was inherent in the implementation of external programs in schools. During the past 20 years, an emerging group of people helpers created strained working relationships with professionals. Some external school programs employed paraprofessionals. Freudenberger (1976) reported that paraprofessional human service workers were used because of a lack of available professionals. Most professionals, teachers, and administrators initially exhibited minimal concern and/or interest in programming for many in need of services, such as addicts, run-aways, and others. Freudenberger continued by clarifying the evolution of resulting problems. He concluded by advising paraprofessionals and professionals to recognize, admit, and deal with the conflicts and confusion in their relationships, because such problems could inhibit external program success.
Use of professionals/educators. Weinstein (1988/89) questioned the lack of involvement by health educators during the increase in curricula, techniques, and training programs about AIDS for health professionals. She indicated that as with sex education, there was a high degree of professionalism in the development of excellent curricula and training by some external agencies and organizations. But overall, school districts have been weak in adopting and/or implementing AIDS curricula. With a better understanding of successful external programming, administrators could encourage more collaborative efforts between educators and outsiders in this area in the future.

School and community cooperative programming was explored by Berdiansky et al. (1988) and Forman and Linney (1987). Both studies highlighted teacher training as benefitting the success of the specific programs studied. Such training served as both support and resource for successful program implementation. Training decisions were administrative responsibilities and might be different for internal versus external programs, depending on available resources.

Program Initiation

Program initiation was the process leading up to and including the decision to proceed with implementation. Initiation might be the result of a decision by a single authority or a broad-based mandate. It might be assumed
that specific educational change was introduced because it was desirable and met a given need better than existing practices. This did not always happen, however. Although countless variables influence whether a change program gets started, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1990) described several variables associated with planned or action-oriented change. They focused on eight sources affecting initiation, without claiming that this list was exhaustive. They also indicated that the order was not important, although different combinations might be. Fullan & Stiegelbauer's factors associated with initiation were:

1. Existence and quality of innovations.
2. Access to innovations.
3. Advocacy from central administration.
4. Teacher advocacy.
5. External change agents.
6. Community pressure/Support/Apathy.
7. New policy--Funds (Federal/State/Local).
8. Problem solving and bureaucratic orientations.

Change agents, facilitators, or consultants external to the school district played an important part in initiating change projects. Many of these roles involved the responsibility of stimulating and supporting change. The importance of these roles, especially at the initiation stage, has been documented over a number of years. For example, research on the United States Office of Education
Pilot State Dissemination Program demonstrated the impact of outside facilitators (field agents) on teacher adoption of new ideas (Louis & Sieber, 1979).

Most federal projects in the United States were voluntary, but some resulted from new legislation or policy that mandated adoption at the local district level. New policies, especially those accompanied by funding, stimulated and sometimes required initiation of change at the local level. One major example of incentive grants through state legislation was California's School Improvement Program. Schools were given substantial funds contingent upon their submission of a plan for improvement that conformed to the guidelines set by the state department of education.

Cox (1983a) also reported on the Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) study of 80 external assisters who worked with 97 local schools. He stated that the external facilitators made people aware of the existence of new practices, helped school people choose among a range of new practices, sometimes helped arrange funding, worked with local facilitators to develop plans for implementation, arranged and conducted initial training, and sometimes played a continuing support and evaluation role. External facilitators have been most influential at the early stages of change or initiation and when working in combination with local leaders.
Implementation/Institutionalization

The processes beyond program adoption were complex, because they more intricately involved people. Many attempts at policy and program change concentrated on product development, legislation, and other on-paper changes. However, they ignored the fact that what people did and did not do was a crucial variable. People were much more unpredictable and more difficult to deal with than things, but they were also essential for success. Educational change was a learning experience for the adults involved (teachers, administrators, parents, etc.) as well as the children. The study of people-related problems in the change process forged greater knowledge about what makes for successful implementation.

The idea of implementation and the factors affecting actual use seemed simple, but the concept has proven to be exceedingly complex. More and more, the evidence pointed to a small number of key variables. Intrinsic dilemmas in the change process, coupled with the intractability of some factors and the uniqueness of individual settings, made successful change a highly complex social process. Effective strategies for improvement required an understanding of the process, a way of thinking that could not be collected in any list of steps or phases to be followed. The complexity of the change process led researchers to search for different ways to best
characterize implementation (Louis & Miles, 1990). One method involved the identification of key factors associated with implementation success, such as the nature of the innovation and the role of the principal. Another way was to depict the main themes, such as vision and empowerment.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1990) described nine critical (key) factors organized in three main categories relating to the characteristics of an innovation: change project, local roles, and external factors. Factors related to characteristics of change included (1) need, (2) clarity, (3) complexity, and (4) quality/practicality. The local key factors analyzed the social conditions of change. Those described by the authors included the roles of the (5) district, (6) community, (7) principal, and (8) teacher. The final category of key factors placed the school or school district in the context of the broader society. The external factor category specifically referred to (9) government and other agencies.

The multiplicity of post-adoption decisions after educational legislation or new policies involved several layers of agencies. Fullan & Steigelbauer's description of key themes in program implementation included a discussion of the complexity of this facet of the process. The first of the six themes, vision-building, fed into and was fed by all other themes. This theme permeated the organization
with values, purpose, and integrity of improvement. Blending top-down initiative and bottom-up participation was characteristic of successful multilevel reforms that used evolutionary planning, the second key theme. Successful initiative-taking and empowerment, the third key theme, was presented by leaders who practiced power sharing and had collaborative work cultures. Constant communication and joint work provided the continuous pressure and support necessary for getting things done. Implementation was very much a social process. The fourth key theme, staff development and resource assistance, was described by Fullan & Stiegelbauer as the essence of educational change through learning new ways of thinking and doing, new skills, knowledge, and attitudes. There had to be continuity of purpose with staff development for successful change to occur, or a project could become fragmented and offer unconnected solutions to a problem. Monitoring/problem-Coping, the fifth key theme, referred to analyzing the process of change, not merely measuring outcomes. The sixth key theme, restructuring, referred to school as a workplace including organizational arrangements, roles, finance and governance, and formal policies. All six of the key themes in concert with one another were required for substantial change to occur during the implementation process.
From the early 1970s through the mid-1980s schools and communities were in chaos, attempting to respond to what was inaccurately perceived as a single issue—a drug epidemic. While there has been improvement in delivering services, and state agencies have developed guidelines, some problems still remain in developing school programming. It is now evident that controlling the tide of chemical use required a range of services including prevention and treatment referral. This example of a need for external programming within a school was documented by Mascari (1990). The process for developing comprehensive, integrated primary prevention in K-12 programming was described in detail using an implementation model at the Clifton Public Schools in Clifton, New Jersey.

Langone (1984, 1987) identified and studied eight factors found to influence implementation of a parenting education program in the State of Georgia. The interaction of these factors (school structure, support, decision-making power, advisory committees, training, resources, teacher commitment, and demands on teachers) dictated whether the school setting and/or the innovative programs would be modified for implementation. Although Langone focused on the level of program implementation, administrative decisions and administrative involvement with the identified factors ultimately affected the programs implemented.
In a related study, Cronin (1983) investigated factors affecting the implementation process. His results suggested that three factors contributed to the level of program implementation attained by teachers, among which were the presence of ongoing inservice training and the provision of resource support. Both of these factors were included in this writer's study.

Several elements that needed to be addressed in planning and implementing (substance abuse) prevention programs were explored by Forman and Linney (1988). The elements included approval and commitment from the schools, staffing and staff training, and the use of prescribed materials. Forman and Linney also reported that availability of funds must be considered in choosing programs. Staffing, training, and allocation of financial resources were crucial administrative decisions and seriously impacted the success of program implementation.

An extensive analysis of program implementation was completed by Vaughn, Dytman, and Wang (1985). The study reported that there were varying patterns of program implementation over time, and that it was not an all-or-none phenomenon. Fluctuation in the level of implementation was attributed to factors such as type or amount of training, type of support, and motivational factors. Those were factors resulting largely from administrative decisions and evolved into indicators of...
successful implementation. Likewise, Hoffman (1991) studied factors influencing institutionalization of projects. Her qualitative study used a conceptual model of organizational change and reviewed program adoption, implementation, and transformation. Four key elements revealed in the institutionalization process were: (1) leadership, (2) communication, (3) multidimensional involvement, and (4) a caring environment. The elements identified by Hoffman were impacted by administrative creativity, which ultimately affected program implementation.

The effects of selected variables on the level of implementation of curriculum innovation was investigated by Smorodin (1984). She found that there was a strong, statistically significant relationship between personal contact with a program coordinator and implementation. As teachers' contact increased, so did the level of implementation. Moreover, increases in personal contact and level of implementation were accompanied by increases in teachers' opinions about the general content area and in teachers' use of community resources.

Lund (1991) investigated the existence of selected factors associated with the implementation of instructional change. In her study, teachers were revealed as the most significant entity in the process of implementing such change. They were the most common decision-making body for
instructional changes and the most frequent change agents assisting other teachers in implementing instructional changes.

No information was found in the literature specifically related to administrative decisions affecting successful external program implementation. However, there was a wealth of research concerning administrative leadership and general school effectiveness. Brown (1991) revealed that in studying leadership behavior and school effectiveness, principals had more favorable perceptions of success than did other groups (teachers, parents, and superintendents).

Similarly, Emory (1981) documented a review of nine reports concerning institutionalization of educational change or innovations. The review concerned the quality of institutionalization following incorporation or routinization of a project, a project's base of support and flexibility, location of administration, administrator involvement, contacts with influential persons and the public, leadership quality and type, relationship to current practices and values, political environment and funding changes, and training of practitioners in the new function.

The literature covered program implementation and school effectiveness in general. Any differences between
internal and external program implementation, however, were not addressed.

**Institutional Change**

While in the process of providing necessary and desired goods and in an effort to train and update employees, industry became a significant source for educational programs. The effects of corporate education on traditional educational institutions have the power and potential to completely change the American educational structure. Industry may have the means by which to become the major provider of secondary, higher, and continuing education.

Our society has evolved through three stages: (1) the pre-industrial, (2) the industrial, and (3) the post-industrial. In the pre-industrial society the labor force was engaged in principally extractive industries (i.e., fishing, agriculture, mining), and life was a game against nature. In the industrial societies, manufacturing dominated and life was a game against fabricated nature. In the post-industrial society, life is now based on services, and life has become a game with our fellow man. Raw strength and energy no longer hold the center stage. According to Daniel Bell (1976), what counted in these times was information. The largest service group in the United States economy was composed of professional, technical, and managerial employees (Bell, 1976). It was
evident that upward mobility, income, and opportunity were best made accessible through education or training.

It has become evident that the skills needed for survival in our post-industrial society might be better taught within the business world than within the confines of academia. It has also become evident that industry felt it could do a better job in education as the students could directly apply their skills to daily jobs. Russell Doll (1980) has stated that at one time public universities provided community service, served as agents for social mobility, developed inter-ethnic understanding, and guaranteed credentials. The university now fulfills neither its academic nor its social-corrective role adequately. Universities have dissipated their resources in mandated social-correction programs. Doll implied that universities could not train for the real world (of work) as well as business and industry could.

Rapidly changing technologies have required workers to have periodic retraining and education. It was estimated that our scientific and technical information has doubled every 8 years. Industry and education must continually introduce new manufacturing methods and/or standardize prevailing ones (Lusterman, 1977). Lusterman also noted that some educational needs were met by outside resources such as universities and consultants.
Luxenberg (1980) reported on several corporations, such as AT&T and Citicorp. The educational settings and types of programs varied from spare space in decentralized facilities to impressive training centers and from printed informational materials to specifically designed courses.

Doll (1980), a doom and gloom forecaster of higher education, stated that corporate education was a response to fill the vacuum caused by crisis in the public schools and universities. He predicted that public schools would soon educate only the poor and all other parents would send their children to private or parochial schools. As the decline of public education continues along with the probable inability of employees to pay for private education, industry might rise to the occasion. The corporate entry into education could very well be made by industry, first providing educational financial benefits to executive and managerial personnel as incentives to move to their place and to defray the cost of parochial and private education at both the higher and elementary levels. Eventually there might be private schools run by a consortium of corporations. There was already documented an increasing number of corporations providing early childhood day care.

School Improvement

Many strategies of school improvement have focused on structural changes of various kinds (Miles, 1965).
Legislation to require special schooling for retarded children, the elimination of one-room schools, age-grading, the creation of new roles such as teacher aide, and teaching teams all involved structure as a base for change. Another approach to school improvement, called curricular, focused primarily on the procedures, materials, and equipment of the immediate classroom learning setting (Miles, 1965). Examples included the creation of new comprehensive curricula, new textbooks, programmed instruction manuals and machines, and training packages.

Miles (1964) included another category of strategies for school improvement, called role-shaping. This category assumed that persons occupying roles such as teacher, administrator, board member, student, or parent needed to be educated or changed in some way to bring about more effective performance in an existing role, or adequate performance in a new role. Examples were in-service education workshops and sensitivity training groups involving teachers, administrators, parents, and students. Other examples included exercises in decision-making for administrators, parent education workshops, and student training in conflict management.

Miles (1965) further discussed school improvement and interjected that some strategies took a holistic approach and involved a new or innovative educational system which avoided the constraints of the existing one. Such an
approach involved structural, curricular, and role-shaping strategies, all integrated into a grand design for a new learning environment. Pilot programs of all kinds, sub-schools within larger schools, and schools outside of a formal educational system, were examples of the holistic strategy for school improvement.

The three strategies mentioned above (structural, curricular, and role-shaping) closely parallel three approaches to organizational change described by Leavitt (1965): structural, technical, and people-changing. Other conceptualizations have been developed that parallel and overlap these.

Chin and Benne (1969), in a thorough review of strategies for improvement, argued that planned change could be characterized as essentially rational (e.g., research, consultation, and personnel replacement), normative re-education (e.g., nonviolence, or legislation).

Miles (1964) offered a strategic classification based on the stage of pre-adoption behavior involved (design of the innovation, awareness of and interest in the innovation, evaluation, and trial), whether the initiative was inside or outside the local district, and whether existing structures or new structures were used to carry out the strategy. Also, Havelock, Guskin, Frohman, Havelock, and Huber (1969) suggested that strategies might focus on rational processes of decision making based on
information (the research, development and diffusion approach), social interaction among potential adopters in status systems (e.g., superintendents who were more respected became interested and tried out innovations faster), or the problem-solving processes that went on as an adopter struggled with difficulties in carrying out an educational program. Havelock et al. further proposed a model in which expert resources were brought in conjunction with the needs and demands of local school districts by linking roles or groups.

**Successful Programming**

Organizational change could be precipitated by public pressure, intraorganizational interest, or both. Designing, planning, and implementing change are elements of organizations. However, there has been little concern with these elements as they relate to the functional effectiveness of programs and structure. Blair (1983) sought to make evaluative action easier for early analysis of planned change at the implementation stage. Implementation was the procedure through which change was brought to fruition. Blair's Model for Early Analysis of Planned Change was the product of an effort to study and facilitate successful program implementation. Program failure could be predicted or prevented so that outcomes could be improved and organizational effectiveness increased.
The research reported by Mwasa (1982) examined three innovations that were implemented in different cultural settings: the Individualized System in Ontario, the Namutamba Project in Uganda, and the School Improvement Program in California. Both similarities and differences were observed. In each case (1) project objectives were unclear to users; (2) neither administrators nor project users changed their attitudes, value orientations, or behaviors; (3) administrators found it difficult to change organizational structures and standardized operating procedures; (4) involvement of users in decision-making, user knowledge and understanding of project philosophy and methodology, and evaluation/feedback networks were reported as inadequate; and (5) conflict was pervasive. (Each of the similarities and differences were related to the indicators of successful implementation investigated in the present investigation.) Mwasa concluded that the model did not fully explain and/or predict the implementation of change in different cultural settings. It appeared that cultural differences relating to the societies of Ontario, Uganda and California created unique circumstances that could not readily be incorporated into a general model of change.

Mitchell (1990) designed a study to document the key factors in the success of 12 urban high schools that prepare students for specific occupational fields as well
as college entrance. From the case studies used, the research yielded 10 factors that may be associated with the success of schools: (1) a safe and orderly environment conducive to teaching; (2) a businesslike attitude among teachers and students; (3) a warm and caring school climate; (4) an admissions process that makes students feel special; (5) a dual mission to prepare students for an occupation and college; (6) high expectations for all students to succeed accompanied by attempts to minimize grouping students by ability; (7) a curriculum organized around an industry or a discrete set of subjects; (8) the integration of theory and practice in the courses of instruction; (9) strong linkages with business and industry and with local institutions of higher education; (10) leadership in the office of the principal that is inspiring, sensitive, and firm. Each of Mitchell's 10 factors of school success might be viewed as a result of the administrative actions and responsibilities (factors) pertinent to this writer's study.

The data collected by Hicks (1980) revealed that educational change resulted as either leaders adjusted their value patterns, or citizens adjusted their value patterns to those held by the leadership structure. This condition tended to enhance the image of the leadership group and at the same time presented a condition whereby
the citizenry reflected a willingness to adjust their values to new directions set forth by the leaders.

Summary

Throughout the literature, different views on external programming were expressed by educators and external program providers. Some educators were encouraging schools to be more aggressive in the prevention effort with difficult social issues, especially in the health areas. Schools seemed not to have moved quickly enough, nor seemed to have the expertise to address some social issues appropriately. On the other hand, program providers were quick to point out that schools needed external assistance to successfully address such issues. In this writer's opinion, both views were accurate. Schools must aggressively address difficult social issues through prevention programming and external expertise and services are necessary to successfully implement preventive efforts.

Various studies have investigated teacher attitude and commitment, leadership as it relates to school improvement, and level of program implementation. However, specific conclusions could not be assumed from the research about administrative factors and successful implementation of externally managed programs addressing social issues. Correlations of administrative factors on decisions to use external programs were not evident in the literature. Questions leading to the identification of factors
contributing to competent administrative decisions and answers about the indicators of effective external school program implementation were provided directly in the literature. However, there is a need for studies such as the present one, which identifies administrative factors for adoption decisions and indicators for successful external program implementation addressing social issues.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of the present study was to investigate (1) administrative factors that influence decisions to adopt external programs designed to address social issues and (2) administrative indicators that impact successful implementation of such programs. The research was conducted across several counties in Indiana. Data collection involved distribution of a survey instrument developed specifically for this study. Administrative factors impacting decisions to use external programs and administrative indicators of successful implementation were listed on the survey, with space provided for participants to write in additional factors and indicators not listed. The target population, survey instrument, survey distribution procedures, research questions, and data analyses are described next.

Target Population

The barriers and successes of the administration of external programming was the initial focus of this study. Therefore, administrators were the focus for a target
population, although other school personnel were included. "Target population" was used to refer to those individuals to whom the questionnaire was mailed. Seventy-nine surveys were mailed within administrators' packets to be passed on to other administrators, teachers, counselors, social workers, or nurses.

Utilizing the 1989 Indiana School Directory published by the Indiana Department of Education, questionnaires were distributed to all high schools, all middle/junior high schools, and randomly selected elementary schools in Marion County and its seven contiguous counties (Boone, Decatur, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, and Shelby). Two other fairly large school districts in Indiana (Elkhart Community Schools and South Bend Community Schools) were also included in the target population. A total of 285 questionnaires were distributed. Responses were solicited from two hundred seventy-four school administrators and professional personnel. Forty-five non-public (parochial and private) school administrators and professional personnel in Marion County were included in the survey process. Eleven external program providers also received the study's questionnaire. The providers all offered programs for school-aged children from state and local private organizations. Nine of them operated programs within school settings, and they were all professional
acquaintances of this writer. Table 1 presents a summary of the survey distribution of the target population.

Table 1

Demographic Summary for Target Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY GROUPS BY EMPLOYMENT SETTING</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributed to non-public schools</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed to public schools</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed to external program providers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUPS RECEIVING SURVEYS

Building administrators                         170  60%
- Distributed by bldg. admins.                   60   21%

Central office administrators                   30   10%
- Distributed by central admins.                 14   5%

External program providers                      6    2%
- Distributed by ext. pro. providers             5    2%

**TOTAL**                                        **285**  **100%**

Survey Instrument

Over a period of 1 year, the research questions explored in this study were informally investigated by this writer through frequent contact with administrators and other school personnel. The questionnaire items were developed by this writer with assistance.

An instrument to gather appropriate data was designed specifically for this project. Using a Likert format, items on the instrument were arranged in a manner that allowed for ease of answer selection. Extra lines were
included to allow respondents to enter additional responses or answers not listed on the survey (Appendix A).

The instrument and survey process were piloted with five individuals: two external program providers, two building administrators and one central office administrator. They were handed the packet (overview, questionnaire, and return envelop) and asked to complete and return the survey. Critiques were also solicited and received. Following this initial run, improvements to the instrument were made to insure participant understanding and ease of completion by the target population.

Survey Distribution Process

Questionnaires were mailed with a cover letter to each of the selected administrators and service providers (see Appendix B). Two surveys were sent to 79 of 206 destinations. Each of those recipients were requested to complete one survey and distribute the second packet to another staff person. Each packet included a brief Questionnaire Overview (Appendix C) and a separate pre-addressed, stamped envelop for each participant. Approximately 1 month later, reminder postcards were sent to individuals who had not responded. The reminders yielded few additional responses. Recipients of the questionnaire were representative of the population to be surveyed, including public and non-public school administrators and staff from elementary, middle, and high
schools with varying enrollments, as well as external program providers. An intended heavy emphasis was placed on building level administrators.

Table 2 reports the figures on survey returns. Clearly, personnel associated with public schools were most strongly represented in the return surveys (86%). With respect to distribution by employment position, as is shown in the statistics in Table 2 and compared to Table 1, building administrators were definitely well represented in the group of individuals who returned completed surveys. This outcome was planned and expected because of the administrative focus of this study.

Table 2

Summary of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYMENT SETTING FOR RESPONDENT GROUPS</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-public schools</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External program providers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATOR POSITION FOR RESPONDENT GROUPS</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/board members</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office administrators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building principals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/counselors/etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External program providers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Questions

The intent of this study was to identify administrative factors surrounding decisions to use external programs and administrative indicators of successful implementation of such programs. Research questions examined were as follows:

1. Has there been an increase in externally managed programs addressing social issues in schools between 1970 and 1990?
2. What external and internal administrative factors impact decisions to use external programs?
3. What external and internal administrative indicators are related to successful implementation of external programs?

Data Analysis

To investigate perceptions of change in the prevalence of external programs, the number of such programs used by participating schools over a 20-year period was examined. Data were obtained through estimates recalled by respondents. Due to lack of accurate information regarding numbers of external programs over the period examined, statistical procedures were not performed with these data. However, a narrative description was used to report these findings. Surveys were also examined to determine which social issues were considered most in need of external expertise when addressed in schools. The survey process
asked for respondents' opinions on these topics. Few additional social issues were entered by participants in the space provided on the survey, and therefore were not reported.

As discussed above, the purpose of this study dictated that the survey process yield administrative factors impacting decisions to use external programs. Also, administrative responsibilities (indicators) linked with successful external program implementation were generated and placed in rank order. Eighteen of the 19 items from the study's questionnaire were ranked and used to note differences among external and internal administrative factors and indicators affecting the success of external programs in schools.

Data were also analyzed by use of paired external and internal groupings of factors and indicators. External factors affecting decisions to adopt an external program and external indicators of successful programs were measured by six items on the questionnaire. Internal factors and indicators were measured by seven items. Five paired external and internal factors and indicators were analyzed using simple t tests: program initiation, funding, training, implementation, and ongoing program support.
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the responses of school building administrators and other school personnel regarding their perceptions of the prevalence of, need for, and success of externally managed school-based programs that address social issues.

As discussed earlier, respondents were solicited largely from school administrative positions. A total of 285 questionnaires were mailed to 206 sites. The materials were mailed to school administrators (principals or superintendents), who were asked to complete one of the surveys and to give a second survey to another staff member.

Survey Returns

A total of 137 surveys were returned for an overall return rate of 48%. Ninety-two respondents (67%) were building level administrators. Seventeen central office administrators responded, as did 10 superintendents/board members, 9 teachers, 6 counselors/social workers/nurses, and 3 external program providers. Questionnaires may not
have been returned from some sites due to the timing of the initial mailings and reminders to administrators (May-July). Summer vacations and numerous changes in administrative positions prevented extensive follow-up. In consideration of these realities, however, the return rate of 48% was respectable.

Table 2 (see p. 59) reports the demographic breakdown on returned surveys. As shown, personnel associated with public schools were most strongly represented in the pool of returned surveys (81%). With respect to distribution by employment position, building principals were definitely well represented in the group of respondents who returned completed surveys. That is to say, although building administrators consisted of 59% of the target population, the dominance of this group increased to 67% in the pool of those who returned completed surveys. Besides the above-mentioned groups, respondents also included external providers, central office, and other school personnel. External providers were not sufficiently represented (3 of the 137 respondents) and therefore were not utilized in the data analysis (unless noted otherwise).

The following report on the significance of external versus internal conditions (of administrative factors and indicators) addresses the study's research questions. Thus, much of the data analysis concentrates on significant differences among external and internal conditions as
measured by specific items on the questionnaire. Five administrative factors and/or indicators measured through the survey were: initiation, funding, implementation, ongoing support, and training. Each were examined both as external and as internal source conditions.

Separate t tests were used to examine the relative impact of external and internal programming variables. Results of the statistical tests were represented by variables as they were defined by individual items on the survey questionnaire. The study's results have been organized into the following two sections: Analysis of Research Questions and Summary of Findings.

Analysis of the Research Questions

In analyzing the study's research questions, significant similarities and differences among respondents' opinions were found across the items surveyed. With a major focus on administrative factors related to decisions to adopt and indicators of successful external programming, the majority of the data are presented by contrasting internal versus external source conditions. Specific topics analyzed were internal and external initiation, funding, implementation, ongoing support, and training for external school programming.

The data are presented under four headings: Prevalence and Need for External Programs That Address Social Issues, Rank Orderings of Decision Factors and
Success Indicators, Administrative Factors Impacting Decisions to Adopt External Programs, and Administrative Indicators of Successful External Programming.

Prevalence and Need for External Programs That Address Social Issues

Perceptions of prevalence trends for external programs within schools. Although participants' recall concerning number of external programs addressing social issues included some "best estimates," there is clearly a trend toward an increasing number of programs operating in schools. As Table 3 illustrates, the 5-year intervals from the school years 1969-70 through 1989-90 showed a steadily increasing number of external programs in school settings, from a total of 78 settings reported in 1969-70, to 90 in 1979-80, and to 125 in 1989-90.

Table 3
Recall of Number of External Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of External Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4 lists in rank order the specific social issues participants considered to be in greatest need of external expertise. Of the items listed, child abuse ($M = 4.85$), substance abuse prevention ($M = 4.84$), and substance abuse ($M = 4.81$) were seen as issues where external help was most needed. The relatively smaller standard deviations for these items suggests that these issues also yielded the most agreement among respondents. Decision making ($M = 3.23$) and values clarification ($M = 3.60$) were regarded as areas where assistance from external sources was needed least. This latter finding could be due to the fact that there already exist several internal and external efforts related to decision-making and values-clarification programming in schools.

Intercorrelations among perceived areas of need for external programs. Table 5 reports the intercorrelations among the areas of perceived need. The issue of career development was most infrequently correlated with other areas of perceived need for external programming. Social issues yielding the greatest number of significant correlations ($p<.01$) were health promotion, teenage pregnancy, and substance abuse. Two similar items, substance abuse and substance abuse prevention, were most highly correlated ($r=.76$), lending increased reliability to the survey results.
Table 4

Rank Order of Social Issues Considered to Be Most in Need of External Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE NEEDING HELP</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse prevention</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting skills</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety promotion</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values clarification</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making skills</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 6-point scale where 1 = external expertise not needed and 6 = external expertise greatly needed.
### Table 5

**Correlation Matrix for Social Issues Needing External Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>DMS</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SAP</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01

**Note.** CD = Career Development, HP = Health Promotion, DMS = Decision-Making Skills, SP = Safety Promotion, SAP = Substance Abuse Prevention, VC = Values Clarification, TP = Teenage Pregnancy, CA = Child Abuse, PS = Parenting Skills, SA = Substance Abuse, S = Sexuality.
This suggests that individual perspectives on issues needing help can be best predicted by knowing something about their perspective on need for help with problems of health promotion, teenage pregnancy, and substance abuse. Individuals who see high need for external assistance in these areas are also more likely to see high need for help in other areas, with the exception of career development. The converse would be the more likely case for individuals who perceive a low need for external assistance in the three key areas.

**Rank Orderings of Adoption Factors and Success Indicators**

Table 6 lists the questionnaire items ranked in order of their perceived impact on administrative decision making and ultimate success. The one factor that most influenced administrative decisions to adopt an external program, namely building level support, also ranked as the number one indicator of success. The means for the number one factor and indicator were notably above the next ranking item. Two other findings are worthy of special notice. Observe, for example, that five of the six highest ranked factors impacting decisions to adopt external programs also ranked in the top six among the administrative indicators of success. On the other hand, the "initiated by teacher/staff member" variable was ranked 4th with respect
### Table 6

**Rank Ordering of Adoption Factors and Success Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adoption Factor and/or Success Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. (bldg. level) support for program</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing (internal) program support</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate staff training provided</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated by teacher/staff member</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program integrates with school program</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing (external) program support</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding: primarily external</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven success through research</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated by superintendent/board</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation by school personnel</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. (central office) support for program</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided externally</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program developed through research</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding: primarily internal</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided internally</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation by external personnel</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated by parent</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated by external source</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** (N=134) Three external provider respondents not included in this analysis.
to its impact on administrative decision-making but was 12th as an indicator of implementation success.

The respective rank orderings suggest that, for the most part, respondents viewed the administrative factors to have comparable influence on both criteria. For 16 of the 18 administrative factors, the rank order positions differed by four or fewer rank positions.

The perceived influence that "administrative (building level) support for a program" has on both the decision to adopt an external program and on its success likelihood is apparent in the data reported in Table 6. The pooled respondents' assigned means to "administrative support for the program" (M = 5.20 for impact on decision to adopt; M = 5.23 for impact on future success) exceeded by .36 or more the next highest ranked factor. This suggests that the individual factors investigated were all judged to impact implementation success and administrative decisions to adopt similarly. Items where there was a pertinent ranking difference were "initiated by teacher staff member" (4th + 12th), and "initiated by superintendent/board" (9th + 15th).

Administrative Factors Impacting Decisions to Adopt External Programs

For purposes of the analysis that follows, data are reported for the entire pool of respondents (N = 137) as well as separately for building administrators (N = 92).
It should be recalled that building administrators represented 67% of all respondents. Parallel results for the analysis by central office and other school personnel (N - 42) are included in Appendix E. (The reader is reminded that external providers [N - 3] are not included in the data analysis unless otherwise noted.)

The means, standard deviations, and t values for the administrative factors that impact decisions to adopt external programs are reported in Table 7 for the combined pool of respondents and Table 8 for the building administrator sub-sample. A separate t value is reported for each of the five administrative factors. In each case the significance of the t value indicates the degree to which the difference between the external and internal means occurred by chance.

Internal vs. External initiation of external programs. As shown in Tables 7 and 8, for both the combined sample and the building administrators sub-sample, decisions to adopt external programs are believed to be influenced more when internal initiation is involved. The differences between the internal means (4.75 for the combined group and 4.78 for the building administrators subgroup) and the external means (3.53 and 3.55 for the combined group and the building administrators subgroup, respectively) were significant at the .001 alpha level.
Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for the Internal Vs. External Contrasts for Each of the Administrative Factors That Impact Decisions to Adopt External Programs: Combined Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Factor</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>-5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Support</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (N = 137) Item E9 (Initiated by external source) was used as the index of external initiation; item E12 (Initiation by teacher/staff member) was used as the index of internal initiation.

* p<.05 *** p<.001
Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values For Internal Vs. External Contrast for Each of the Administrative Factors That Impact Decisions to Adopt External Programs: Building Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Factor</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-7.61</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Support</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (N = 92) Item E9 (Initiated by external source) was used as the index of external initiation; item E12 (Initiation by teacher/staff member) was used as the index of internal initiation.

* p<.05       *** p<.001
Internal vs. External funding of external programs.

As reported in Table 7, the mean responses from the combined respondents for external and internal funding of school-based external programs were 4.63 and 4.33, respectively. The significant $t$ value of 2.02 indicates that the difference between external and internal funding, as it related to adoption of external programs, was significant at the .05 alpha level. In this case it can be concluded that external funding is more likely to result in a decision to adopt. In a separate analysis, building principals also viewed external funding to have significantly more influence on decisions to use external programming. This finding from building principals was also significant at the .05 level of confidence (see Table 8).

Internal vs. External implementation of external programs. Adoption of an external program was impacted more by implementation using internal personnel. The mean responses for external and internal program implementation were 3.79 and 4.55, with standard deviations of 1.21 and 1.11, respectively. Table 7 shows that the $t$ value for the combined group was -5.69 which was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Similar results were found when the analyses were performed using only the building administrator sub-sample of respondents. This suggests that as a group, building
principals also viewed implementation by external school personnel as having a greater influence on the decision to adopt (M = 4.49) as compared to a value of 3.80 when external implementation is planned. This difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence (see Table 8).

**Internal vs. External support of external programs.** Differences in perceived importance of external and/or internal ongoing support for external programs were not found for the combined group of respondents or for the building principals (see Tables 7 and 8). However, both groups rated this factor highest of the five paired items (initiation, funding, implementation, ongoing support, and training). This would seem to indicate that it is a critical administrative factor, whether external (M = 4.71 for the combined respondent group and M = 4.70 for the building administrator sub-group) or internal (M = 4.24 for the combined respondent group and M = 4.86 for the building administrator sub-group), in the process of adopting an external program. Ongoing support consistently yielded the lowest standard deviation among the five factors by both groups, indicating more agreement among respondents as to the relative importance of this factor.

**Internal vs. External training for external programs.** As displayed on Tables 7 and 8, there were no significant differences in the importance assigned to external and
internal provisions for training as a factor in deciding to use an external program.

**Administrative Indicators of Successful External Programs**

The following data are also presented with information from two groups of respondents: combined respondents (N = 137) and building administrators (N = 92). Results for these two groups are presented in Table 9 and Table 10. Results from other school personnel are included in Appendix E but are not referred to in the subsequent text. A distinct indicator of successful external programs was administrative support at the building level (see Table 6). Responses to this item were in accord with the importance of this issue.

**Internal vs. External Initiation of External Programs**

Table 9 reports the means, standard deviations, and t values for indicators of successful implementation of external programs as reported by the combined respondents. The external and internal initiation means reported in Table 9 indicate that the combined respondents were of the opinion that external programs are more likely to be successfully implemented when initiated internally (M = 4.21) as compared to externally (M = 3.60). Results were similar for the building administrators subgroup, with both
Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for Internal vs. External Indicators of Successful Implementation of External Programs: Combined Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Indicators</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>.008**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (N = 137) Item F9 (Initiated by external source) was used as the index of external initiation; item F12 (Initiation by teacher/staff member) was used as the index of internal initiation.

** p<.01     *** p<.001
analyses demonstrating significance at the .01 level of confidence.

**Internal vs. External Funding for External Programs.** As shown in Table 9, external funding ($M = 4.28$) of external programs, as compared to internal funding ($M = 3.46$), was considered by the combined respondents to be a more profound indicator of success. Similar results were produced by the building principals' subgroup.

**Internal vs. External Implementation of External Programs.** Internal implementation ($M = 4.54$) emerged as a more significant indicator of successful external programming as compared to external implementation ($M = 3.94$). The combined group and building principals generated significant results, each group yielding significance at the .01 level of confidence as reported in Tables 9 and 10.

**Internal vs. External Support.** There were no significant differences in perceived importance of external ($M = 4.61$) and internal ($M = 4.71$) ongoing support. Ratings from both the building principals subgroup and the combined group were higher than for any of the other four paired indicators. This finding clearly demonstrates the perceived importance of ongoing support, whether internal and external.
Table 10
Means, Standard Deviations, and \( t \) Values for Internal vs. External Indicators of Successful Implementation of External Programs: Building Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Indicators</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Support</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: (\( N = 92 \)) Item F9 (Initiated by external source) was used as the index of external initiation; item F12 (Initiation by teacher/staff member) was used as the index of internal initiation.

** p<.01     *** p<.001
Internal vs. External Training for External Programs.

As shown in Tables 9 and 10, there were no significant differences between external (M = 4.38) and internal (M = 4.08) sources for training when considering the successful implementation of an external program. Neither the combined group nor building principals sub-group rated the source of training as a profound significant influence on successful implementation.

Summary

Chapter 4 presented an analysis of data collected from 137 respondents giving their views on external programming. Areas of investigation included the number of external programs in schools, the need for social issues to be addressed in schools, administrative factors impacting decisions to adopt external programs, and administrative indicators of successful implementation of external programs. Data were analyzed by generating means and standard deviations for items surveyed and by computing t values to determine the probability that the observed differences could have occurred by chance.

From the perspective of this study's participants, the prevalence of external programs was seen to be on the rise between 1970 and 1990.

External expertise is perceived to be most needed in the areas of substance abuse and substance-abuse prevention and least needed in the areas of decision making and values.
clarification. The perceived need for help in the area of career development is the least predictive of an individual's perspective on need for help in the other areas. Individual perspectives on need for help in the areas of substance abuse, teenage pregnancy, and substance-abuse prevention, on the other hand, are relatively good barometers of perceived needs in other areas.

Building level support stood out as the single factor that most influenced administrative decisions to adopt an external program. It was also ranked as the best single predictor of future success.

In general there was a striking overlap among the indicators that were seen to most influence decisions to adopt and to most influence the prospect that a particular external program will be successful. Perhaps the most interesting finding was that the "initiated by teacher/staff member" was seen as the fourth most critical factor in deciding whether or not to adopt a particular external program, yet the item ranked 12th as an indicator of successful implementation.

This is also the area where there is the most agreement among respondents. Decisions to adopt external programs are believed to be influenced more when the program is being initiated by internal forces, as compared to external forces. This difference was highly significant (p<.001).
The prospect of external funding rather than internal funding, is more likely to result in a decision to adopt. This result was significant at the .05 level. Decisions to adopt are believed to be most influenced when it is expected that implementation will be achieved through the use of internal personnel.

Projections for training responsibility, whether by internal or external personnel, did not weigh heavily on decisions to adopt.

Paired sources of administrative factors (external and internal) impacting decisions to adopt external programs were analyzed. Internal program implementation proved notably more influential, while external funding had a significantly greater impact on external program adoption.

Administrative indicators for successful external program implementation mirrored the findings for program adoption. The combined respondents' data reported in Table 9 indicate that the source (i.e., external vs. internal) of initiation, funding, and implementation were considered to have an impact on successful implementation. More specifically, internal initiation (M = 4.21) was seen as contributing more to successful implementation than external initiation (M = 3.60). This difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Along similar lines, internal implementation (M = 4.54) was seen to have a greater influence on ultimate success than external
implementation (M = 3.94). These two findings contrast with source of funding as an influence on success in external programming. Here the combined pooled respondents considered external funding to have a greater influence on success (M = 4.28) as compared to internal funding (M = 3.46). This difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence. Similar results were obtained in the analysis of the building principals' data set, although the results were not as significant (external funding mean = 4.22; internal funding mean = 3.41; p<.01). External funding emerged with the most significant t value, with internal implementation also showing significant results.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify (1) administrative factors impacting decisions to adopt external programs that address social issues and (2) administrative factors associated with successful implementation of such programs. Research questions examined included the following:

1. Has there been an increase in externally managed programs addressing social issues in schools between 1970 and 1990?

2. What external and internal administrative factors impact decisions to adopt external programs?

3. What external and internal administrative indicators relate to successful implementation of external programs?

Although previous researchers have investigated teacher attitudes (Howell, 1987; Klein, 1980), program delivery personnel (Brown, 1981; Wills, 1982), implementation success (Cronin, 1983), and degree of implementation (Gruberman, 1986), no conclusions can be
gleaned from their studies regarding successful administrative factors and/or indicators related to external programs addressing social issues within school settings. This lack of research attention to administrative influence on the success of external school programs may be due to the limited use of external programs addressing social issues until recent years. This study charts a current trend toward increasing numbers of such programs and, therefore, a need for more precise historical data.

Furthermore, administrative issues surrounding the implementation of external programs have become more complex and difficult to define as their number has increased. As mentioned in the literature review (Kahn, 1974; Mitchell, 1990), some of the complexity may be due to organizational changes brought about by adding new programs. This study focused on identifying administrative factors affecting decisions to adopt external programs and administrative indicators of successful implementation. Similarly, questions that help to identify effective administration and implementation of socially oriented external programs have not been approached directly in previous research. For instance, although Joki (1982, 1984) focused on effective administrative characteristics, no specific connection was made with social issues and/or external programs. Likewise, Forman and Linney (1987,
1988) studied school-based programs addressing social issues, but did not cover the effect of the administrator's role on implementation.

As mentioned in the literature review (Deputat & Pavlovich, 1988), some educators have encouraged schools to be more aggressive in preventive efforts directed at difficult social issues, especially in health areas. Program providers are quick to point out that schools need external expertise to successfully address some of these issues. Both views are accurate in this writer's opinion. Schools must aggressively address difficult social issues through preventive programming, and external experts, services, and programs are necessary to successfully implement such efforts. With increasing national attention focused on AIDS, teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, and other health issues, schools have received legislative and some financial support to attack these problems. In this writer's experience, existing school personnel rarely have adequate knowledge, experience, and/or time to devote to some social issues. Therefore, external programming must be managed effectively within existing school curricula, personnel, and schedules.

Data collection in the present study involved distributing questionnaires to school personnel and external program providers. The survey process involved mailing questionnaires to superintendents, principals, and
external program providers. One-hundred-thirty-seven respondents provided views on administrative factors related to decisions to employ external programs and on administrative indicators of successful implementation of external programs.

Responses were tabulated and compared, and correlations of some survey items were made. Responses were analyzed by subgroups of respondent positions and as a total combined group.

The data generated ranking of administrative factors related to decision making and administrative indicators for successful implementation of external programs.

Conclusions

The following discusses findings derived from the study's statistical and non-statistical analyses of responses regarding the research questions.

Perceived Changes Over Time in the Prevalence of School-Based External Programs

Because many participants had not held their positions long enough to speak first-hand, and because most schools apparently had no serviceable records regarding the number of external programs, accurate long-term accounts of numbers of external programs operating in schools over time were not obtainable through the present study's survey process. Further research through a longitudinal study of
several school districts could rectify this problem in the future by yielding concrete data. However, given the data available, a definite trend toward increasing numbers of external programs addressing social issues and operating within school settings was evident. First, the number of schools reporting no external programs decreased at each 5-year interval from 1970 to 1990, from 29, 23, 17, 7, to 0, respectively. Second, the number of schools reporting three or more external programs increased steadily over the 1970-1990 period, from 20, 23, 37, 66, and 99, respectively.

Third, the mean number of programs rose from 1.60 in 1970 to 3.88 in 1990. Not only does the mean number increase moderately at each 5-year interval between 1970 and 1990, but the amount of increase also expands slightly at each interval.

In general, respondents indicated a need for external expertise to address several social issues. Similarly, in informal interviews conducted by the researcher with principals in eight counties in central Indiana from 1987 to 1990, this need was sometimes felt as pressure to bring the experts into schools. Such pressure came from teachers with little confidence, ambitious school boards and/or superintendents, zealous communities, and progressive national and/or state legislation. An analysis of individual social issue items revealed that child abuse
topped the list of issues educators viewed as needing external expertise (Table 4). Substance abuse prevention and substance abuse followed.

**Administrative Factors Impacting Decisions to Adopt Programs**

Building-level administrative support emerged as the major factor impacting decisions to adopt externally managed programs (see Table 6). The Gibbens (1986) and Lund (1991) studies discussed earlier demonstrate the central role of administrators on the adoption and implementation of school programs. Thus it stands to reason that administrative support would be a factor of high priority for external programs. Administrative support, as their research showed, yielded more effective program implementation and, thus, a sound decision for adoption. Ongoing internal support and staff training were seen as the next most important of such factors. This is also the variable of influence for which there was the greatest amount of agreement on both criterion questions (see relatively small standard deviation values). Nearly identical findings indicate that the school building administration subgroup (n = 92) and the combined respondent pool (n = 137) looked at this variable in much the same light. Most interesting is the finding that neither group differentiates at all on the basis of "source" of support. The bottom line is that internal
support and external support are seen as equally influential with respect to administrative decisions to adopt external programs and the likelihood of future success with such programs. Ongoing support was regarded by respondents as the most critical administrative factor influencing decisions to adopt external programs and their likelihood of success.

Other than funding, all items with external involvement ranked lower than internal factors as impacting decisions to use external programs. External funding ranked higher than internal funding as a factor for adopting an external program.

Administrative Indicators of Successful Implementation of External Programs

Building-level administrative support also emerged as the major indicator of successful externally managed programs (Table 6). In fact, 8 of the top 10 indicators for successful programs were also on the top 10 list of administrative factors impacting decisions to use external programs (Table 6). There was also significant difference in the role of teachers and/or staff members initiating a program. Program successful was not defined for this study. It is difficult to know whether respondents referred to initial on long-term success. To assure ongoing implementation success, external programs must be internalized and institutionalized. Therefore,
administrators must be careful in the selection process to adopt programs that have components that will encourage institutionalization.

Recommendations

Based on the literature review and the findings of this study, the following recommendations are presented for consideration and future study.

Implications for Research

Consideration should be given to longitudinal research to determine the scope of increasing external programs and the social issues they address. Without concrete evidence of increasing numbers of new programs, it is difficult to project the magnitude and complexity of administrative responsibilities. The impact of the administrator on programs has been established in the literature (Bech Jr., 1983; Burrello, 1986; Nelson Jr., 1988). However, more complete information regarding external programs would assist in predicting their success. Focusing national and local attention on the social issues discussed above could pressure schools to include specific external programs within their curricula. But as this researcher's own analysis of the existing literature revealed, little previous research has focused on which specific social issues are best addressed in school settings. A qualitative study is recommended in which some schools
using external programs are studied in depth. Including successful and unsuccessful programs, the viewpoint of those involved (administrators, teachers, program providers, etc.) should be examined.

Further research should be conducted to include more external program providers in order to establish their ability to assume expanded school programming. This study focused on school administrators. However, as Weinstein (1988/89) reported on the competence and initiative of external providers, knowledge of their future capabilities is just as important. Therefore, community agencies, both private and public, should be included in future research.

Implications for Program Selection and Implementation

It is recommended that administrators (and/or school districts) recognize that the highest ranking administrative factors and indicators for success confirmed in this study exist prior to making decisions about program selection (see Table 6). More specifically, prior to program adoption, building-level administrative support must be developed, ongoing program support established, and appropriate staff training provided. Correspondingly, successful implementation was shown to relate to building-level administrative support, program integration within school curricula, and appropriate staff training.
It is also recommended that administrators strive to execute external programs initiated and/or implemented by staff members, and integrated with the total school program, to strengthen their likelihood of success, as this study yielded in Table 6.

It is further recommended that building-level administrators develop means to remain consistently involved with external programs to assure their success. In support of this idea, prior research (Nelson, 1988) has shown involved administrators (actively or as supervisors) programs were more likely to have successfully implemented programs. This study's results, likewise, have shown that building-level administrative support is the most important factor in deciding to adopt external programs and is the best predictor of external program success.

The implications from this study are that external funding seems to be a significant factor for decisions to adopt an external program and as an indicator of successful implementation. However, it is recommended for administrators to be selective of programs with components that will encourage institutionalization in order to sustain success when external funding ceases.

This study has not only supported the results of several previous studies, but has also revealed specific information regarding the administrator's role as it related to successful implementation of external programs.
As mentioned above, successful implementation of external programs hinges on a number of variables, such as the political climate of a community, cross-cultural differences, economic feasibility, and the social consciousness of local citizens. Future research can shed further light on the adoption of external programs by addressing these variables more specifically than did the present study. Overall, the basic message of the present research has been that external programming is becoming an important factor in the thinking of superintendents, principals, teachers, other school personnel, and program providers. The ramifications of this trend might include a transformation of the traditional school, increased cooperation among community agencies, and ultimately a more effective means of addressing societal issues.

Such moves toward increasing use of experts can be seen as a natural extension of the post-industrial or information age and an integral element of education in the future.
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APPENDIX A

EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EXTERNAL PROGRAMS ADDRESSING SOCIAL ISSUES OPERATING WITHIN SCHOOLS

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. YOUR POSITION: Please indicate with a check (X). If more than one role applies, check the one where you are most invested.

   ___ 1. School Building Administrator: ________________________________
   ___ 2. Central Office Administrator: ________________________________
   ___ 3. Superintendent/Board Member: ________________________________
   ___ 4. Teacher: Subject - __________________________________________
   ___ 5. Counselor/Soc. Wkr./Nurse: ________________________________
   ___ 6. External Program Provider: Social Issue - _______________________

B. IN YOUR OPINION, TO WHAT DEGREE IS EXTERNAL EXPERTISE NEEDED IN HELPING SCHOOLS ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING SOCIAL ISSUES (Circle your choice):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue</th>
<th>External Support</th>
<th>External Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally Not Needed</td>
<td>Greatly Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Career development</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Health promotion</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decision-making skills</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Safety promotion</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Substance abuse prevention</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Values clarification</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Child abuse</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parenting skills</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Substance abuse</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sexuality</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF EXTERNAL PROGRAMS ADDRESSING SOCIAL ISSUES IN YOUR SCHOOL(S) DURING EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SCHOOL YEARS:

Circle Appropriate Number

1969-70: 0 1 2 3 4 5+
1974-75: 0 1 2 3 4 5+
1979-80: 0 1 2 3 4 5+
1984-85: 0 1 2 3 4 5+
1989-90: 0 1 2 3 4 5+

D. EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS OF EXTERNAL PROGRAMS CURRENTLY OPERATING IN YOUR SCHOOL(S):

Directions: List the social issue for each external program, the number of years in operation, and your rating of its effectiveness. Indicate your effectiveness rating by circling "1" (not effective) through "6" (very effective).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name (Optional) and Social Issue Addressed by the Program</th>
<th>Number Years In School</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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E. RATE THE ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS IMPACTING A DECISION TO UTILIZE AN EXTERNAL PROGRAM TO ADDRESS SOCIAL ISSUES. (Circle your rating.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Impact On Decision</th>
<th>Great Impact On Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative (central office) support for the program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative (building level) support for the program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program integrates with total school program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriate staff training provided</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Funding - primarily external</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Funding - primarily internal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implementation by external personnel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Implementation by school personnel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiated by external source</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Initiated by parent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Initiated by superintendent/board</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Initiated by teacher/staff member</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ongoing (external) program support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ongoing (internal) program support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Implementation managed externally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Program developed through research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Proven success through research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Training provided externally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Training provided internally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. LIST THE MOST EFFECTIVE EXTERNAL PROGRAM CURRENTLY IN OPERATION IN YOUR SCHOOL(S): Program Name (Optional) and Social Issue Addressed

Directions: Using the scale provided, rate from "1" to "6" administrative indicators of successful implementation of the program you have identified above. (Circle your rating.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Least Indicative Of Success</th>
<th>Most Indicative Of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative (central office) support for the program.</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative (building level) support for the program.</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program integrates with total school program.</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appropriate staff training provided</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Funding - primarily external</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Funding - primarily internal</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implementation by external personnel</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Implementation by school personnel</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Initiated by external source</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Initiated by parent</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Initiated by superintendent/board</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Initiated by teacher/staff member</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ongoing (external) program support</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ongoing (internal) program support</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Implementation managed externally</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Program developed through research</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Proven success through research</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Training provided externally</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Training provided internally</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 14, 1990

Dear Administrator:

I am requesting your participation in my doctoral dissertation research. The enclosed surveys were developed to examine administrative factors that contribute to the success of external programs designed to address social issues in schools. Based on my own administrative experience, I recognize a growing need for external expertise, materials, and/or man-power in addressing the added social responsibilities placed upon schools today.

Two questionnaires are being sent to selected building principals and superintendents, and one to some external program providers. Approximately, three hundred (300) responses are sought from several different counties in Indiana. I am asking that you complete one survey, and distribute the other one to a member of your staff (position categories are listed on the questionnaire). Please encourage your staff member to complete the survey promptly.

Your participation in this survey procedure is crucial both to the distribution of this questionnaire, and the ultimate success of the inquiry project.

Thank you for your effort and support as I undertake the final stages of earning a doctoral degree through Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Sincerely,

Roselyn R. Greene Cole
Enclosed please find one small token of my appreciation for your time and effort in behalf of this research. (I hope you like this brand of gum.)

This survey is concerned with the administration and implementation success of external programs dealing with social issues only; academically oriented programs are not considered in this survey questionnaire. Some of the social issues include the development of decision-making skills, health promotion, sexuality, career development, child abuse, and substance abuse/prevention.

Please describe the following characteristics of programs that were externally initiated, developed, and/or managed. (An external program requires an outside organization to work with the school for implementation within the school setting. Program management, actual implementation, training of school staff, and/or the provision of materials needed may externally generated in such programs.)

If you have questions regarding this survey or the research project, you may contact me at (317) 291-6844. Thank you for your participation in this assessment project. Please send the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, return envelope by June 8, 1990 to:

    Roselyn R. Greene Cole
    7565 Augusta Court
    Indianapolis, Indiana 46268

___ No  ___ Yes  I would like a copy of the results of this doctoral research project. (RRC 5/90)
REMINIDER!

This reminder comes with sincere wishes that you would complete and return the inquiry on EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EXTERNAL PROGRAMS ADDRESSING SOCIAL ISSUES OPERATING WITHIN SCHOOLS. This important inquiry may lend beneficial information for future programming addressing social issues. (If you passed a survey to someone else, please also pass this reminder.)

Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible to give your valuable input. THANK YOU in advance for your support.

Sincerely,

Roselyn R. Greene Cole
(7/27/90)
APPENDIX E

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for the Impact of External/Internal Conditions of Administrative Factors on the Adoption of External Programs as Reported by Central Office and Other School Personnel (N = 42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Indicators</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>-5.98</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>-4.57</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Support</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001
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### APPENDIX F

**Table 12**

*Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for the Impact of External/Internal Conditions of Administrative Indicators on the Successful Implementation of External Programs as Reported by Central Office and Other School Personnel (N = 42)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Indicators</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
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