

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 534

EC 007 994

TITLE Rural Education -- A Forward Look. Yearbook 1955
(Department of Rural Education).
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
Dept. of Rural Education.
PUB DATE 55
NOTE 499p.; Out of Print
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.90 HC-\$23.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Agriculture; *Conference Reports; *Educational Needs;
*Futures (of Society); *History; Manpower
Development; *Rural Education; School Districts;
Speeches
IDENTIFIERS *National Conference on Rural Education

ABSTRACT

Drawing upon the 1954 National Conference on Rural Education, the Yearbook discusses major problems and possibilities arising from significant changes in rural education. Part I presents an overview of education for rural America -- its achievements, continuing problems and some suggestions for their solutions, and the challenge for the immediate future. Parts II and III give major conference addresses. Part II includes, in slightly condensed form, all papers presented in the general sessions and the 4 Assemblies; Part III gives papers from various divisions, selected as comprehensive statements or because their major content could not be incorporated into the brief statements in Part I. General areas are: community involvement, teacher shortages, business perspectives, agriculture, population trends, cultural changes, educational administration, economic changes, school district reorganization, State education departments, farm and rural incomes, rural environment, school building use, financing problems, suburban development, and personnel needs. The conference program and personnel, the history of the Charl Ormond Williams Award, a rural education bibliography, an explanation of the Department of Rural Education, and a roster of its members are also given. (KM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1955 YEARBOOK

RURAL EDUCATION

—a
forward
look

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rural Education
Association

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

RURAL



EDUCATION

—a forward look

Yearbook 1955

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES
1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest
Washington 6, D. C.

COPYRIGHT 1955

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

Published by the Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association of the United States and sent free of charge to all 1955 members of the Department; Executive and editorial offices, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington 6, D. C. Sale price per copy: \$3.50. Discounts: To bookstores and other agencies for resale purposes: 20 percent on shipments to one address; to others ordering more than one copy of same title for shipment to one address: 2-9 copies, 10 percent; 10 or more copies, 20 percent.

Out of print

Foreword

Over the years the Department of Rural Education has effectively focused attention on the educational needs of rural children and youth and on special problems in meeting these needs under conditions peculiar to rural areas. Every new advance on the social-economic front brings fresh problems to challenge the future of rural people. Consequently, rural education faces a never-ending responsibility to adapt to new needs and, at the same time, to support whatever is fundamental and enduring in rural life.

As the one national professional organization in rural public-school education, the Department feels the need, periodically, to survey its field of operations and to take inventory of the resources at its command to achieve its purposes. A *Policy for Rural Education in the United States* was issued by the Department in 1940 "to provide a basis upon which those concerned with the public school program in rural areas can coordinate their activities on a nation-wide basis in moving toward a more adequate educational program for rural America." In 1945 the report of the First White House Conference on Rural Education and the Department Yearbook, *Rural Schools for Tomorrow*, provided a reassessment of the task ahead in the light of changes accompanying World War II.

The decade since 1945 has brought changes of great significance to rural education. The widespread application of science and technology to problems of rural living and the accelerating pace of change make education and re-education a lifelong necessity. It is no longer possible to limit our thinking to a 12-year school; "from Kindergarten to the grave" more nearly describes the time range of the needed educational program. That program must be extended, too, in both the range and quality of its offerings. Rural people are confidently raising their sights and demanding educational opportunities that leave no doors closed to them merely because they are rural folks. They are also reaffirming their sense of personal concern and responsibility in helping to maintain good schools, and to strengthen other educative institutions and agencies in rural communities.

The 1954 National Conference on Rural Education was organized to consider the major problems and possibilities arising from this changing situation. We are indebted to the Department's Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies for their decision to draw upon the rich resources of the National Conference for the major content of this volume. By so doing they make available to a wider audience this most recent assessment of the scope and nature of the task ahead in rural education.

This Yearbook will surely take its place as one of the basic documents in the literature of rural education. It has significance for the classroom teacher facing

tomorrow's immediate problems and for the university professor directing his graduate students into fundamental research for the more distant future. Local, county, intermediate, and state school administrators and members of their staffs will find it helpful as will the innumerable leaders of organizations and agencies whose activities and interests aid and support the public schools. It is, in fact, an essential volume for anyone who is thoughtfully interested in the best education obtainable for rural people in the second half of this century.

HOWARD A. DAWSON
Executive Secretary

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Development of the Book</i>	xi
<i>Charter of Education for Rural Children</i>	xiii
<i>The Setting</i>	xv

PART I

An Overview of Issues and Problems and Their Possible Solutions

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. A Decade of Progress in Rural Education	3
2. The Challenge of Continuing Problems	15
3. The School as a Community Institution	35
4. The Rural Environment's Distinctive Impact on Children and Youth	43
5. Social and Economic Changes in Rural Life	53
6. The Scope and Quality of the Needed Educational Program	63
7. Education for Disadvantaged Rural Groups	79
8. Personnel Needed for Schools Serving Rural People	91
9. Physical Facilities for Schools Serving Rural People and Their Communities	105
10. School District Reorganization	119
11. The County Unit as a Type of Administrative Organization	129
12. The Intermediate Unit of School Administration	141
13. Improving the Administration of Small Schools	155
14. Financing Rural Education	167
15. The Schools and the Educational Programs of Other Agencies	177
16. Rural Education on the World Scene	189
17. The Next Decade	203

PART II

Major Conference Addresses

(Papers arranged sequentially)

<i>Paper</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Walker, Waurine. "As I See Rural Education At Midcentury"	209
2. Brownell, Samuel M. "As I View Rural Education"	213
3. Dawson, Howard A. "Rural Education—A Backward And A Forward Look"	216
4. Davis, John H. "Forces Confronting Rural Education In Building A Better World"	227
5. Heath, Vernon L. "The Nation's Stake In Solving The Teacher Shortage Crisis"	233
6. Kendall, Glenn. "Teachers For Rural Communities"	242
7. Chase, Francis S. "The Task Ahead In Achieving Equal Opportunity For All"	246
8. Smith, Mrs. Haven "The Distinctive Educational Needs Of Rural People"	251
9. Cyr, Frank W. "Making The Provisions Necessary To Implement An Adequate Educational Program"	255
10. Cox, John K. "Rural Education Problems: Past And Present"	265
11. Goslin, Willard E. "The School In The Community—An Educator's Viewpoint"	270
12. Morgan, Griscom. "The School Must Discover The Community"	273
13. Roosevelt, Mrs. Eleanor. "We Must Be Concerned"	280
14. Reuther, Victor G. "Rural Education From The Viewpoint Of Labor"	284
15. Fuller, Walter D. "Rural Education From The Viewpoint Of Business"	290
16. Benson, Ezra Taft. "Rural Education From The Viewpoint Of Agri- culture"	294

PART III
Selected Divisional Addresses
(Papers arranged alphabetically)

<i>Paper</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Beale, Calvin L. "Population Trends And Distribution In Rural Areas"	299
2. Bertrand, Alvin L. "Cultural Changes In American Rural Life"	306
3. Cushman, M. L. "The Significance Of The Community School Concept For Educational Administration"	312
4. Duncan, Otis Durant. "Economic Changes In American Rural Life"	316
5. Ellena, William J. "School District Reorganization In The United States"	327
6. Griffin, Francis E. "The Role Of The State Education Department In School District Reorganization"	330
7. Grove, E. W. "Trends In Farm And Rural Incomes And Their Distribution"	335
8. Hoppock, Anne S. "The Influence Of The Rural Environment On Children"	341
9. Jenson, Theodore J. "Use Of School Buildings For Activities Other Than Instruction"	345
10. Kretlow, Burton W. "Standards Of School Organization In Relation To The Community To Be Served"	349
11. Lindman, E. L. "Present Problems In Financing Rural Education"	356
12. MacRae, Douglas G. "The Community School From The Viewpoint Of Suburban Development"	360
13. Rohrer, Wayne C. "Culture Changes And Education"	363
14. Stinnett, T. M. "Present Status Of Personnel Needed"	371
<i>Conference Program and Personnel</i>	377
<i>Chas Ormond Williams Award</i>	413
<i>Selected Bibliography on Rural Education</i>	417
<i>The Department of Rural Education</i>	443
<i>Roster of Department Members</i>	449
<i>Index</i>	475

Acknowledgment of Photographs

Frontispiece—New York Central School Boards, Committee for Educational Research, Suffern Central School District, New York

Chapter 2—Department of Audio-Visual Service, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

Chapter 4—Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

Chapter 5—Department of Audio-Visual Service, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

Chapter 9—Leland Stanford University, Palo Alto, California

Chapter 10—Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Chapter 11—Department of Audio-Visual Service, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Chapter 13—Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

Chapter 16—Foreign Operations Administration, Washington, D. C.

Chapter 17—Journal of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

Development of the Book

The Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies is indebted to literally hundreds of people for their part in the development of the 1955 Yearbook. Drawing upon the National Conference on Rural Education as it does for its major content, the book reflects the long-time planning of Department leaders and the more immediate planning in which representatives of the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as co-sponsor and many cooperating organizations and agencies shared. Every person who carried a named conference responsibility and the many conference participants whose contributions were given anonymously added to the resources from which the Yearbook writers were to draw as they developed their manuscripts. To the extent that these people are identifiable, their names appear in the section of this publication entitled Conference Program and Personnel.

Attention is called to the important work of the Findings Committees which served the fifteen Conference Divisions and, especially to the work of the Assembly and Divisional Reporters. Their work made available to the editorial committee an overview of the entire Conference.

In this Yearbook Conference materials are drawn upon and presented in two ways. Part I presents an overview of education for rural America—its achievements, continuing problems and some suggestions for their solution, and the challenge for the immediate future. This section draws heavily from conference materials for its content, but is organized around topics which the editors believe to be of major importance. In Parts II and III major conference addresses are presented. Part II includes, in slightly condensed form, all papers presented in the general sessions and the four Assemblies. Part III includes a number of papers from the various Divisions, selected for their value as comprehensive statements or because their major content could not be incorporated into the necessarily brief treatment of topics in Part I.

A number of people have helped in the development of the Yearbook manuscript by assimilating and interpreting the available information and materials and preparing first drafts of the several chapters. These include:

- Frank D. Alexander*, Social Services Analyst, Tennessee Valley Authority
- Clifford P. Archer*, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota
- Lois M. Clark*, Assistant Director of Rural Service, NEA
- Howard A. Dawson*, Director of Rural Service, NEA
- William J. Ellena*, Assistant to the Director of Rural Service, NEA
- Janet Gramsath*, Specialist in Rural Education, U. S. Office of Education
- Gay Hayt*, Chief, Bureau of Elementary Curriculum Development, New York State Education Department
- Robert M. Lienberg*, Assistant Director of Rural Service, NEA
- Richard E. Jaggors*, Professor of Education, Eastern Kentucky State College
- Jagora Lantier*, Professor of Education, Florida State University
- Kenneth E. McIntyre*, Associate Professor of Educational Administration, University of Texas
- Mrs. Ruth O'Brien*, American Public Relations Association, Washington, D. C.

Frank Philpot, Acting Director of Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Alabama

Rex K. Reckewey, Assistant Professor of Education, Purdue University, Indiana

James A. Seizenbaugh, Assistant Superintendent, Baltimore County Schools, Maryland

Howard O. Yates, Bureau of Elementary Curriculum Development, New York State Education Department

To all of the above the Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies expresses sincere thanks. Special thanks are also due and gratefully given to Julian E. Butterworth, Professor Emeritus at Cornell University, for the preparation of the selected bibliography and other invaluable assistance; to Elaine Exton of Washington, D.C., for editing the manuscripts in Part II; to Kenneth Frye of the NEA Publications Division for designing the Yearbook cover; to Burton Kreitlow for representing the Publications Committee in the continuing work of directing the development of the Yearbook, and to the secretarial staff of the NEA Division of Rural Service without whose exacting work the publication could not have been produced.

In expressing our pride in sponsoring this significant publication and our thanks to those who made it possible, I am joined by the other members of the 1954-55 Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies: Lulu Barnard, Superintendent, Flathead County Schools, Kalispell, Montana; Effie G. Bathurst, Research Assistant, U.S. Office of Education; Burton W. Kreitlow, Assistant Professor of Rural Education, University of Wisconsin; and John Wilcox, Supervising Principal, Candor Central School, Candor, New York.

Robert S. Fox, Chairman of the Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies, University Elementary School, Ann Arbor, Michigan

A Charter of Education FOR RURAL CHILDREN

The First White House Conference on Rural Education in 1944
Presented the Following as the Educational Rights of Every Rural
Child and Pledged itself to Work for Their Achievement:

1 Every rural child has the right to a *quality* rural education.
Education—This education should be such as to guarantee the child an opportunity to develop and maintain healthy body and a pleasant personality, to acquire the skills needed in tasks of learning, to get a good start in understanding and appreciating the natural and social world, to possess proper habits and helpfulness in home and community life, to work and play with others, and to enjoy and use music, art, literature and handicrafts.

2 Every rural child has the right to a *satisfactory* rural secondary education.—This education should assure the youth important progress in his general, physical, social, civic, and cultural development; begin in the district or school, and provide social training for learning to enter occupations and as they enter in college and the professions.

3 Every rural child has the right to an educational program that bridges the gap between home and school, and between school and adult life.—This program requires, in the first place, cooperation with parents for the home education of children and young for school and for the care of a rural guidance to make and where it all other children, and, in the other hand, the cooperative development of cultural and vocational adult education suited to the needs and forces of the people of the community.

4 Every rural child has the right through his school to health services, educational and vocational guidance, library facilities, recreational activities, and, where needed, school facilities and paid transportation facilities or public systems.—Such special services, because they require the employment of specially qualified personnel, can be supported best through enlarged care of school administration and the cooperation of general and adult schools.

5 Every rural child has the right to teachers, supervisors, and advisors trained who know rural life and who are educated to deal effectively with the problems peculiar to rural schools.—Persons so educated should hold their positions for as long as their special qualifications demand, be paid adequate salaries, and should be provided by law and fair practice in service of their positions as a reward for past and useful services. The accomplishments of these objectives is the responsibility of local leadership, state departments of education, the teacher education and service, and national leaders in rural education.

6 Every rural child has the right to educational services and guidance during the middle and high school attendance in a school that is open for not less than 9 months in each year for at least 12 weeks.—The educational development of children during middle years is also a responsibility of the community where, in more communities the period of schooling has already become 14 weeks and should become such in all communities as rapidly as possible.

7 Every rural child has the right to attend school in a *satisfactory* school building.—The building should be attractive, clean, spacious, safe, conducive to good health, equipped with materials and apparatus essential to the best teaching, planned in a community center and surrounded by ample space for playgrounds, gardens, landscaping, and landscaping.

8 Every rural child has the right through the school to participate in community life and culture.—For effective service the school plans must be planned and recognized as a center of community action; the closer possible interrelationships should be maintained between the school and other community agencies, and children and youth should be recognized as active participants in community affairs.

9 Every rural child has the right to a local school system sufficiently strong to provide all the services required for a *quality* education.—Organizing such a school system depends upon organizing enough large units of school administration, each unit to be somewhat small as large schools. Large schools can usually provide better educational opportunities more economically, but with special efforts small schools can well serve rural children and communities.

10 Every rural child has the right to have the full resources of his community, State, and Nation used to guarantee him an *average standard* of educational opportunity.—This right must include equality of opportunity for minority and low income groups. Even more rural youth because of their poverty and conditions, it is necessary for the development of the democratic way of life that the wealth and productivity of the entire Nation should act in the support of the right of every child to a good education.

These are the Rights of the Rural Child because they are the Rights of Every Child regardless of Race, or Color, or Situation, wherever he may live under the Flag of the United States of America.

The Setting

THE 1954 National Conference on Rural Education was called to enable those who are concerned with the educational well-being of rural people to (1) review the decade of progress since the 1944 White House Conference on Rural Education, (2) study persistent and emerging problems now affecting rural living, and (3) explore broad questions of policy for the future.

The 1944 Conference, meeting when many chronic problems of rural education had become acute under wartime conditions, gave birth to an awakened public interest in rural education. A resigned acceptance of "second best" as all that could be hoped for in many rural situations had given way to the firm belief, voiced in the Charter of Education for Rural Children, that "These are the rights of the rural child because they are the rights of every child regardless of race, or color, or situation, wherever he may live under the flag of the United States of America." During the decade 1944-54 widespread advancement was made toward the solution of many of the basic problems facing rural people and communities in meeting their demand for broad educational services equal in quality to the best obtainable anywhere.

The decade 1944-54 was a period of phenomenally rapid change in much that affects the daily living of people, both rural and urban. Infinitely greater possibilities for a "good life" for all were opening up, but new problems accompanied new opportunities and old problems took on new ramifications. The year 1954 seemed an appropriate time to draw together our best resources, insight, information, and understanding; to bring these to bear on the realities and the possibilities confronting rural people today; and, out of this, to get a renewed sense of direction for the future. For it was evident, as perhaps never before, that the effective solution of school problems facing rural people and their communities is essential to the fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world.

How could significant resources best be identified and brought into focus for a clear look at the present situation and the emerging future? Many participants in the local, state, and regional activities which grew out of the 1944 Conference had been asking for an opportunity to come together again in a national conference. How could such a

conference be made fruitful for these people and for the others who might attend? Such questions were considered in executive sessions and informal meetings of the Department of Rural Education and its various committees over a period of several years. These general guides to Conference planning evolved:

1. *Sponsorship* should be at the highest appropriate level within the organizations and agencies which accept sponsoring relationships, in order to assure to the Conference the status and recognition appropriate to its significance.

2. *Program emphasis* should be focused on rural education, with particular reference to public school responsibility, but within the broad social and economic context within which the schools exercise their functions.

3. *Program scope* should encompass the concerns of all major regions and all significant elements of the rural population of the nation and the related world scene.

4. *Membership* in the Conference should be broadly representative. Individual participation should be on the basis of interest in and ability to contribute to the purposes of the Conference and readiness to assume responsibility for leadership in putting to good use insights gained from the Conference.

In accordance with these agreements, the following decisions were made and action taken:

Sponsorship

The Conference was sponsored by the National Education Association through the Department of Rural Education. The Office of Education of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare acted as associate sponsor. Because the 1954 National Conference was a successor to the 1944 White House Conference on Rural Education, inquiry was first made through appropriate channels regarding the possibility of White House sponsorship of the 1954 Conference. The President thought it best that the Administration not assume this relationship but offered the cooperation and assistance of all appropriate agencies of the U. S. Government.

Program Emphasis and Scope

On the basis of suggestions from interested individuals, organizations, and agencies, four types of program meetings were established: (1) *General Sessions* to provide broad background and orientation at the opening of the Conference and to summarize and focus thinking at its close; (2) *Assemblies* to explore broad areas of responsibility in providing for the education of rural people and to present more specific background and orientation; (3) *Divisional Meetings* to study specific problems which must be faced if all rural people are

to be served adequately by their schools and consider promising lines of action for the solution of these problems; (4) *Special Interest Group Meetings* in which interested cooperating organizations and agencies might consider the implications of the Conference for their own programs.

Conference Membership

Membership in the Conference was by personal invitation. Because their interest could be assumed, invitations were sent to (1) the members of the Department of Rural Education, (2) those who had participated in the 1944 White House Conference on Rural Education, and (3) those holding official positions of leadership in the National Education Association, the state education associations and state education departments. Plans were set in motion to identify other interested persons through cooperating national agencies and organizations, and through official state committees. Embassies of foreign nations were invited to send representatives.

To assure broad cooperation and representation, nearly two hundred organizations and agencies were contacted, some through direct invitations to their official heads to attend the Conference. Others, with a more direct concern in the purposes of the Conference, were invited to become cooperating members, with representation on the Advisory Council and an opportunity to nominate persons to be invited. State Committees were established through state education associations and charged with the twofold responsibility of nominating persons to be invited and identifying and advising the central staff concerning the major needs, problems, and interests of their states. The cooperating groups are specifically identified in the section entitled Conference Program and Personnel.

The official program for this National Conference on Rural Education which was devoted to "Rural Education—A Forward Look" carried this challenge: "For the Conference to reach its full effectiveness in achieving the purposes for which it is called each of us must assume our responsibility for leadership. We must return to our communities—cities, towns, villages, and hamlets—better equipped with needed insight and vision to do a better job. What we do at this Conference will significantly affect rural people wherever they live. We stand at the threshold of great achievement." As the Conference convened, it was evident that its members had come with a deep sense of their individual responsibilities—to learn and to contribute to the learning of others.

An Overview of Issues and Problems
and Their Possible Solutions

A Decade of Progress in Rural Education

THIS segment of the report might well have been called "A Decade of Change in Rural Education" for all changes have not been progress. That determination must remain for the future. Nevertheless, it is profitable to take a retrospective look at the educational opportunities provided for rural citizens.

Ten years ago the First White House Conference on Rural Education was held in the Nation's Capital. A survey of problems considered at that Conference points to what should be examined to determine the extent of change in the past decade.

TEN YEARS AGO

The 1944 Conference revealed an intense interest in the many unique problems of providing education to rural children, youth, and adults. The addresses and reports of discussion groups reveals the concern of informed people at that time were: (1) trends of rural school population and the size of the rural school enterprise; (2) the comparative salaries of rural teachers; (3) the shortage of teachers for rural schools; (4) the comparative expenditures per pupil for rural pupils; (5) the relative value of physical facilities of schools serving rural pupils; (6) the relative proportion of persons of high school ages attending high school; (7) the problems of small high schools; (8) meeting the needs of rural children by the adjustment of curriculum and instructional procedures to the experiences and needs of children and youth living in a rural environment; (9) pupil transportation; (10) the need for state and Federal support for education; (11) the reorganization of school districts and the consolidation of schools; (12) the special aspects of equalizing educational opportunities, with special reference to the children in areas of low economic resources—the Negroes, the Spanish Americans, the Indians, and the children of migratory agricultural workers.

AND NOW IN RETROSPECT

Now a decade has passed. What has happened? What are the trends? What evaluations of changes can now be made? Significant facts point to some of the answers. Other answers will have to wait future and needed researches.

All in all it can truly be called a decade of progress. Without any detailed or critical analysis of the statistical data, many important aspects of which will be found throughout this volume, some major generalizations can be drawn which will stimulate further inquiry.

The Concept of Rural Education

Ten years ago it was said that the major purpose of education for rural children and youth is not the mere imparting of literacy and a regimen of certain information and skills, but rather to achieve and sustain a desirable level of cultural, ethical and economic living; that the rural schools, or those that serve a rural constituency, ought to be institutions whose programs are indigeneous to the needs and experiences of the pupils and the communities served. A major problem of education is the adaptation of instructional programs and procedures to individual needs and experiences and community living in ways that will best advance "better living" among rural people.

While the instructional program in many rural areas is almost wholly out of date and stilted, there is no doubt that vast improvements have been made in the adaptation of instruction to life needs. Quantitative measurements are all too often lacking, but opinion of many informed persons, both lay and professional, substantiates this conclusion.

The ancient concept of rural education was that it consisted only of the operations and problems of one-teacher schools, or at least of small schools in the open country. It is now conceived to be the education of children and youth who live in a rural environment. The location of the school (open country, village, or city) has little to do with whether the school, its teachers and administrators, have an obligation in the field of rural education.

Population Factors

Great changes have taken place in the numbers and relative proportion of rural population in the United States. The number of rural farm people has continuously declined during the decade, from

approximately 30 million to less than 23 million. At the end of the decade not more than 15 percent of the Nation's population was living in rural farm areas. The number of school age children in rural areas declined somewhat during the decade but not in proportion to the decline in total population.

It seems very likely that a stabilization point may have been reached so far as total rural farm population is concerned. Such forecast, however, does not mean that geographical or area distribution stabilization of either rural farm or of rural non-farm population has been reached. Mobility of population, changes in agricultural production, and increased size of farms are causing, and will no doubt continue to cause, changes in the concentration of population, changes in school attendance units, school administrative units, and location of school buildings and the need for new school facilities.

Occupational Changes

It has become increasingly evident that farming is not the sole occupation of people living in farm areas. Perhaps not more than two-thirds of the people residing in rural farm areas are engaged in farming. They pursue many occupations and more and more of them are commuters to industrial employment. Such facts should have great significance for the types of vocational opportunities available to rural youth in the high schools that serve them.

School Attendance

The decade has been one of progress in the percentage of rural children of school age attending school when compared to the attendance of urban children. That a lower percentage of rural children attend school than of urban children has long been a matter of observation and concern. During the war years both rural and urban school enrollment declined, especially in high school, but the urban decreases were the greater.

The increased percentage of rural youth in high school has been exceptional during the decade. The proportion of rural youth 16 and 17 years old in high school increased nearly 20 percent while the proportion of urban youth remained about the same. Within a few years rural areas will probably equal urban areas in the percentage of their school age population attending school.

Disadvantaged Groups in Rural America

At the First White House Conference on Rural Education it was a matter of concern and discussion that the most unsatisfactory schools in the Nation were usually those that served the million or so children of migratory agricultural workers, the Negroes in rural areas of states maintaining separate school systems, and many Spanish Americans. It was said that almost equally unsatisfactory were the schools for rural children in the Southern Mountains and in other areas of depleted natural resources in many parts of the Nation and in the cotton belt wherever there were large numbers of sharecroppers and farm laborers.

All such problems are still extant, except possibly to a lesser degree. Migrations, improved agricultural income, better and more adequate systems of state school finance have all contributed to partial alleviation of the educational conditions of the disadvantaged rural groups. Furthermore, there has undoubtedly developed a keener and more ethical conscience in a majority of American people about such matters than formerly was evident.

Greatest improvements have probably occurred in the schools serving Negroes. The new school building programs and the increases in teachers' salaries in some of the states, notably North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Virginia and Louisiana have been little short of phenomenal. Federal court decisions concerning equal facilities and equal pay for equal responsibility and qualifications probably have been an accelerating factor, but undoubtedly not the only one. Public opinion among citizens affected has been a potent influence.

Excellent progress, without attaining the millenium, has been made in the improvement of educational opportunities for children of migratory agricultural workers in California, New York, New Jersey, and Michigan. The most recent programs have been initiated in Palm Beach County, Florida and Northampton County, Virginia.

It is now evident that mechanical improvements in the harvesting of crops, an aroused public conscience, and more skillful and devoted teaching procedures and administrative arrangements are well on the way to solving the most poignant problems concerning the education of one of the most neglected groups among American children.

Cooperative community efforts at educational improvement in many areas of low economic resources are now evident and numerous. Two that have recently appeared in the rural education literature are worthy of wide public attention: *Guidance in a Rural Community* and *Guidance in a Rural Industrial Community*, both published by the NEA Department of Rural Education.¹

Rural Teachers

Ten years ago the average salary of rural teachers was about one-half that of urban teachers. Today it is about two-thirds as much. The trend toward lessening the difference is quite distinct. The reason is perhaps two-fold; a lessening gap between farm and non-farm income, and a constantly increasing amount of state, rather than local, financial support of schools.

The qualifications of rural teachers have greatly improved during the last decade. Now about four out of ten rural elementary teachers have a college degree. In the one-teacher schools nearly one in four now have a college degree, about twice the proportion of a decade ago. During the decade the proportion of rural teachers who have at least two years of college preparation has increased at least 25 percent. The NEA Department of Rural Education's Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers reported as follows:

"Approximately one-third of all rural teachers have been annually in attendance at summer school. Contrary to public opinion in some quarters typical rural teachers are neither inexperienced or supernumerary. Rural elementary teachers average fourteen years of experience and rural high school teachers eleven years. This favorable situation is all the more remarkable when it is noted that rural America has a disproportionate share of disadvantaged groups such as low-income farmers, Negroes, Spanish Americans, Indians, and workers in rural industrial slums."

To a considerable extent there has been a reversal of the trend begun in the 1930's to abolish divisions of rural education and courses designed to be of special use to teachers in rural schools. It is undoubtedly true that more and more attention is now being given to the

¹Warburton, Amber Arthun. *Guidance in a Rural Community—Green Sea*. Yearbook 1952. Department of Rural Education. Prepared for the Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1952. 156 pp.; Warburton, Amber Arthun. *Guidance in a Rural Industrial Community—Harlan County*. Prepared for the Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954. 249 pp.

education of rural teachers and administrators to equip them to handle successfully the unique and specialized problems with which they have to deal. Those who insist that "education is education" have fallen behind the procession and are no longer deemed desirable to provide educational leadership to school systems that serve a rural constituency.

School Finance

During the last decade the amount of money spent for public schools in rural areas has become proportionate to the number of pupils involved. About 39 percent of all school pupils are rural and about 39 percent of the money is being spent on them. The drawback, however, is that the cost of transportation is included in the rural expenditures, about a quarter of a billion dollars annually, a sum that under other-than-rural conditions might go to better salaries for teachers and expanded educational services.

The reasons for the improved financial status of rural schools are chiefly as follows: (1) increased state support of education; (2) better methods of apportioning state funds for education, especially equalization methods that are designed to aid school districts in proportion to needs; and (3) the improved income status and proportionate taxpaying ability of rural people.

School District Reorganization

The decade witnessed a reduction in the number of school districts from almost 110,000 to 66,000, a change that usually took place by direct action of the people concerned through elections and petitions. The greatest reductions in the number of school districts have occurred in Illinois, New York, Texas, Missouri, Mississippi and Arkansas. In contrast, seven states—Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa, Kansas and South Dakota—now account for approximately half of the total number of school districts in the United States. But the close of the decade finds a ferment for change and shaping programs of action for great reductions in the number of school districts in these states.

Teacher Shortages

A potent subject of discussion at the First White House Conference on Rural Education was the rural-teacher shortage, it being referred to as a "crisis."

In 1954 the National Conference on Rural Education was concerned with a similar crisis, perhaps more severe than ever. Ten years ago it was reported that over 50,000 persons were teaching on emergency certificates; 70,000 persons are now teaching on such certificates. Now as then the major part of this burden falls on the rural schools. Now as then the reason for the crisis is not so much a shortage of competent persons as a shortage of money to pay sufficient salaries to obtain their services. Also, there is still a shortage of satisfactory working conditions for rural teachers, a shortage in such matters as tenure and continuous contract laws, sick-leave provisions, satisfactory living conditions, and the lack of supervisory assistance for the teachers who most need such services. The most promising lines of action for the future improvement of rural education would undoubtedly be in this field.

Small Schools

A result of school district reorganization has been a marked decrease in the number of small rural schools. The most notable change has been the reduction in the number of one-teacher schools during the decade from 108,000 to about 45,000.

The reduction in the number of small elementary schools and their consolidation has brought a considerable growth in the number and importance of the elementary school principalships.

Rural high schools are still relatively small, but there has been a distinct trend for the very small schools to disappear.

Pupil Transportation

School district reorganization and school consolidation have resulted in a vast expansion of the pupil transportation system. A decade ago it was reported that 93,000 buses transported nearly 4.1 million children to school daily at an annual cost of about 70 million dollars. In 1954 about 130,000 buses transported about 8 million pupils daily at a cost of more than 250 million dollars annually.

The transportation of pupils has become more than a business and mechanical operation; it is now looked upon as an educative experience for pupils and a means of strengthening community life and activities.

School Buildings

That there is a tremendous shortage of suitable classrooms in the Nation in 1954 is a well publicized fact. The extent to which the problem is a rural one is not known to an exact extent. Certainly a

part of the shortage is due to the fact that large areas of the United States are so divided into small districts that financial resources in sufficiently large units cannot be made available to pay for the needed buildings. On the other hand, many school districts are not being reorganized because, even if they were, the financial resources are not available to pay for the buildings needed to have better schools.

That great progress has been made in obtaining better and more attractive schools is quite evident to all who travel about the country and observe the new buildings in the open country and villages in every state.

Many of the states in which the greatest progress has occurred in rural school buildings have been those that have enacted laws to provide substantial state aid for school buildings. Good examples are New York, Washington, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia and Maryland.

Educational Attainment of Rural People

A measure of the continued advancement of rural education is the steady rise in the level of educational attainment of the rural population. During 1944-54 the percentage of rural adults who had completed the eighth grade increased by 50 percent; the proportion who had completed high school increased 50 percent; and the proportion who were college graduates increased more than one-third. Since the number of functional illiterates among rural people is still twice as great as the number of college graduates, the American people are in no position to rest on their laurels.

Rural Teachers and the Profession

The rural teachers and school administrators have joined the vanguard of professional educational advancement in our Nation. Evidence is that the membership of the National Education Association has grown during the decade from about 250,000 to nearly 600,000, the largest proportion of increased membership having come from the ranks of open country, village and small city teachers. In slightly over ten years a sampling of rural teachers showed that NEA membership among rural teachers had increased from less than 10 percent to more than 50 percent.² The large metropolitan areas have by no

²National Education Association, Research Division, "Rural Teachers in 1951-52," *Research Bulletin* 31:3-63, February 1953. "Membership in the National Education Association," pp. 15-17.

means accepted a comparable share of national professional obligations.

Development of Broader and Better Programs of Education

One of the handicaps to rural education has been the absence of an adequate ideal as to what the scope and quality of the educational program necessary to serve rural people ought to be. Too often rural people have assumed that, because their communities and schools are small, their educational programs must be small and limited too. Adaptations and expansions have been and no doubt will continue to be, in proportion to what people think a good educational program is.

The past decade has seen a continuous effort on the part of educational leaders, supervisors, administrators, and many teachers, to relate instructional methods and curriculum materials to the experiences, needs and community life of rural children, youth and adults.

The philosophy propounded by the late Dr. Fannie W. Dunn in her address on "The Education of Rural Children and Youth" at the First White House Conference on Rural Education has more and more become a reality seen in practice.

Much of the movement for the reorganization of school districts has arisen from the desire for a more complete program of education and especially the desire for better high school opportunities.

That the educational program should include kindergarten through at least grade 12 has become almost universally accepted. It has become more and more accepted that the elementary school program should consist of the "3R's" *and much more*, such as the communicative arts and skills, studies and activities that make for successful living together, knowledge of the material and natural world, manual skills, citizenship, and understanding, appreciation, enjoyment and some skill in music, literature, dramatics, painting, drawing, modeling, designing and other activities intended to enrich and beautify life.

It has become more and more accepted that the high school program should not only prepare young people for college but should provide for those who will enter into employment either before high school graduation or immediately thereafter. The need for vocational education and homemaking instruction is widely accepted and is motivating many changes in school organization. In the opinion of many informed citizens, vocational educational opportunities in agriculture,

business and industry, are essentials in the program of schools serving rural youth.

In addition it has now become customary to seek means through organization, finance and personnel to have such opportunities and facilities as the following: (1) school-community programs in adult education, library services, recreation, dramatics, music festivals, industrial arts and handicrafts, and non-commercial entertainment; (2) services in counseling and guidance, health, psychological and psychiatric services, library and audio-visual aids; (3) specialized services and instructional opportunities for exceptional children; (4) supervision of instruction and school attendance; and (5) a number of business and administrative services now known to be essential to the successful operation of an adequate school program.

The Intermediate Unit

Perhaps the most significant movement in the field of public school administration during the past decade has been the development of the intermediate unit of school services and administration in the 30 or more states to which it is applicable. This type of administrative arrangement has become the means by which a comprehensive program of educational services can be made available to constituent community schools and school districts which acting alone would be unable to have the needed services.

During this decade the county and rural area superintendents have formed an active and powerful organization through their division of the NEA Department of Rural Education. The Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents have held nine annual national conferences and have become a strong influence in American education. They have become a strong and active element in the American Association of School Administrators, which has given the fullest possible support to the advancement of this sector of American school administration.

Without doubt one of the more important contributions to the literature in school administration during the past decade is *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*, the 1954 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education.³

³Isenberg, Robert M., editor. *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*. Yearbook 1954. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954. 259 p.

Progress has also been marked by improvements in the selection methods of county superintendents of schools, notably in Iowa and Michigan. There is good reason to believe that the selection of county superintendents by popular election will very soon become completely out-dated.

Summary

The magnitude of the task of providing adequate educational opportunities to all rural people should now be obvious to all proponents of equality of opportunity. Leadership of a high order is essential as the improvement of opportunities requires the best leadership, personnel and resources this nation can muster. Educational leadership must arise in each community, leadership sensitive to the needs and problems of the people, leadership to develop a sound and satisfying educational program for all rural people.

We have seen a decade of progress in rural schools. Not all is perfect. There is yet much to be accomplished judging by the record of the most recent decade, but there is also every reason to be optimistic about the future. Such being the case, it is altogether fitting and proper that the Nation's leaders in rural life and education should assemble in the National Conference on Rural Education to evaluate the past, measure current problems and chart the future.

The Challenge of Continuing Problems

IN taking a broad look at rural life and education over the past decade, we have noted general trends and identified major issues which must be taken into account in shaping policies for the future. What do these mean in terms of day-to-day decisions and activities? What specific problems must we face—each of us who carries responsibility of one kind or another for putting into practice what we believe and what we want to achieve in and through the schools which serve rural people?

Obviously the specific problems to be faced are numerous and varied. Indeed our general concerns may become so segmented into specific concerns that we lose our sense of values or direction in the multiplicity of demands on our attention. These specific concerns do tend, however, to cluster around a few broad problems whose solutions are basic to the adequate provision of educational opportunities for rural people. Identification of these, and a brief exploration of their implications, may give helpful background for discussions of the more specific problems to follow. Four broad problem areas are here identified and explored.

The Teacher. The fundamental concern is with the need for better teaching, and with more and better teachers in order to get better teaching. Interpreting "teacher" to mean all professional persons needed to provide suitable educational opportunities, how can we assure an adequate supply of suitably qualified personnel to serve rural people and their communities?

The Student. What is the scope and the task of rural education in terms of the people to be served and their distinctive needs? The Charter of Education for Rural Children of 1944 set forth the rights of rural children as the *rights of all children*. How adequately are all rural children being served today? Is it enough to speak of children

and youth being served or should goals be set in terms of *all people* of a community? What is our "goal to go" in terms of the nature and quality of educational opportunity the schools serving rural people should strive to provide?

Implementation of Program. What facilities and administrative arrangements will make available to rural people educational opportunities adequate to their needs? How can the necessary resources be made available *where* they are needed and in ways that strengthen the abilities of people to cope successfully with their own problems, to play a major role in shaping their own destinies? How can leadership to accomplish this be strengthened?

The School in the Community. How can the inherent relatedness of school and community be made to function most fruitfully in the lives of rural people and their communities? What implications for the school in its community grow out of changing social and economic conditions which affect rural life?

Each of these areas of concern in providing educational opportunities for rural people impinges again and again on the others. The specific problems which each area encompasses cannot and will not be solved without references to the others. Yet clear thinking with respect to each of the four areas of responsibility can lead us toward better solutions of some of our most crucial problems.

THE TEACHER

One of the most baffling problems—in all areas and at all levels—arises from the persistent shortage of competent, qualified instructional personnel. As T. M. Stinnett pointed out, the Nation has been in a continuous period of short supply since the beginning of World War II.¹ And, it seems clear, we must consider the teacher shortage in full awareness of the valid turnover of teaching personnel and the great competition from many fields for all young people graduating from colleges. The need for teachers must be faced as a total community responsibility, since a parallel need is faced by other groups serving rural communities. Vernon Heath has given much thought to the teacher shortage and to the Nation's stake in finding satisfactory solutions to it. He had this to say of the problem:

¹Adapted from the address of T. M. Stinnett, Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, "Present Status of Personnel Needed."

The crisis facing the rural schools of the Nation is of special significance and importance, and will require more than a Herculean effort to solve. Approximately one-half of the children of school age, or nearly 15 million, live in the open country or in centers of less than 2500 population. Of that number more than 7.7 million live on farms.

More than one-half of the Nation's teachers are in rural schools. To meet the demand in the years ahead, it is estimated that as many as 125,000 additional elementary teachers must be recruited, not to mention the many thousands more who will be needed if we are to bring about a 30 to 1 pupil-teacher ratio in the rural classrooms of the Nation. Approximately 80 percent of the Nation's total teacher shortage is in the schools serving rural people.²

Mr. Heath believes it is the public's responsibility to see that our schools are staffed by an adequate number of competent teachers; that this is a major problem that the schools alone cannot solve. Too often, however, we show more concern over the dangers of soil erosion than we do over the human erosion that threatens us in many areas through the neglect of the education of our rural youth. . . . Unfortunately, educators have seemingly not been able successfully to tell laymen in realistic terms what damage results to a child's mind when there is poor instruction in the school or when an incompetent teacher is in the classroom, or for that matter, what penalties we must pay if these problems are not solved. . . . Until the consequences of the critical shortage of teachers can be explained to the public in this fashion, citizens probably will not be impressed by a mere statement of facts or the threat of a few closed classrooms.³

Many organizations and agencies, representing both professional and citizens groups at national, state, and local levels, are aware of the need for soundly conceived, vigorously administered programs of teacher recruitment. Many such programs have been instituted, most of them directed to the teacher shortage in general, some to the special need for teachers in rural areas. Illinois' ten-point program which Mr. Heath reported is illustrative of the broad and cooperative approach to the problem which many states are taking.⁴

Illinois' experience also reveals certain inequities operating at local levels which must be corrected if rural schools are to compete on a favorable basis for the services of competent teachers. How widely do these factors operate to the disadvantage of rural school children?

²Adapted from the address of Vernon L. Heath, Vice President, Illinois Chamber of Commerce. "The Nation's Stake in the Teacher Situation."

³*Ibid.*

See p. 236

—Many rural school districts do not have a salary schedule for teachers, most of the small districts still employing teachers on a bargaining basis, from year to year, with no guarantee of continuity of employment.

—About half of all the high school teachers are receiving higher salaries than grade school teachers with equal training and experience.

—There is a wide variation of salaries in the rural and city schools of the Nation. Beginning salaries in rural areas and in towns of 2500 population or less in many instances are six hundred dollars per year under those paid beginning teachers in schools of 2500 population and above. The spread is even more noticeable in the maximum salaries paid rural and city teachers.

—In several states that have a teacher tenure law, rural school teachers are not covered by its provisions. Thus city school teachers are assured continuous employment after having served the necessary period of probation, while rural teachers can count on employment only on a year to year basis, subject to whatever whim or handicap they may encounter in a small local situation.

—There are numerous cases where school boards of small school systems are hiring regular teachers as substitutes, knowing full well that these teachers will be working full time in regular positions. It is evident that this practice is followed not only for the specific purpose of keeping teachers off tenure or continuing contract but also for preventing teachers from being placed on the regular schedule that has been adopted in the district and that is provided for by legislative action.⁵

To these inequities are added other special problems of rural schools with respect to teacher supply and demand. Among the most serious is the fact that teachers in rural schools, in spite of considerable gains, are relatively poorly qualified. Many states permit teachers in small schools and rural areas to teach with lesser qualifications than those required in towns and cities.

How can we secure better-prepared teachers and at the same time increase the number of teachers? Ruth Stout, reporting from the experience of the Kansas Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, lists as one of three primary reasons for the teacher shortage low standards of preparation and certification which neither provide nor demand the preparation essential to the effective discharge of the responsibilities which confront today's teacher.⁶

Closely allied to the problem of recruitment are twin aspects of the problem of retention in teaching of persons qualified to teach. Mr. Stinnett reported, on the basis of data from 13 states, that 35 percent

⁵Adapted from the address of Vernon L. Heath, *op. cit.*

⁶Stout, Ruth. "High Standards—More Teachers." *Journal of the National Education Association* 43:507-508; November 1954.

of all those completing preparation for teaching take other jobs—do not go into teaching.⁷ To this Mr. Heath added the information that in 1953-54 more than 60,000 teachers, rural and urban, left the profession for one reason or another. Mr. Heath commented:

I know of no other profession where this mass exodus has occurred, where people have left a field in which they are highly trained to move into other jobs where they are essentially untrained. If this condition or exodus of workers prevailed in any business or any industry, we would have to conclude that there must be something wrong with both management and the company, the wages were not high enough and that other conditions within the company were not too good.⁸

The problem of adequate teacher supply, especially for schools serving rural children and youth, must be faced directly by every state and every community. In the past, some have benefited by advantageous positions among the states, or among communities within a state, with respect to salaries offered. As the reservoir of fully competent teachers available for employment diminishes, this becomes a decreasingly satisfactory method even to the advantaged situations. It has never been a satisfactory general solution of the problem. We have reached a time when every state should see that it is preparing enough teachers to meet its individual needs. It seems unreasonable that some states or communities should draw so heavily from the pool of available teachers without making an all-out effort to put back into that pool the same number of teachers that it withdraws.⁹

One way in which states help or hinder in both attracting and holding teachers is through their standards for teacher certification. Mr. Stinnett believes the mistake is often made of setting the standards too low in states having both a high proportion of substandard teachers and a considerable shortage.

If every state department of education would declare legally its concept of the beginning qualified teacher as one with at least the Bachelor's Degree of specific preparation for teaching, the situation would quickly right itself. If each state will clearly say that teachers with less preparation are sub-standard, that a qualified teacher shall have completed at least the Bachelor's Degree, the state has then declared its legal concept of the qualified teacher, and this will profoundly influence teacher supply. Such a policy says to young people that the state believes they must have a thorough scholarly university program to

⁷Adapted from the address of T. M. Stinnett, *op. cit.*

⁸Adapted from the address of Vernon L. Heath, *op. cit.*

⁹*Ibid.*

be qualified to teach. That tends to attract capable young people into education.¹⁰

But it is not enough that states take appropriate official action or that professional organizations work for the removal of serious inequities. The active and effective concern of individual citizens in their communities is required. Mr. Heath put his convictions in these words:

I feel that all of us from now on must work diligently at the grass-roots level to find out what conditions within our own communities are responsible for discouraging so many young people from entering the profession and encouraging so many others in leaving the profession. Our desire for better schools and better working conditions for our teachers must be something more pronounced than mere lip service. It must be so strong that we will be more than willing to pay the cost that a good system of public education demands.¹¹

The problem is not solely a matter of *enough* teachers; teachers "suitably qualified" are called for. Francis S. Chase suggested that all children, being in some degree or in some respect exceptional, are deserving of exceptional teachers. To get these good teachers in sufficient numbers we must exercise a quality of imagination we have not yet applied to the problem. We must make their education more exciting, more meaningful. They must be prepared, among other things, to be able to make full use of the rural environment as a laboratory for some of the richest learning experiences that can come to children.¹²

Glenn Kendall, in seeking a clear answer as to whether unique qualifications are to be required of the teachers of rural children and youth, accepted the thesis that schools should be concerned with the basic problems of helping people make the community a better place in which to live and to make a living.

If this premise and its implications are accepted, for the kinds of responsibilities involved in rural communities, teachers need—and in generous quantities—a rich understanding of people, with emphasis upon rural folks, and their aspirations; a deep respect for individuals; a vision of what can be accomplished through education; techniques for teaching and working with others;

¹⁰Informal statement during the discussion of Conference Assembly I by T. M. Stinnett, Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association.

¹¹Adapted from the address of Vernon L. Heath, *op. cit.*

¹²Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, Chairman, Department of Education, University of Chicago. "The Task Ahead in Achieving Equal Educational Opportunity for All."

interest in and understandings of rural life; and dedication to the job to be done in rural communities.

Successful teachers in rural communities have an understanding of each pupil, the kind of abilities he has, including the ability to learn, his physical condition, his interests, his emotional and social development, and his home and neighborhood environment. Successful teachers in rural communities have understandings and skills in developing and conserving natural resources. They know the cost of wasted lands, of absence of home gardens, of inferior livestock, of non-creative use of leisure time. They have a feeling of the practical problems of community living and they develop skills in ways in which the community becomes the laboratory for learning. Successful teachers in rural communities have learned good ways of helping people work together in a spirit of harmony and cooperation.¹³

How can these qualities be developed in teachers? Mr. Kendall offered this general guide. The teacher preparation institution itself must be concerned with the problems of the region it serves. And, along with the preservice education program, it must concern itself with teachers already on the job. In doing so, it will need to develop cooperative arrangements with many groups, based on the thesis that "all the agencies—local, college, and state—are involved in the educational program and that specialists should be identified and, insofar as possible, used where the need is greatest."¹⁴

There are obstacles to be overcome in developing such a program. For instance, the general pattern of education for college teachers does not usually include concern with community service experience. Yet gains are being made. Taking a long-range view of the curriculum of institutions which prepare teachers, Earl Armstrong believes that:

In the preparation of elementary teachers and secondary teachers for rural and urban positions, a greater emphasis has come to be placed on an understanding of community life; a greater and greater emphasis on the understanding of human beings, whether it is human beings in school or not in school, with such emphasis on the people in rural communities. The best teacher education programs that I know of across the country today are moving out of their campus schools for their student teaching programs, and the best ones are taking their students out into the smaller communities, because educational problems and community problems are a little more simple and easier to grasp.¹⁵

¹³Adapted from the address of Glenn Kendall, President, Chico State College, California. "Teachers for Rural Communities."

¹⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁵Informal statement during the discussion of Conference Assembly I by W. Earl Armstrong, Executive Director, National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education.

With this trend, Mr. Armstrong saw less need for a differentiated curriculum for rural teachers. E. L. Cole, reflecting the experience of Grambling College, indicated the belief that some special college training for rural teaching is needed and that this should include both the content courses and the professional courses.¹⁶ The Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers of the NEA Department of Rural Education takes the position that:

Certain problems and opportunities peculiar to rural schools justify differentiation in the professional preparation of rural teachers. The basis of rural education is not only in matters of external and technical administration. It lies also in the fact that people in rural farm and rural non-farm communities are subject to unique, identifiable, and describable environmental influences. These people have unique social and economic problems, and specific resources with which to work.¹⁷

Regardless of the viewpoint taken with respect to the degree of specialization needed in preparing rural teachers, it is clear that institutions involved in the preparation of teachers have both opportunity and responsibility for helping to insure that available teachers will be suitably qualified. Heads of such institutions, like other administrators, face special problems. Working in community projects is time consuming and exhausting and college teaching loads are already heavy. In some states "rural" lacks status and programs planned specifically for "rural" emphasis have difficulty in obtaining an adequate budget.

The need for suitably qualified teachers extends to the whole of the instructional and administrative force. Recognizing that the full achievement of educational rights for all rural children depends on the the availability of such personnel, the 1944 Charter of Education for Rural Children stated: *Every rural child has the right to teachers, supervisors, and administrators who know rural life and who are educated to deal effectively with the problems peculiar to rural schools.*

Insuring an adequate supply of suitably qualified teachers, administrators, and specialized personnel would challenge our best efforts, were we to set our goals merely in terms of prevailing circumstances. When we set these goals to take in *all* the rural children, youth and adults for whom the schools have responsibility, and when we bear in mind the growing demands which arise from a changing society

¹⁶Informal statement during the discussion of Conference Assembly I by E. L. Cole, Dean, Grambling College, Louisiana.

¹⁷National Education Association, Department of Rural Education. "A Competent Teacher for Every Rural Child." *Rural Education News*, Special Issue, April 1954. 4 pp.

and the expanding needs and wants of people, the challenge is almost staggering. Mr. Kendall's final word to the Conference is helpful and appropriate.

Such problems are not impossible of solution. The potentials of education in rural communities can be realized. But now, as in the past, both lay and professional people need to make it a higher priority than generally is done.¹⁸

THE STUDENT

Every rural child has the right to a satisfactory modern elementary and secondary education. This we declared in October 1944 and we pledged ourselves to work for the achievement of this right. To make doubly clear that we meant *every* rural child, we said these were his rights *regardless of Race, or Color, or Situation, wherever he may live.*

We also said that such a program bridges the gap between home and school and between school and adult life. We spoke of year-round educational services and guidance and full time attendance in a school that is open at least nine months in each year for at least 12 years. We mentioned a wide range of special services—health services, educational and vocational guidance and recreational activities among them. We further recognized the child's right through the school to participate in the community life and culture.

What is the challenge we face in the next decade in providing equality of educational opportunity for rural people? Progress along several lines was noted in the previous chapter. Is our concern merely to continue to work for the goals we accepted a decade ago, or must we now redefine our goals? Three key questions are involved: (1) How broad is our concern and our responsibility with respect to who is to be educated? (2) What are the needs of these students, in the light of the changing society and our growing understanding of that society and of learners? (3) What should be our concept of a "satisfactory modern educational program" for rural people in the face of these needs?

How Broad is Our Concern and Our Responsibility?

The Charter of Education for Rural Children set minimum goals in terms of a 12-year elementary-secondary program. The goals now accepted as desirable extend well beyond this. "Shall we consider that the rural school is less concerned with the totality of the population

¹⁸Adapted from the address of Glenn Kendall, *op. cit.*

than schools elsewhere? What shall be our concept for the next fifty years? We should assume that the rural school is concerned with all the people, not just be a day school for children aged 6 to 16."¹⁹ And rural schools *are* so concerned, for their leaders speak of kindergarten instruction in reorganized districts; the need to extend high school to include grades 13 and 14; the need for community colleges for rural areas; continuation schools for rural adults. And they ask about the chances of the rural child going to college.

These concerns provide many challenges for the years ahead. Francis Chase estimated that one in ten of the rural children who might reasonably be expected to attend kindergartens are doing so. This contrasts to nearly six in ten urban children attending kindergartens. Mr. Chase commented, "So far as this is a valuable part of education, of the socialization process . . . , it is denied to those already most disadvantaged in opportunities for learning and developing their full potential."²⁰

Similarly, rural areas enroll proportionately only one-third as many adults as do urban areas. The limited provision of community colleges and other community educational agencies to serve rural areas and the limited ability of rural youth to afford full college experience further illustrate the need. Again commenting, Mr. Chase said, "It is clear that here again a large segment of our population is denied the opportunity for the enrichment of life that adds so much to the fulfillment of the individual to which our society supposedly is committed." If we accept full initial opportunity and continuing re-education as essential, the challenge to provide equal opportunity is *formidable* indeed.

The rural people to be educated, now as in 1944, include various disadvantaged groups. In recording achievements of a decade, the previous chapter noted partial alleviation of neglect of these groups, but we were reminded that the problems are still extant. Many doors remain closed, we are told, for those who are born into families of low income or of meager culture, into families for whom, for one reason or another, opportunities are not available. One of the best means of opening more doors for such people is to provide a level of

¹⁹Statement made by Raymond W. Gregory, Special Assistant to the Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education, at one of the early planning meetings preparatory to the 1954 National Conference on Rural Education.

²⁰Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, *op. cit.*

education which will enable them to acquire the culture, the skills for vocational effectiveness, the ability to participate effectively in the making of public policy decisions. A first task must be to provide a decent minimum of education for the seriously disadvantaged children of low income and low social status groups. To do so is a matter of simple justice to help overcome the disadvantages suffered.²¹

Progress has also been made in identifying and providing needed services for another segment of the total group to be educated, the so-called exceptional children. These are the children who have marked educational needs: the physically handicapped, the socially and emotionally disturbed, the children with mental limitations or with intellectual and other talents. Rural situations present special problems in providing for these because, though total numbers are great, these children appear in any one school situation in limited numbers. "If we are to serve the large number of children in rural areas who have exceptional needs, we need to work together to find some new ways of doing it."²²

There is special need to keep an open road for the talented. In rural areas, as compared with urban, a small proportion of youth are enrolled in high schools and a much smaller proportion go to college. This means that there is a waste of talented manpower in rural areas for lack of educational opportunities. We need to be especially concerned with the upper 15 to 20 percent of ability, who, because of the paucity of cultural resources and opportunities for learning, do not always become identified.²³

What Are the Needs of These Students?

What are the real needs of all those we would now include as the responsibility of the schools in light of the demands set by our society and the nature of learners? What is now known about human development and the nature of learning tells us that, in a measure, each school and each classroom must be unique. Only thus can it meet the needs of the individuals it serves. But schools will also have much in common, because individuals have much in common and because society sets certain goals which we all share. What is to be individual about schools each must determine and develop in its own setting.

²¹*Ibid.* See also Chapter 7.

²²Informal statement during the discussion of Conference Assembly II by Romaine P. Mackie, Chief, Exceptional Children and Youth, U. S. Office of Education.

²³Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, *op. cit.*

Together, we may appropriately ask: What needs do rural people have in common, viewed in the setting of life in the United States and the World in this second half of the Twentieth Century?

Mr. Chase saw these needs as related to the demands of a free society. He challenged us to "a quality revolution in education."

If we were to make an equal division of the educational opportunities currently available, this would be less than adequate for our present needs. Therefore, to the familiar idea of *equality of opportunity*, we must add the concept of *adequacy of opportunity*. Only thus can we offer education adequate to sustain our freedoms and to attain our aspirations. Adequacy has several dimensions: Adequacy in the sense of enabling the individual to develop his full powers so that, in his own way, he may make his special contribution to our society; in the sense of developing the Nation's full potential of its human resources; in the sense of developing citizens who can make wise choices. The task of providing an education adequate to sustain our freedoms is the overall task which confronts all of us. It is of special concern in rural areas because the loss of potential human resources is greatest in the rural areas, greatest of all among our disadvantaged groups.²⁴

If we accept *adequacy* rather than *equality* as our goal, what is a satisfactory, modern educational program? The quality revolution which Mr. Chase called for means discarding the mass production model of education which moves learners along through standardized learning experiences at uniform rates. This method is not good enough to meet the needs of today. What is needed is a quality of teaching, a flexibility of grouping for experiences, which make possible sequence and continuity for the individual learner in the learning experiences provided.

Teaching of this kind and quality is not new but it is far too rare. What is needed is that it become universal. The administrative arrangements, the preservice preparation and inservice education of teachers, and the expectations which citizens, including educators, hold for their schools—all of these must be examined and, where necessary, revised with such a goal in view.

What special implications for a satisfactory program for rural children, youth and adults derive from the rurality of their living? The basic principle that instruction should be related to the experiences, needs and community life of the learner is well established. What does this principle mean with respect to *this child*—or *this youth* or *adult*—living *here, now, with this background of experience*, in a

²⁴*Ibid.*

society that is trying to achieve democracy? The answer to this question is something teachers must eternally seek to discover. And those who work with the schools so teachers may teach—the administrators, supervisors, specialists, and others—must help them to find adequate answers to that question for every learner.

For each rural learner the answers involve an understanding of what is meaningful in rural living both for what it has done to shape him and as a resource for further learning.²⁵ Because rural living is changing, and because it varies greatly in its external aspects, superficial aspects of experience will vary. What matters is that we identify whatever is fundamental and of enduring value in rural living and give it so vital a place in our educational programs that the whole society is enriched. And, because we are a mobile people, how we in rural schools educate each child is of concern to all citizens. In these facts lie not only our task but a great challenge.

IMPLEMENTING AN ADEQUATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The provision of facilities and the adoption of a functional pattern of administrative organization comprise another broad area about which many problems of rural education tend to cluster.

The vast educational program now required to serve the needs of the American people cannot be achieved unless adequate provisions are made to carry it on effectively in each locality throughout the Nation. Today we face the tremendous task of providing the corporate organization, the physical facilities, the personnel, and the financing necessary to make the educational program needed a reality. Our forefathers had the foresight and courage to set up a public school system to serve the educational needs of their day. Since that time men have struggled to change, adapt and improve these early provisions for education as the demands for more education have increased and as modern technology has changed our ways of living and earning a living. The rapidity of change has multiplied the need for reorganizing our school systems, constructing new buildings, and refinancing our schools. We must be courageous in adapting our public school system to meet new needs in education.²⁶

It is in the area of educational administration that perhaps the greatest changes have taken place in the past decade. Gains were noted

²⁵See Chapter 4: For a full discussion of the impact of the rural environment on children, see Dunn, Fannie W. *The Child in the Rural Environment*. Yearbook 1951, Department of Rural Education. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1951. 253pp.

²⁶Adapted from the address of Frank W. Cyr, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. "Making the Provisions Necessary to Implement an Adequate Educational Program."

in Chapter I with respect to financial status, reduction in number of school districts, expansion of pupil transportation, and the development of the intermediate unit of school services. Yet, despite the progress made, in each of these aspects of school organization and administration a great task lies ahead. And to these tasks must be added another—overcoming the tremendous shortage of suitable school buildings. How can we best direct our further efforts in the immediate future? What guides to desirable action have emerged from past experiences?

Mr. Cyr suggested three guiding principles: (1) Equality of educational opportunity, (2) democratic control, and (3) design adapted to the small community situation. In applying the principle of equality to the development of all provisions for education in rural areas, he has in mind, not absolute equality, but the elimination of the gross inequalities which now exist among local districts and among states, "inequalities which penalize the children of economically poor districts and at the same time prevent wealthier districts from making maximum progress."²⁷

The principle of democratic control must ever be applied to new situations and problems as they emerge. John K. Cox told of its being put to test in his own state. "The degree of success of the Illinois school reorganization program on a voluntary basis, depending upon local people making the moves after they know and have thoroughly discussed the alternatives, is an unmistakable proof that the democratic process works."²⁸ As we face new problems or plan new attacks on continuing problems, we must give thought to guarding and fostering this process. Democratic control "requires intelligent, active, and constructive participation by the people, within a structure which is capable of putting their desires for good education into effect."²⁹

How does the principle of design apply? We ask for a structure capable of putting the people's desires for good education into effect. What might such a structure be for a rural community? Are we, even now, dominated in our thinking by plans developed for city school systems? Mr. Cyr, believing that we are, emphasized that in considering provisions for implementing the educational program in small

²⁷*Ibid.*

²⁸Adapted from the address of John K. Cox, Secretary, General Services, Illinois Agricultural Association. "Rural Education Problems: Past and Present."

²⁹Adapted from the address of Frank W. Cyr. *op. cit.*

communities, we must recognize the size of the group to be served and approach the problems with open minds and creative imagination. The factors of sparsity and size of group cannot be ignored.³⁰

What general lines of action should our efforts to improve implementation of the educational program now take? With respect to the reorganization and strengthening of the administrative structure, action has gone forward on three levels: the local administrative unit, the intermediate superintendency and the state education department. For the most part, reorganization has been carried on at one level at a time. As we begin a new decade of effort, we see the need for more of an across-the-board approach, applying what Mr. Cyr called the *federation principle*. Following this principle, each level—local, intermediate, and state—would be assigned those functions it is especially fitted to perform. And, applying the principles of democratic action and equality of opportunity, all levels would be represented in determining at which levels the various functions can best be performed to insure adequate educational opportunities to all.

With respect to the provision of physical facilities, two basic problems challenge us: (1) to appropriately combine the financial resources of localities, individual states and the Federal government in overcoming the building shortage without endangering the support of the educational program itself; and (2) to plan functional buildings adapted to the needs and circumstances of small communities. The planning of functional buildings requires consideration of unique characteristics of the school for a small community, including its relationships with the community.³¹

In the matter of pupil transportation the task ahead is largely one of continuing to move toward the accepted goals of *safety*, *economy*, and *adequacy*.

With respect to financing an adequate educational program, "adequacy" is perhaps the key word. Thinking of the call for a quality revolution, we note the estimate that the school budget for current expenditures must be increased from seven to twelve billion dollars to provide an adequate educational program.³² Equalization has not yet been achieved, let alone adequacy. Two items identifying inequities are noteworthy. The cost of transportation, about a quarter

³⁰*Ibid.*

³¹*Ibid.* See also Chapter 9; also Jenson, T. J., "Use of School Buildings for Activities other than Instruction."

³²*Ibid.*

of a billion dollars annually, is included in rural expenditures in comparing the proportion of money spent for public schools in rural areas with the proportion of rural children. Hence, funds available for teachers salaries and expanded educational services are not yet in balance as between urban and rural children and youth. Also there is the special problem of providing and financing services to children of migratory workers. "This is, in some cases, as serious a burden to the states and the local school units as are impacted areas for which Federal aid is available. Yet there is no help with this problem."³³

Facing these unfinished tasks in ways that strengthen the abilities of people to cope successfully with their own problems requires special qualities of leadership. Persons with administrative responsibility and authority have special need to understand what the principle of democratic control means in the day to day planning and operation of school programs. Increasingly we see that the best answers to even our most nettlesome problems may be reached through enabling the people affected to know the facts, the possibilities, the alternatives, and to share in making the decisions.

Courageous leadership is called for. Shirley Cooper, reviewing the "unfinished business" in his interpretation of the 1954 Conference, says:

Educational leadership in many rural communities lacks courage and initiative. It lags behind the expectations of the lay citizenry who should look to it for stimulation and counsel. In far too many instances it waits to be pushed or driven by legislative enactments or minimum standards rather than stepping out boldly into the stream of competitive community life. It is too often content with a meager half-loaf for the pupils and teachers, for the schools, for the community's educational program, rather than courageously contending for the schools that are needed and the rightful share of community and state resources.³⁴

THE SCHOOL IN THE COMMUNITY

The school in the United States has been established by the people to perform an important part of the task of educating each new generation, in order that each person can find or make his appropriate place

³³Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, *op. cit.*

³⁴Adapted from the address of Shirley Cooper, Associate Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association. "One Man's Interpretation." Available from the Department of Rural Education, N.E.A.

in the society. In early days the American public school carried a limited and rather specialized responsibility, chiefly for the 3 R's; the important job of educating youth for his role of making a living and being a good, upright citizen was carried on in the home and the community. As the Nation grew and the economy became more complex, it seemed necessary for more and more of this second phase of education to be carried on by the school. The purpose of such education continued, in theory at least, to be preparation for life in the community, the society. There is, therefore, an inherent relatedness of school and community which is fundamental to the effective functioning of both institutions in American life.

Attainment of the full potentiality of this relatedness of school and community lies almost entirely in the future. Only here and there have we achieved a true *community school* in the fullest sense. Too often the school is *in* the community but not *of* it; "school and community" too often emphasizes divisiveness rather than unity. It is as though we regarded schooling as a world of its own, without organic relationships to the life around it. Schools depend too exclusively on the ideal of good teaching in limited fields—such areas as reading, writing, arithmetic, history, geography, and so forth—without making these meaningful from or relating them to the vital life experiences of those we teach.

We need to recognize, from the viewpoint of the school, the untapped resources in every community, and especially the rural community, that would give the school "an enrichment and a quality that many teachers and communities and children have not yet had the opportunity to experience."³⁵

What are these resources? What are the relationships of school with community which will help us to tap these resources, to begin to use them more fully and wisely? Mr. Goslin identified three areas of relationship: (1) the relationship between the school—its content, program, policies, procedures—and our American system of freedom and democracy as represented by our institutions and ideals; (2) the relationship of the school to the land—the soil, the moisture, the forest, the ground covering, the minerals, and so forth; and (3) the relationship between the school and the community—to the economic

³⁵Adapted from the address of Willard E. Goslin, Chairman, Division of School Administration and Community Leadership, George Peabody College for Teachers. "The School in the Community—An Educator's Viewpoint."

flow and development and welfare of the community, the development of constructive social activities for individuals and groups of individuals.

Within these broad areas of school-community relationships lies the source of much of the significant content for learning which the schools need to take hold of and use.

Exploring education's stake in the relationship of the school to the historic national community, Mr. Goslin suggested:

The rural school is in a particularly advantageous position to offer the needed learnings to both children and adults—to children in need of the cultivation of initial understanding and habits, to adults in need of recultivation and orientation in terms of the changing needs of our concepts and institutions and freedoms in these times. Rural schools in America—farm, village and small town—are closer to more of the important things out of which we built this land, its institutions and its ideals, than any other set of schools in this country. We happen to be at a period when guidance and inspiration and help are needed, not alone for rural education and the work it has yet to do, but for the whole of American education and American life.³⁶

The relationship of the school to the land is at the very heart of life and education in the rural community. To keep education from being "academic, theoretical, floating around in the misty blue," is to root it in the realities of the community where the education is taking place. A part of this reality for a rural school is to root it in terms of the resources that underwrite not only the school, but also the people the school serves. A rural school cannot come close to meeting its responsibility if it is not realistically attuned to, aware of, and a part of what is happening to the soil of the area where the school is located. If problems with respect to the land and its use are to be faced in that area, the schools should have a share in facing them, if for no other reason than to provide a forum where new understandings and new techniques and procedures can be brought to the awareness of the whole community.³⁷

What sorts of problems with respect to the land may need to be faced in our various communities? How can the facing of them be made an appropriate and meaningful part of the life of the rural school in its community? What is the significance of these kinds of learning experiences for persons who remain in rural communities?

³⁶*Ibid.*

³⁷*Ibid.*

For those who move to urban centers? These are questions to challenge our best thinking *and doing*.

The third area of relationships between school and community is broad and often hard to take hold of in meaningful ways. Mr. Goslin pointed to a very great challenge when he identified "our desperate need, in education, for sociologists and others to help us understand what some of the handholds are on a community; how to take hold of them and get to work with them."³⁸ Without awaiting full identification of these handholds, we are challenged to identify the basic problems of rural life—the problems that are pushing people, about which they make their decisions. We are then challenged to understand what these problems mean for the curriculum of the school and, as we come to understand, putting it into practice.

We face another challenge—a sometimes nebulous and always difficult one. It is the challenge to understand the significance of the community itself—particularly the small community—to the life of individual citizens and the Nation; and to examine and clarify our responsibilities toward communities in light of such understanding.

Griscom Morgan suggested that the small community is vitally important; he questioned whether civilization itself could long survive the disappearance of small community life.

The community values which all people require for wholesome living are universal values, not limited to rural areas or any one Nation. . . . Both children and adults have vital need for the community as an area of life in which the intimate group shall have mastery over its affairs. To survive, the community must be cared for and loved for its own sake, as the family or Nation is loved and cared for. It must be a self-respecting, self-existing institution, managing its own local affairs in its own way, as does a mature family.³⁹

We cannot dismiss lightly the implications of this viewpoint for, willy-nilly, whether we realize it or not, we do *change* communities by what we do, by the decisions we make. Mr. Goslin illustrated this fact by referring to the tremendous expansion of school transportation in the past decade.

Transport children to and from school, do this for one generation, and you will have remade an American community. You will change the contacts socially, economically, religiously and perhaps even politically. Few changes

³⁸*Ibid.*

³⁹Adapted from the address of Griscom Morgan, Community Services, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio. "The School in the Community—A Community Leader's Viewpoint."

could be more basic than what is happening to the American people in the regrouping of their community lives under the impact of the transportation system.

As workers in education and rural life we need to take a deep-seated student's attitude toward such development. We need research so that we can have at our disposal some of the best insights as to what changes mean in American life and in the content and procedures in American school systems.⁴⁰

Experiences such as that described by Millard Pond, in which groups of citizens and educational workers in school districts take a look at their communities and their educational programs, are helpful. Each of these groups has set out, first, to describe the characteristics of what the group thinks their community might be and then to try to determine what the educational program ought to be. It is not an easy process, but progress is made.⁴¹

Another very serious challenge must be faced. The kind of school-community program here outlined implies teaching staffs who understand and know how to implement that kind of education. What next steps can we take to get the appropriate kind of teacher preparation?

This brings us full circle, returning us to *The Teacher*, with whom we started our exploration of major areas of challenge to our efforts in the decades ahead. As we turn now to more specific aspects of the job to be done, perhaps the greatest challenge of all is that we keep in perspective each phase of the great overall goal which is the broad concern of rural education—the goal of *adequate* as well as *equal* opportunity.

⁴⁰Adapted from the address of Willard E. Goslin, *op. cit.*

⁴¹Informal statement during the discussion of Conference Assembly IV by Millard Z. Pond, Project Coordinator for CPEA, Ohio State University.

The School as a Community Institution

AMERICA is made up of many communities, large and small. Communities are different; each has a certain degree of individuality. But despite these differences, it is within each community that the concerns of people for the welfare of each other and their willingness to share in the cooperative solution of vital problems give meaning to the democratic process.

The school is a part of the community. It is an institution established to fulfill one of the specialized services that every community needs to provide. The school shares with all other community institutions, organizations and agencies the responsibility for the solution of community problems and for learning how to work together for the common good of all. An understanding and appreciation of some of the characteristics of our rural communities is necessary for an understanding of the place of the school in this network of relationships and social structures which we call community.

THE RURAL COMMUNITY

It is not the purpose of this report to make a detailed sociological analysis of the components which go to make up a community. Our focus here is primarily upon the ideas, the feelings and the beliefs which the dairy farmer or the superintendents of the canning factory or the telephone lineman express when they refer to *my community*.

People generally take "community" for granted. It just is. But everyone has some feeling about it. Not the kind of feeling that comes from objective analysis, but a feeling which expresses the composite of their impressions and experiences as interpreted by their personal values. The range of these understandings is perhaps even more broad than the range of the differing concepts developed by students of community. It is with these people and these ideas, however, that community leaders must work.

Despite these varying conceptions, however, there are some common elements, uncomplicated by physical differences, which can be identified.

Communities have locality. Although its boundaries may be uncertain and elusive, the center of it will be tied to a location. Every rural community has two interdependent parts—a relatively self-sufficient multiple-service center of population (town, village, or small city) and the people living in the surrounding area who use its facilities and services regularly.

Communities are more than people and place. They are a complex of human relationships. Morgan emphasized that the community is more than "simply the location of largely unrelated activities and institutions, such as school, church, and business. It must be a self-respecting, self-existing institution, managing its own local affairs in its own way."¹

Communities have institutions. For any population center to provide the required goods and services, it must have an adequate set of institutions, organizations, and agencies to keep the community framework secure. In addition to the family, community institutions center about political, economic, educational and religious activities.²

Communities have common interests. The community provides its people an opportunity to come together, plan together and act together. The community gives opportunity for the development of a feeling of belonging, of a high degree of loyalty of people for each other. Cohesion is measured by the sharing of common services, the feeling of relatedness, and the extent of common endeavor.

Communities are dynamic. They continuously feel and are affected by the pressures which come with the passage of time. Goslin stated that "one of our limitations is perhaps a static concept of the word *community*. It would be difficult in a changing culture to put your finger on anything that is more subject to change than the American community in our time."³ Many places which once could have been

¹Adapted from the address of Griscom Morgan, Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio. "The School in the Community—A Community Leader's Viewpoint." See page 275.

²For a detailed analysis of American institutions, their variations and interrelationships, see Williams, Robin M., Jr. *American Society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. 345 pp.

³From the address of Willard E. Goslin, Chairman, Division of School Administration and Community Leadership, George Peabody College for Teachers. "The School in the Community—An Educator's Viewpoint." See p. 270.

classed as communities no longer qualify as such today. General changes identified by Bertrand include (1) the increasing centralization of social institutions, and (2) the increasing multiplicity of special-interest groups.⁴

Although this description of some of the characteristics of rural communities is over-simplified and incomplete, it does represent to some extent the kind of context within which schools function.

THE SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY

Education is identified in the preceding section as one of the areas of community activity about which institutions and other groups are established. It is generally recognized that education in a community is not limited to a single institution, the school. But the school, having education as its primary function, is here the focus of discussion. Other educational programs are discussed in a later section of this report.⁵

Regardless of its program of activities, its emphasis or its leadership, the school is a community institution. These factors do determine, however, the extent to which the school functions harmoniously in the total complex of community activity and actually contributes constructively to a mutual support of other social structures.

School and Community vs. School Districts

Any consideration of the relationships of school and community is complicated by the existing pattern of school organization within each state. School districts very often have little relationship to community boundaries. This not only makes it difficult for the school to really serve as an instrument for community processes, but also impedes the natural flow of activity.

In states where organization is on the common school district basis, there are many instances where the school district is only a small part of an actual community. Numerous small one-, two- and three-teacher schools serving only a single neighborhood are also the basis for school districts. In these instances school organization tends to divide community ties.

⁴Adapted from the address of Alvin L. Bertrand, Associate Professor of Rural Sociology, Louisiana State University. "Cultural Changes in American Rural Life." See page 310-311.

⁵See Chapter 16, "The School and the Educational Programs of Other Agencies."

In certain other states the schools are organized in a manner which makes the county the basic administrative unit. Most of these counties include several identifiable communities. But direct responsibility for managing an important social function is removed beyond the grasp of each single community. Except where county administration provides a structure giving each community some individual responsibility, this type of district organization tends to weaken community by taking "away" one of its functions.

When school district boundaries are limited to straight lines or contained within village, town or township or county boundaries, relationship to the boundaries of social interaction, of community, is in most instances substantially lessened.

Community School Districts

Many educational leaders, particularly in regard to the reorganization of school districts, have long advocated the establishment of "community school districts" for which boundaries would correspond as nearly as possible to the area within which a major portion of the social interaction of a group of people is carried on. Such districts take advantage of the patterns of association and lines of communication already established.

The full impact of school district reorganization upon community life and community solidarity has not yet been determined. It is significant, however, that an increasing number of reorganized districts have completely disregarded political boundary lines in order to take advantage of the boundaries of social interaction.⁶ Community leaders generally recognize the importance of having school organization close enough to the people in each community for them to develop a strong personal interest in its welfare and to actively participate in its program. Community school districts should contribute to community cohesion . . . toward making communities strong.

The Leadership Role of the School

Most educational leaders recognize that the responsibilities of the schools are something more than the kinds of activities that can be carried on within the "schoolhouse." Frequently this desire to serve

⁶See Fitzwater, C. O. *Selected Characteristics of Reorganized School Districts*. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Bulletin 1953, No. 3. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. p. 15.

the community finds expression in the development of some kind of community improvement program—making the school a community center, establishing adult courses, providing recreation programs, improving an understanding of the economy, improving health and sanitary conditions, and other types of programs which are conceived to inspire the community and in other ways contribute to the achievement of the "good life." Such programs often become school goals. Administrators and teachers frequently become devoted to these objectives which when accomplished can result in a better community for all citizens.

But desirable as such objectives may be and however substantial the actual improvements are, community goals cannot be determined by the school alone. Too often the well-intentioned efforts of educational leaders place the school in the center of community development activities. The school is an integral part of the community—not something apart from it.

Community development depends upon the coordination of the many social, educational, and economic organizations which share responsibility. The leadership the school exerts should not be that of setting its own independent goals for community change but rather that of an institution arriving at its goals cooperatively with other community organizations and agencies and having their understanding and support. Only then is the school an integral part of the community in both planning and process.⁷

THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL

The major function of every school is that of providing an educational program. It has already been indicated that the relationship of a school to its community is affected by the degree to which school organization corresponds to natural community boundaries and the concept of its leadership role which the school assumes. Of even greater importance, however, to the development of a *community school* is the nature of the educational program provided.

A school is a community school to the extent that it derives its program from the problems of the people whom the school serves and draws upon all of the resources available in attempts to solve them. Goslin gave emphasis to the importance of schools which realistically

⁷See Kreitlow, Burton W. *Rural Education: Community Backgrounds*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. pp. 163-67.

relate curriculum and activity to the area in which the school is located. He indicated three areas of relationships which must be developed and exist at a high order if the schools in rural America are to meet the responsibilities to their communities, the Nation, and the world. These were identified as: (1) a relationship between the school and our system of freedom and democracy, (2) a relationship between the school and its environment, the land in all of its aspects, and (3) a relationship between the school and the economic flow and development and welfare of its community.⁸

Effective learning is meaningful, not abstract. The schools of rural communities, because of the relative ease by which intimate acquaintance and mutual endeavor are or could be realized, have a unique opportunity to develop into *community schools*. These schools serve as the center for many community activities and use these same activities as the core about which learning activities revolve. Rural schools and rural education are distinctive and meaningful to the extent to which they are tailor-made on a community by community basis. It is the responsibility of all who are interested in the educational well-being of rural people to help these community schools emerge.

CONCLUSION

The school as a community institution is more than a matter of organization and financing or a collection of buildings, teachers and pupils. Its place in the community is that which all of the people, including its own leadership, conceive it to be. It should be an integral part of all community activity.

The school does not always reflect the "ideal characteristics" which have been ascribed to it here. Achieving them would seem to be the task ahead for all community leaders. Such a challenge was outlined by Morgan:

Education of children and adults was once an integral part of community life. As formal schooling became an increasingly specialized activity, it has tended to institutionalize education away from direct relationship with the community. Education has become primarily the responsibility of administrators and teachers, to a much less extent of the parents, and almost not at all of the community as such.

As the nature of communities has changed, we have too often tried to solve educational problems as though schooling was a world of its own, without long and organic relations with society as a whole. The problem is to determine

⁸Adapted from the address of Willard E. Goslin, *op. cit.*

how the underlying life of the small community is to find expression in a world of large governmental and economic affairs, and of extreme mobility and interrelatedness of people, of population centers and of economics. It cannot be solved except by seeing life as a whole and by treating education, not as an independent interest, but as one of the interweaving threads in the whole seamless fabric of society.⁹

People in rural communities need somehow to discover means for using technological advances to build and strengthen their communities, not disintegrate them. The school as a community institution can assist. It has some responsibility. Its achievements might well be measured by the extent to which the combined efforts of people can develop what might truly be called a community school. The successful development of a community school is a test for all community leaders. But the reward is a realization of the close interdependency of school and community. The more closely allied they become, the stronger each is made to meet whatever challenge it is called upon to face. For good schools make good communities.

⁹Adapted from the address of Griscom Morgan, *op. cit.*



The Rural Environment's Distinctive Impact on Children and Youth

DURING the 1944 White House Conference on Rural Education, Fannie Dunn spoke into being a profound conception of a sound basic philosophy of rural education and the kind of opportunities the program should provide for youth.

If we accept these three principles—*the child growing up in the community as the center of the educational effort; active experience as the means; improvement of present living as the test and the immediate purpose*—rural education must be distinctive, because the community, the present living, the opportunities for active experience, are rural. The rural child's development must be rooted in the soil. His present needs and problems will be what they are because of the interrelationships of his life and those of the rural community. His first hand experiences will be those which rural life affords.¹

It is recognized that many statements of educational principles and goals have been advanced but the above appears to furnish anchorage in this discussion of the rural environment's impact on children and youth.

With such a philosophy as a foundation and possessing a basic understanding of the way children learn, grow, and develop, the teacher can and does set about to create situations and experiences that hold rich promise for each learner entrusted to his care. As growth and development occur and the progressive stages of growth and development are reached, the learner becomes more and more the emerging, developing personality he should become in light of his capacity, interests, and abilities.

¹Adapted from the address of Fannie W. Dunn, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, and presented at the White House Conference on Rural Education, Washington, D. C., October 1944. "The Education of Rural Children and Youth."

It should be recognized however, that each child has his own unique environment and that environment is not what the casual observer might describe it to be. Growth-encouraging environments can be provided only if we understand that which each child is able to choose and use from the wealth of potential resources about him. It is a temptation to assume that the potential values of a rural environment are fully utilized, but experience tells us that this is not necessarily so.

NATURE OF THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT

It is difficult and dangerous to generalize about the influence of the rural environment for conditions vary greatly from country to country, state to state, and even from one farm to its nearest neighbor. The prosperous dairy farmer in Wisconsin or New York have little in common with the Alabama sharecropper, beyond the fact that neither lives in the city. Nor does the well paid worker in a branch plant of a large industry, recently located near a small rural village, have much in common with the farm laborer who may be his next door neighbor. In essence, there are wide differences in occupations, standards and values, and the general way of life among the people who make up our rural population.

That environments vary considerably is well known. That the same or identical environments may affect individuals in different ways has not always received due consideration in recent literature. This concern was expressed by Anne Hoppock when she reported the following:

Two children I know well illustrate the unique impact of similar environments. These two ten-year-olds are cousins. Their families live in neighboring farm houses. The fathers rent their fields to nearby farmers and make a living as mechanics. A garden, a cow, and a few hens supplement the family resources. Both sets of parents are high school graduates and live fairly comfortably but with few luxuries. They spend a good bit of time together. The children walk a mile to the little school in the village.

Jane lives zestfully. She has a dog which she cares for faithfully, and with it roams the countryside. She is writing a book and consults gravely regarding her writing problems with a young teacher who lives in the neighborhood. She is intensely interested in plant and animal life and has a number of collections including several live animals. She collects rocks and Indian artifacts. She is an inveterate researcher into the meanings of her out-of-door experiences. In pursuing her various interests, she exhausts available printed material at home and school, asks questions of everyone who might have information, and writes to the county agricultural agent, the U. S. Department

of Agriculture, and other organizations and agencies. Jane swims, picnics, and sings in the children's choir in the church in a nearby town.

Jane's cousin Carol, also ten, is quite different in her interests and her approach to living. She is an avid comic book reader, is interested in clothing and beginning to experiment with cosmetics. She makes half-hearted attempts to keep up to Jane's pace but seldom follows through on projects they start cooperatively. She evidences little curiosity. She putters around the house; is indoors more than out.

Obviously, we cannot generalize about the influence of the rural environment on child development. Jane and Carol seemingly live in the same rural environment, go to the same school, roam the same fields and woods and streams under the same sky. But even this superficial description indicates that the two children are learning different values and interests; their lives are taking different directions. I cannot accurately account for this. This we do know, however. The appropriations a country child makes from the experiences available in his environment, and how these appropriations affect his growth and development depend upon many factors.²

BASIS FOR GENERALIZATION

Realizing the many dangers and limitations inherent in making generalizations about the rural environment, it is possible to go to a basic source of sociological data, the reports of the Bureau of the Census, and discover some important facts from which certain qualified generalizations may be drawn.

(1) There were 54 and one-quarter million rural people in the United States in 1950, comprising 36 percent of the total population. There is no question but that the rural proportion of the population declined somewhat between 1940 and 1950. Within the rural population there was a great difference between the growth pattern of farm and non-farm areas.

(2) Several factors have combined to draw millions of people away from the farms. Military service, the great expansion of industrial activity, the extension of industrial plants into rural areas, the rapid mechanization of agriculture, and major improvements in yields for many crops have each played a part in influencing nearly 9 million people to move off the farm, or at least to abandon agriculture, in the 1940's. From a 1940 level of 30 million, the rural farm population declined to 25 million by 1950, and today is but a little more than 21 and a half million—all this without a decline in agricultural production.

(3) The rural non-farm population has greatly expanded. It would appear to have grown by at least 35 to 40 percent during the 1940's, and more than 10 per cent since then. In general the increase has been especially large around

²From the address of Anne S. Hoppock, Assistant Director of Elementary Education, New Jersey State Department of Education. "The Elementary School Child in the Rural Environment."

the periphery of urban centers. The farm to non-farm shift in the rural population has proceeded so rapidly that the farm population which, less than 15 years ago comprised 55 to 60 per cent of the rural population now constitutes less than 40 per cent.

(4) In the aggregate, the total rural population is growing and should continue to grow. The most rapidly growing segment of this population is children of school and preschool age. In each year since 1946 there have been more births than the population analysts just the year before had predicted there would be. There will be about 4 million births in the United States this year as compared with 2.5 million in the years just before the war.

(5) Rural families, on the average, tend to have much lower incomes than those living in urban areas. Thirty-six and nine tenths percent of rural non-farm families had an annual cash income of less than \$2000 in 1950. Fifty-six percent of the farm families had a cash income of less than \$2000. Of those persons who live on the Nation's five and one-half million farms, 35 percent derive their income from sources other than farming.³

These data could well serve as the basis for certain generalizations. The rural farm population is decreasing despite the tremendous growth of our total population. The migratory movement is in part due to the changes in agricultural methods. Fewer workers are needed as the use of machinery increases. Similarly, the number of producing farms is decreasing since technological and scientific improvements have made it possible for a greatly reduced number of farms to produce the goods that our economy demands.

The rural non-farm population is increasing. Many small villages and their environs are growing rapidly as small industry, some of them branch plants built by large corporations, are locating in rural areas. Another factor in the growth of rural non-farm population is the trend toward the rapid expansion of suburban areas. While these areas are not officially classed as rural, they are in many cases actual farming areas which have experienced a large influx of people from nearby cities.⁴

Many of the people living in rural areas are "disadvantaged." Their income is considerably below the level which makes it possible for

³All statistical data are drawn from U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1953*. Seventy-fourth edition. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953.

⁴Rural population as used in the census data no longer includes the suburban fringe of large cities, nor unincorporated towns such as those characteristic of mining and textile areas. The resulting definition of rural as the population living outside of places of 2500 inhabitants and beyond the built-up fringe of large cities is a much cleaner one. It handicaps analysis of historical trends, however, since it cannot be applied to past censuses.

them to maintain a relatively acceptable standard of living. Their opportunities for cultural growth are extremely limited, and their educational opportunities are far below that of both urban centers and the more fortunate rural areas in spite of tremendous growth of improved school district organization, improved support, and rapidly growing professional leadership.⁵

Presently about half of the farm children leave the farm upon reaching maturity. Even if the size of the farm population should stabilize, the farm birth rate is sufficiently high at its current level that only about three-fourths of the farm boys will be needed to replace those presently engaged in agriculture. The obvious conclusion is that for many farm youth, their ability to enter the labor force in a skilled remunerative job is dependent upon the preparation they receive in their schools for non-farm employment.

To persons having a philosophy of life which recognizes the romance and beauty and wholesomeness of rural life, the decline in the farm population and its increasing dependence on urban modes of employment may be cause for lament. But there seems to be no prospect in the foreseeable future of a reversal in the current trend.

Briefly then, it would seem that farming is becoming less and less a way of life for more and more of the total rural population. We may expect an increasing number of rural people to be engaged in various aspects of industrial life, other than farming, if the decentralization of industry continues. At the same time we are faced with the fact that proportionately, the rural areas of this country are poor in wealth and rich in numbers of children. On a regional basis, it can be said that "where the kids are, the money ain't." And finally, we may expect the suburban population of our more populous industrial states to continue to grow. These trends are already well known to most rural leaders.

CHILDREN IN THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT

It has been emphasized that in view of the wide differences existing among children and among rural environments in the various regions and sections of this country, it is difficult to discuss rural children in generalizations. There are, however, certain conditions which pervade almost all rural areas and which rural children can be expected to experience in common.

⁵See Chapter 7, "Education for Disadvantaged Groups."

Children in rural areas live close to nature and have virtually unlimited opportunities for observing nature. We must ask ourselves, "What is the effect on growth and development of the country child's closeness to nature and natural phenomena? Whether they live on a farm or in a small rural village, they are usually free to roam through fields and woods, to explore creeks and rivers, and to engage in vigorous out-of-doors activities. They are in daily contact with growing, living plants and animals. The rural child, unless over-protected, is face to face with reality. He observes that life comes from life and in turn produces life. He sees the strong prey upon the weak, but realizes that life goes on and that nature's balance is maintained unless upset by man. As he lives near nature, the country child can derive fundamental meanings from the turning of the earth and the changing of the seasons. He lives in a great scientific laboratory.

In his explorations of his environment he is at best very much in time with his universe. He may be grubby and tousled of hair, but he has distance in his eyes, wings on his feet, and stardust in his hair.⁶

Rural children have unique opportunities for responsible participation in the enterprises of family living. We must again ask ourselves "How can we assess the affects of family participation and responsibility on development?" Usually there are several children in the rural family and there is much work to be done both indoors and out, whether it be a farm or non-farm home. In such families, children accept responsibility for the care of younger children and pets, domestic tasks, weeding and cultivating gardens, barn chores, care of lawns and flower beds, the gathering of eggs or the feeding of young stock, and many other important chores which contribute to family welfare. Children have opportunity to acquire many desirable attitudes as they become functioning members of a working unit. A feeling of family solidarity is a most desirable outcome. Even though the child makes but a small contribution through his efforts, he is developing a sense of responsibility and a sense of pride and personal worth which comes with doing work that his family considers essential. He is also acquiring skill in working with others on cooperative projects, and is well along the road toward becoming a good citizen of his community.

Children in most rural areas have opportunity to participate in many community activities. A sense of neighborliness is characteristic of

⁶From the address of Anne S. Hoppock, *op. cit.*

rural America. Rural people make it a point to know their neighbors, to offer a helping hand where needed, and to join with their neighbors in promoting community welfare. Young people are welcomed into these groups and made to feel an important part of the many activities carried on by 4-H Clubs, Grange organizations, church groups and organizations sponsored by their schools. In this friendly, face-to-face atmosphere, rural youth learn the fundamental concepts of democratic citizenship.

EDUCATION FOR RURAL LIVING

Education for rural children today and tomorrow must be much wider in scope than the traditional school curriculum. It must go beyond the "3 R's", a little history, and geography. It must include a broad program of modern science, the arts and music, technical education, and guidance in the appreciation, enjoyment, and utilization of the advantages of the rural environment. It must include specific instruction directed toward the development of economic competency for all rural youth—for those who farm, those who go to the city, and those who remain in the country to engage in a wide variety of industrial activities. And it must work toward the development of those knowledges, skills and attitudes which will make good citizens of all the children who grow up in rural areas.

But we are not yet fully utilizing the potential values of the rural environment.

Look, for example, at the farm youngster who rises before dawn, has his breakfast very early, helps with the chores, walks a distance to the bus, rides another distance to school, eats cold sandwiches for lunch (perhaps six hours after his breakfast) studies how the Egyptians built the pyramids and why some nouns are in the objective case. When he leaves school, he reverses his morning marathon—with perhaps homework added. . . . Such lack of time is not the only reason why some country children cannot benefit from happy experiences in the out-of-doors. It is unhappily true that some country children, particularly girls, do not have the skills and awareness to enjoy these pursuits. One has only to drive through the countryside on a Sunday afternoon to see children alone or in small groups, just "hanging around," looking bored and lonely. I live within comfortable driving distance of three state parks with outdoor cooking facilities, hiking trails, fishing streams, and overnight camping privileges. It is, by and large, people from the cities and their children who fill these parks on weekends.⁷

It would seem, then, that one important educational need of rural children is a school program which helps them to recognize and utilize

⁷*Ibid.*

the potential values in their environment. They need school sponsored experiences in hiking, camping, picnicing, swimming and other outdoor activities which will help them to realize the possibilities about them. They need a school program that will teach them how to improve their environment, through such activities as conservation programs and the beautification of grounds, and to derive satisfaction and enjoyment from the task.

Older children, in particular, need other school sponsored recreational activities which will help them to develop a desirable social life. Attendance and participation in community dances, school plays, basketball and other sports, all will tend to make the local community, rather than the nearest city, the center of social life. Such participation in company with adults should do much to help young people develop healthy personalities.

Rural young people need an education that will help them to develop economic competency. As previously noted, the general level of income in rural areas is considerably below that of urban areas. Our rural high schools must provide a program which meets the needs of those children who will not farm but who must seek other jobs. This means that a variety of vocational courses must receive increasing emphasis. It is highly probable that the move to decentralize industry will continue, and it is likely that industries will locate in those rural areas which have a trained labor supply available.

Meeting these educational needs of rural children and youth will involve increased expenditures. A number of our rural areas, particularly in the South, are in dire need of funds and local sources are no longer adequate. It is apparent that some new sources of income for many school districts must be found.

Country schools spend less per pupil, have inferior equipment and buildings, and in far too many cases are forced, by inability to pay good salaries, to employ emergency teachers. Although there are numerous and outstanding exceptions to this general condition, we must face up to the fact that a great many of our country children are denied equality of educational opportunity. We must recognize, too, that the city itself tends to benefit from the well educated country youth who finds his life work in the urban center. The life blood of our municipal centers flows in from the open country.

CONCLUSION

The basic needs of children as well as the broad purposes of education are fundamentally the same regardless of where children go to school. But because *active experience is the means of improvement of present living* and because the *experiences are unique in rural areas*, *rural education must be distinctive if the school is to be vital, creative and meaningful.*

The rural environment offers much that can and does enrich the lives of children. What is needed is the wise guidance of children and youth by adults—in the home and in the school—who understand and appreciate the beautiful richness of rural life and feel the challenge of living in harmony with America's rural environment.

Social and Economic Changes in Rural Life

THE school is a community institution and should be a part of the total social structure of that community. It should determine its goals or objectives in terms of all community processes and be closely associated with other community institutions, organizations and agencies. To the extent that each school blends into the total context of its community, schools will be somewhat different—each from the others.

The individuality which schools achieve in response to differing community patterns, characteristics and resources will take into account the effects which a rural environment has upon children. The children attending school in a community related almost wholly to agriculture have different experiences than those in a rural industrial or mining community. Good schools recognize the distinctive influences of environment and take advantage of them in shaping their educational program.

But however carefully a school has organized its program to be responsive to environmental influences upon children, and however sensitive it is to its appropriate role in or relationship to the total community, it is most important that it recognize that these factors do not have stable characteristics. Communities change. And with the changes which are continuously occurring, the environment for children changes and the kinds of experiences they have are different.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES

The manner in which people individually and in groups relate themselves to each other and to economic activities is constantly changing. These changes are brought about or stimulated by many highly inter-related factors—discovery, invention, technological development and political concerns and policies, both national and international. They

result from new influences or a new emphasis of some specific factor or group of factors within a large complex of interrelationships.

It is important for us to recognize that social and economic changes are seldom abrupt. They come about slowly and gradually. They reflect a continuously evolving set of circumstances which never become fixed or stable. They usually have direction, although this is also subject to change or fluctuation—at times tending toward one direction and then reversing to tend toward another. At any given time we can expect only to determine directions or trends.

During recent years there have been a number of significant changes in rural life. Our purpose here is not to identify the causes of these changes but to indicate the trends and point out some of their implications for education.¹

POPULATION CHANGES

<i>Trends</i>	<i>Implications</i>
1. Farm people are becoming a smaller and smaller part of the total population.	The non-farm population is becoming dependent on a smaller group to furnish a large part of their fundamental wants. Hence, it becomes important to have highly trained individuals operating the Nation's agricultural enterprises, and to have a non-farm population that has a sympathetic understanding of the farmers' problems.
2. But within the rural population the rural non-farm sector is growing rapidly while the rural farm is declining. Many non-farm people now live in the countryside.	This suggests a re-examination of the rural school curriculum in terms of more varied vocational training as well as improved generalized education directed to developing adaptive behavior for a variety of environments. Necessitates a broader base for school financial support to take care of population shifts.
3. Despite over-all out-movement of the farm population, there are many areas in which this has not occurred; often these areas are in the same school administrative area.	The general public should be acquainted with this fact so that school administrators are permitted flexibility in handling the distribution of school funds and facilities.

¹The tabulated identification of trends and their educational implications which is included in this chapter represents the report of the Findings Committee for Division 3, "Economic and Social Trends Related to Rural Education."

4. The growth of fringe, non-farm populations around towns and cities below the metropolitan level has been large and extensive.

These fringe areas are often areas of administrative chaos. The public school people along with planners and others should give serious attention to adult education in these areas so the citizens become more enlightened with respect to securing adequate public services.

5. The movement of young people out of the farm sector of our population is taking place continuously and in large numbers.

This raises important questions concerning the kind of education these young people are receiving in the rural schools. We need to give increased attention to guiding our surplus rural boys and girls into non-farm vocations where they can capitalize on their rural background, interests, and aptitudes. Since many of these youth end up in cities, a strong argument for equalization of education funds is presented.

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES

Trends

1. A large sector of agriculture has become highly commercialized — agricultural technology has increased including machines, crops and livestock, control of diseases and pests, fertilization, etc.; size of operations has grown in terms of capital, not alone in acres; the number and amount of business transactions of farmers have expanded greatly; and agricultural policy has become important in terms of adequate returns to the operator.
2. The number of part-time farmers has increased tremendously. Industry is being dispersed into rural areas which provides additional off-farm employment.
3. An increased proportion of the rural population is compelled to find gainful employment in non-farm occupations.

Implications

Educational offerings for youth planning to enter agriculture must be adapted to this change in the agricultural system. Training in technical agriculture and farmer cooperation should be given in a much larger number of rural schools. The curriculum should be broadened to include more training in the business transactions of farm families. Adult education programs of schools and the Extension Service should be strengthened and should include public affairs as well as farm production and living.

A program needs to be developed to meet the needs of these part-time farmers and their families. Mutual self-help associations can be of material assistance to these rural families.

Vocational guidance and training in rural schools need to be expanded to include more of the service industries and non-farm occupations related to agriculture.

4. The homemaking and farm family living problems of rural people are becoming more like those of their city cousins. Increased home mechanization, better roads and improved communications operate to bring the farm closer to the city.

INCOME CHANGES

Trends

1. While farm income has increased considerably in recent years, the farmer is still in an unfavorable position as compared to urban workers.
2. While there is a definite shift in agriculture to more economic units with higher incomes, there are still many low production, low income farms.
3. Industrial employment and other off-the-farm jobs for wages, salary, or business profits provide income for a large number of rural people.

Implications

This means the school curriculum should seek to develop an appreciation for governmental efforts through research, education, credit, production, marketing, and conservation programs to strengthen the income position of farmers. Likewise an appreciation of what he can do himself through better business practices individually or jointly with his neighbors through cooperatives. This also has implications for equalization of facilities.

These small, low income farmers constitute a group who have received little attention from public agencies. The rural schools are often inadequate in these areas. Educational leaders need to study and plan how to help these people to increase their farm income and to find supplementary employment.

Educational help should be provided to enable these families to obtain full advantages from their rural situation, including usually some food production as well as full development of aesthetic and social opportunities.

CHANGING SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND PATTERNS

Trends

1. Rural and urban cultures and economies are being blended through interrelated vocations as in part-time farming; education in consolidated schools; recrea-

Implications

More emphasis on education programs that will help rural young people better understand and adjust to urban life and to help urban young people better understand and adjust to rural aspects of liv-

tion in movies, fairs, and social activities; services of electricity, telephones, hospitals; common levels of consumption in automobiles, household appliances, and living patterns.

2. There are numerous changes occurring which involve shifts from small, personalized, intimate groups, to large, less personal groups. These changes are the result of technological and other broad economic changes over which we expect at present a minimum of control. Social contacts are made over wider areas; the community is larger. Yet the family still continues to be the core of rural society.
3. Some functions of the rural family are being shifted to the schools in terms of the inculcation of group responsibilities, early emotional conditioning, etc.

ing. General courses and activities that will lead to the development of basic attitudes, skills, and understandings for living as democratic citizens in today's world and in today's modern rural-urban community.

This means that we should make the most rational adjustments possible to these broad changes, including school district reorganization and curriculum, and not block them by insisting on maintaining old forms and symbols which can no longer function. New school district boundaries should take into account as far as practicable "natural community" areas which are taking shape.

A broader basis of school financial support is probably a necessity if the changed structure of rural life is accepted realistically. In many cases the number of children is high and the amount of wealth low.

This suggests the need for more effective training of teachers who are responsible for the moral and emotional development of children. Worthwhile values of the past have to be consciously maintained.

The wide range of the trends identified makes the detailed analysis of each more than can be accomplished in this brief report. The implications which they have for the educational programs of rural communities can be sharpened, however, through an understanding of the specific changes which each implies. Attention is focused here however briefly, upon a few areas as illustrative.

Commercial Farming

Technical developments in agriculture have been associated with a rapid growth in the acreage and output of commercial farms. Since 1930, output per commercial farm has more than doubled. Farm acreage has increased by a half; cropland by a third. Not only has acreage

increased, but output per acre has been raised by increased yields and the decreased use of farm-grown crops for feeding horses and mules.

These changes have occurred largely by adding land and capital to a relatively fixed labor supply made up largely of labor resources of the farm operator and his family. Estimated labor requirements per commercial farm for 1950 were only slightly above the 1930 level—averaging slightly more than 400 man-days per farm. The number of commercial farms has been rapidly decreasing; farms are much larger—fewer farms but more acres. They decreased in number by approximately one-third from 1930 to 1950. Recently they have been decreasing at the rate of over 2 percent a year.

The reduction in the number of commercial farms has been, to a considerable extent, offset by the rapid increase in part-time farms and rural homes. The estimated number of part-time and residential farm units has increased from one million in 1930 to 1.7 million in 1950. The total number of farm operators who have non-farm jobs has been increasing even more rapidly. In addition, there has been a considerable increase in the number of older farmers operating small retirement units.

From the standpoint of education in rural areas it is obvious that those who are planning to enter agriculture—farming itself or the increasingly numerous related occupations—must be more highly trained than has been necessary in the past. Training in agriculture should include a more thorough understanding of business transactions, accounting, record keeping and reporting, and the like. Successful farmers must now be competent business men. Rapidly changing methods and techniques clearly point out the need for more adult education, both as a part of the program of the local school and through the Extension Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The increased number of part-time farmers puts emphasis on the need for a broader program of agricultural education than that which might be classified as "vocational." Part-time farmers and non-farm rural dwellers are interested in gardening, fruit growing, landscaping, home decoration and repair, and numerous other types of activities which rural people generally do for themselves. An educational program which could thus enrich rural living for those not involved in commercial agricultural should be available for both youth and adults.

Perhaps the most significant implication of the trend toward fewer but larger commercial farm operations is that *rural schools need to*

provide a much broader range of vocational education. A rural school cannot adequately serve its youth and adults when its vocational program is limited to agriculture.

Farmer Cooperatives

Agricultural cooperatives have a place in both the cultural and economic phases of American rural life. The economic phases, however, are the most dominant, with the cultural accruing as residuals. However, they are both significant.

Two features of agricultural cooperatives may affect the culture of American rural life. One of these is the fact that cooperative action brings into focus and encourages expression of the age-old tendency of people to work together and pool their efforts for both individual and collective benefits. The second application is that cooperative action sharpens the tools of democracy. Cooperatives are economic democracies and thus, in their operation, develop leadership and skills in democratic procedure. This leadership and these skills are beneficial when determining policy in local, state and national governments.

As just stated, agricultural cooperatives have the greatest bearing on the economic phases of rural life. Farming is a business. Thus, it has joined others in the fast moving business parade. As a result, the commercial farm of yesterday is the self-sufficient farm of today. An example of the modern farm going commercial is the fact that only about one unit in 13 of the products of the farm are now used by the farm family. This is in contrast to more than one unit in six a generation ago.

The increasing size of farm operations has resulted in an increase in total production with an accompanying decrease in farm population. Yet, as compared to other business, agriculture is basically a multiple of small units. As such, they operate independently and competitively in their production efforts.

Business is streamlining and integrating as part of the modern processes. For example, we do not have to look to industry and manufacturing alone. Just look for the "drummers" and other traveling salesmen who used to line the lobbies of country hotels each week-day evening a short time ago. Where are they now? Not only are they gone, but the hotels in which they used to assemble are largely casualties to the integrating and streamlining of distribution and other business processes.

These are visible effects. The invisible ones are equally as significant. Thus, in the distribution of wheat, livestock and cotton, the physical facilities may still be there. However, the invisible processes, the transactions of marketing and purchase, have integrated to as great an extent as have the ones that are visible.

Agricultural cooperatives are a natural means by which the individual farm units can join in this merchandising integration. Another alternative is an intensification of the trend toward very large farm units of sufficient size to maintain the necessary management skills and facilities to meet competition. A number of examples of this ability can be found. However, the small farmer cannot do it. His alternative is the cooperative.²

The implication for educational programs that an understanding of cooperatives and the place of cooperative organization in a free enterprise economic system is quite obvious. It is important that these understandings be a part of the educational programs for both rural and urban schools and that they be a part of the economic education of all children.

There is perhaps an even more far reaching implication for rural educational leadership, however. Farm people who are members of cooperatives have become fully aware that, when their own unit of production is small, they can compete with big organizations only by joining forces and cooperating. This well understood need is identical to that which smaller school units have for providing an educational program of the scope and quality considered essential in smaller communities and rural areas. Some educational leaders have recently put emphasis upon the development of cooperative educational services through some type of intermediate unit as a logical means for providing needed services of a specialized type in smaller community school system.³ The theory of cooperative educational services, however sound, is little understood. The experience of farm people in cooperative organizations and their understanding of the benefits received is a great

²Adapted from the presentation of J. H. Heckman, Chief, Membership Relations Branch, Farmer Cooperative Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture. "Special Aspects of a Changing Rural Life—Farmer Cooperatives."

³See Chapter 12, "The Intermediate Unit;" For a thorough discussion of the interrelationships of intermediate units and local school districts in the provision of cooperative services and descriptions of many presently operating programs, see Isenberg, Robert M., editor, *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*, Yearbook 1954. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954. 259 pp.

potential for developing cooperative programs of specialized educational services. Educational leadership must recognize and capitalize upon this development.

Family Living

A cultural change important for rural education programs to take into account is the lessening differences between rural and urban people in ways of living. For farm families this has meant more convenient homes, kitchens and laundries with labor-saving equipment for getting the housework done and the cash commitments for fuel and services to keep these conveniences in operation. It has also meant the money spent for other aspects of a higher standard of living—better medical care and more recreation and education, for example. A number of forces are responsible: (1) incomes are now generally higher than they were ten years ago; (2) rural electrification programs have extended electric power to many areas which were previously without it; (3) there are many more opportunities for off-the-farm work for farm people; and (4) contacts with urban ways of living through movement of city people to the country and through the schools, radio and television, magazines and other means of communication.

Farm living has remained different in one important respect—dependence on the home farm for a large share of the family's food supply. The home farm, for example, provides on the average nearly half the dollar value of family food on farms in the North Central States. This pattern of getting the food from the home farm, therefore, is a cultural difference between city and farm people that is persisting, despite their growing more alike in other ways of living. Its economic importance to farm people is apparent. Intangible values, however, may be even more significant—for example, farm people have greater opportunities for family projects and for realizing benefits of home activities in a manner which is not generally available to urban people.

For education, especially in home economics, the lessening of rural-urban differences would point to the need for the same basic training for rural as for urban people. But in this emphasis on rural-urban likeness, we should not lose sight of the continuing different farm pattern of obtaining its food supply and of the opportunities it offers for strengthening home life.⁴

⁴Adapted from the presentation of Mrs. Gertrude S. Weiss, Assistant Chief, Home Economics Research Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture. "Special Aspects of a Changing Rural Life—Family Living."

CONCLUSION

Rural areas are sometimes regarded as resistive to change. It is no doubt true that traditionally changes have come about more slowly in rural sections. In recent years, however, rural life has undergone tremendous change.

For educators, it is most important that they understand what changes have taken place, the implications of these changes for educational programs, and the manner in which this program might be adapted to take new conditions into account. For rural people in general, it is most important that they understand that changes have taken place and that the school of yesterday is no longer adequate, that it, too, must change.

When change takes place, the "good old days" are gone—never to return. The challenge for everyone is to make the most of it. For "these days"—by any measure—are better.

The Scope and Quality of the Needed Educational Program

WHAT educational program is needed by rural people and rural communities for the years ahead? How *much* is needed, in terms of over-all offerings and in relation to individual and community variations? What *quality* of education is "adequate" for a good life now and in the foreseeable future? Are the needs of rural people and rural communities distinctively different, with respect to either scope or quality, from the needs of other people, other communities?

Answers to these questions are neither simple nor easy to achieve. Nor can they be fully answered for the whole of the United States by general statements, even though such statements evolve from the deliberations of broadly representative groups, such as the National Conference on Rural Education. Each community and each school, by what it does or fails to do, answers these questions for itself and by so doing contributes to the composite total answer.

Some general guides are needed, however, to help all of us—we who work in local school districts, at county or state or national levels through governmental agencies or voluntary organizations, or in colleges and universities—to be sure we are setting goals that are adequate to our need. For in truth,

The greatest obstacle to good education is our willingness to settle for less than the best. Too readily we accept the belief that many necessary educational services cannot be provided in *our* community . . . for *our* children. We know that youth are our most valuable resource. And we believe that every child, regardless of where he lives, should have the benefits of a comprehensive program of educational services. Yet many, many children and communities do not have adequate educational opportunities.¹

¹Adapted from National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit. *Effective Intermediate Units—A Guide for Development*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1955. p. 1.

We can, if we set adequate goals and marshall our forces effectively, do what needs to be done to assure adequate educational programs for all rural people. What general guides will be useful to us in setting sound and adequate goals and in marshallling our forces effectively to achieve them?

SOME GENERAL GUIDES FOR DETERMINING GOALS

We believe that the educational program must be geared to the life of the people, to the needs and resources of their communities. Therefore, for rural people generally and for our communities—or counties or states—specifically, we must ask: *What are the significant needs of the people and the community? What are the important resources and values of rural life?*

We recognize that the tremendous changes which characterize the world today are reflected in rural life. So we ask: *What changes have significance for the scope and quality of the educational program? What are the essential characteristics of educational programs geared to our changed and changing rural life?* We observe a tendency, not yet fully overcome, for rural people to set inadequate specifications for their educational programs. So we ask: *What are general specifications of an adequate educational program? What ways of working to plan and develop educational programs will best help rural people to raise their level of aspirations for education?*

We realize that the leadership and services provided to the schools must facilitate and support the development of the educational program people need and want, not proceed independently of or at cross purposes with it. Therefore we need to know: *What kinds of leadership and what facilitating services will best assure attainment for rural people of adequate educational programs?*

SIGNIFICANT RURAL NEEDS AND RESOURCES

In discussing social and economic changes in rural life, we have noted that rural and urban cultures and economies are blending so that differences are decreasing and interrelationships becoming more important.² We have noted, too, that there is much that is shared by all our people, because human likeness underlies individual difference and the shared aspirations of our culture provide common bonds which transcend differences, one community or group to another. So we begin our delineation of scope and quality of program by recognizing that

²See Chapter 5, "Social and Economic Changes in Rural Life."

many of the needs that rural schools serve are not unique for rural people or rural communities. Certain things we all need, whoever or wherever we may be.

But we are not wholly alike, either as individuals or as communities, and ruralness of environment is one of the factors which effects difference. So we have reviewed available information concerning the rural environment's impact on children and youth and have noted that the rural child's present needs and problems are influenced by that environment. We have looked at the total rural community and have noted that adults also have needs and problems which the school must take into account in planning its program. And, in looking at the rural community and its setting on the land, we have been impressed with the resources—often untapped—offered there for the enrichment of learning.³

As we weigh the significance for the educational program of experiences provided by rural environments, we are challenged by the question Francis Drag raises: How can we discover the uniqueness in rural life that can be exploited by education in developing citizens with the competencies needed for democratic living in the present-day culture? Exploring this question, Mr. Drag said:

We have come to feel that the strength and the worth in rural education lies somewhere within the whole wide area of how people can live better together—the whole area of human relationships. Is there not to be found in the rural environment a peculiar and happy combination of relationships of soil to people and space and time which somehow sets the stage for the kinds of human relationships which are essential to the good life? When we have discovered this, this uniqueness of rural life and its contribution to be made, then it would seem to me we have, and would have only then, a sound approach to the innumerable problems which plague us from day to day as we work in rural education.⁴

We have, in part, identified the uniqueness in rural life, the discovery of which can help us to solve problems relating to the scope and quality of the educational program. To get a clearer picture of the needs of rural people, we must now consider the implications for education which grow out of the great changes which are occurring in our culture and our economy.

³See Chapter 2, "The Challenge of Continuing Problems," especially the section on "The School in the Community," p. 30; See also Chapter 3, "The School As A Community Institution," and Chapter 4, "The Rural Environment's Distinctive Impact on Children and Youth."

⁴Informal statement in the discussion of Conference Division I by Francis L. Drag, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Curriculum Services Division, San Diego County, California.

CHANGE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

The implications of change for education on a long range, never-ending basis were indicated to the Conference by John Davis:

The task confronting education is not just one of trying to meet the educational needs which exist. Rather, it is one of developing an educational program which itself is geared to change—one which will meet not only the needs of today, but also of tomorrow, next year and ten, twenty, and even fifty years from now.⁵

Among the social and economic trends identified in the previous chapter as having implications for education are several which relate directly to the scope and quality of the educational program. For instance, the need to expand and enrich certain curriculum offerings and the need to provide certain types of adult educational services are seen as arising from population changes. Similarly, the scope or quality of curriculum offerings—sometimes both—are seen to be affected by occupational changes, by income changes, or by changes in the social structure.⁶

Many of these implications for the educational program are essentially a matter of adding offerings, either in the form of new courses or through modifications or enrichment of existing ones, or of extending program to a wider age range or to a year-round calendar. Others call for a qualitative change, as, for example, the need for improved general education directed to the development of adaptive behavior, which is seen as a need arising from the increase in rural non-farm population. Closely related, as a causative factor, is the movement of young people from rural to urban areas. Guidance to occupations that use their rural backgrounds, interests, and aptitudes is another resultant need.

The concern expressed by Francis Chase that there be a "quality revolution in education" was noted earlier.⁷ He saw this as needed to break the lock-step which accompanies over-emphasis on fixed standards. This revolution, he hoped, would make possible teaching directed to the sequential development of each individual and his full powers, including the ability to make wise choices. The importance of providing educational programs which do, in fact, give meaningful pattern to the individual student's learning experiences and develop the ability

⁵Adapted from the address of John H. Davis, Director, Moffett Program in Agriculture and Business, Harvard University. "Forces Confronting Rural Education in Building a Better World."

⁶See Chapter 5, "Social and Economic Changes in Rural Life."

⁷See Chapter 2, "The Challenge of Continuing Problems," especially the section on "The Student," p. 23.

to make good choices, can be illustrated in the area of farm policy-making.

*Educational Implications of Farm Policy-Making**

Desirable farm policy would seem to require a gradual shift of the responsibility for basic economic stability in agriculture from government to farmers, processors, and the distribution trade. What does his share in being responsible for basic economic stability demand of the individual farmer, processor, or distributor? What kind of educational program best fits him to carry this responsibility well?

Today our rural society is so complicated and intricate that no one person or organization has the competence to deal with all phases of it. Therefore, *people of various competencies must work together to find solutions to problems.*

With respect to many problems, the best solution is often obscure—it must be searched for and developed. Under such conditions *the search for truth is a continuous process.*

Rural people must often choose between alternative courses which are open to them; a judgment must be exercised, a decision made. Therefore *true facts must be available and be used in choosing a course of action.*

Research and technology, while they are powerful tools in the hands of men, of themselves have no sense of moral direction. *Man, himself, must supply the social, moral, and spiritual values* which determine the way in which the fruits of technology will be used.

What implications do such facts as these have for the educational program? *People must work together:* How do they learn to do so? When do they begin to learn? If, as adults, they have not learned or have learned inadequately, can and should the school provide for their need? Shall the school "go it alone" in this, or can other institutions and agencies help? *People of various competencies:* What ways of working in school and classroom does this imply? What policies of organizing or grouping for learning are appropriate? What relationships among age groups, ability grouping, and so forth, are helpful?

The search for truth is a continuous process: How do we search for truth? How do we learn *the need* to search for it? How do we learn to recognize "truth" with respect to specific problems? *True facts must be available:* When and how do we learn to find the facts? To distinguish true facts from those which are not? What sources of information ought to be available in the school? Through the school to the community? *True facts must be used in choosing a course of action:*

*This section is based largely on the address of John H. Davis, *op. cit.*

How and when do we learn to *use* facts, to weigh them, to make up our minds on the basis of them? What is the school's responsibility?

Man, himself, must supply the social, moral, and spiritual values. How do such values develop in people? What is the school's role in helping people to develop them? What program provision is most helpful?

It seems clear that these are valid questions affecting the scope and quality of the educational program. It seems equally clear that the answers to them are to be found more in *how* teaching and learning take place than in any particular field or unit of subject matter. So, as we set up the specifications of an adequate educational program we will bear in mind the school's responsibility to help learners develop the abilities, attitudes and habits of attack needed in facing problems and making choices.

Furthermore, in a world where change is normal and the future is in many respects unpredictable, rural people must go on learning all their lives. Schools therefore have a responsibility to provide appropriate educational experiences for adults. Since in our society each person is assumed to be a responsible citizen, accountable for his decisions, it is imperative that teaching and learning be so organized that *each* individual achieves a growing mastery, not alone of the traditional skills, but of the integrative tools, attitudes and abilities.

*Cultural Change and Human Adjustment*⁹

Certain superficial aspects of the changing culture are so readily observable that they become almost as commonplace as the weather as topics of casual conversation. Understanding the full significance of some of these changes for human development and the inter-relationships of people is more difficult. A brief review of implications of certain general areas of change which have important consequences for human adjustment, and hence for education, may be helpful.

Changes in the material culture—the mechanization of farm and home tasks, the development of mass communication media and ready transportation, for example—have greatly increased man's control over nature. This control is more actively and intimately exercised by the farmer than by most city workers. Out of man's increased control of nature may come a lessened humility, false confidence, contempt of the

⁹This section is based largely on the address of Wayne C. Rohrer, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Maryland. "Cultural Changes and What They Mean for Educational Goals."

real world and, in turn, contempt for his fellowman. These are negative values and attitudes. They do not enable the person holding them to solve his problems well in an interdependent world. How can education help to correct such attitudes, develop positive ones?

- Organizing the work of the school to emphasize individual capacities and differences and to deal with each person on his own merits, rather than expecting conformity to a standardized goal, is one way to help. Following democratic procedures which give opportunity for the individual to play various roles—sometimes exercising leadership, sometimes followership—helps him to achieve adaptability, a positive quality.

Specialization of work and centralization of services have led to the impairment of communication. We have developed specialized jargons, which within a group we understand, but which tend to shut out others, and we tend to gather in groups of our own specialities. Being unable to communicate adequately, we are unable to work together with full effectiveness in matters which concern a total community or any cross-sectional grouping of people. In education, we need to learn to communicate better with other special groups within education. We especially need to learn to communicate with the community. How can we learn this?

- Increasing lay participation in school activities is helpful. Considering the school an integral part of the community, using the school for adult forums and so forth, also help. By bringing youth into adult forums we can contribute to another important network of communication—that between generations—and help bring about the gradual transition of youth to full adulthood.

A change from production orientation to consumer orientation in our culture is evidenced by such things as increased interest in hobbies and sports, in homemaking appliances and the like, and by the emergence of women as the chief money spenders.

- The school program can include directed activities in handicrafts, hobbies, sports, consumer education and so forth.

Extensive development and dissemination of information from the social sciences—sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and the integrative fields such as human growth and development—bring consequences which may be good or ill. As we learn how human behavior is caused, we may utilize control it gives us to "use" people for our purposes or to contribute to their own growth.

Teachers can make sure that their own application of the social sciences is sound and ethical. They can help children to develop sound attitudes about helping others to achieve their own goals as being better than "using" people.

ESTABLISHING SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Further implications for education could be drawn from an examination of rural communities of the Nation in their varied physical settings and their complex interrelations with a changed and changing world. Perhaps enough has been suggested, in this and preceding chapters, to indicate the major elements to be considered in establishing specifications for an adequate program.

To organize our ideas, it may be helpful to turn to two familiar analyses drawn from educational literature; the one to look at purposes, the other to see how the nature of learning affects program. The Educational Policies Committee has presented a classification of the goals and purposes of education which groups them into four major objectives: Self-realization; Human Relationship; Economic Efficiency; Civic Responsibility.¹⁰

Fannie Dunn, in discussing the distinctive aspects of a rural educational program, referred to three principles of education: (1) The center of educational effort is the child (individual) growing up in the community; (2) Active experience is essential to learning; (3) Improvement in the present living is the only way in which we can test whether learning is taking place.¹¹

Using the four major objectives as the focal points and applying the three principles to them, what general guides to the planning of an adequate educational program for rural people and rural communities may be drawn from the observations reviewed above? The chart entitled *A Genealogy of Educational Aims* (page 000) may be helpful in expanding the meaning of the four objectives selected for use here.

¹⁰National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*. Washington, D. C.: The Commission, 1938.

¹¹Dunn, Fannie Wyche. See Chapter 4, "The Rural Environment's Distinctive Impact on Children and Youth." p. 43.

A GENEALOGY OF EDUCATIONAL AIMS

(1918)	(1938)	(1952)
<i>Seven Cardinal Principles</i> (Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education)	<i>Four Groups of Objectives</i> (Educational Policies Commission)	<i>Ten Imperative Needs</i> (Educational Policies Commission)
Worthy Home Membership Health Command of Fundamental Processes Worthy Use of Leisure	Self-realization	Family Life Health Think and Communicate Clearly Arts (aesthetic) Science Use of Leisure
Vocation Citizenship Ethical Relations		Occupational Skill Wise Consumer Civic Understanding Human Relations

Self-realization

We accept this objective as applying to *all* people. We have specified the need for each individual to develop his full powers and have indicated that we regard the enrichment of life at all age levels as a concern of the school. We have identified certain groups as requiring our special concern, calling for a fair chance for the seriously disadvantaged low income and low social status groups; for an open road for the talented; and for better provision for exception children.¹²

We recognize that opportunities for self-realization for the individual in his community—be he child growing up or adult continuing to develop his capabilities—are varied in their nature and quality. Every individual has his own environment, his own "community," not only because environments differ but because environments affect individuals differently.

We know, too, that physical and mental health affect opportunity for self-realization and that families and communities differ in the adequacy with which they provide healthful environments and health-fostering activities and services.

¹²See the address of Francis S. Chase, Chairman, Department of Education, University of Chicago. "The Task Ahead in Achieving Equal Educational Opportunity for All." See p. 247.

What do these facts imply for the planning and development of an adequate educational program? With respect to the school unit for which leadership is being exercised—the local school, the community school district, the county, the state—such questions as these are pertinent:

What people, if any, lack a satisfactory minimum of opportunity for self-realization? There may be an age group, a cultural or economic minority group, or people having special needs because of handicaps or special abilities, who lack adequate or suitable opportunities to develop their full powers. There may be school "dropouts" who found school offerings unrelated to their immediate needs and interests, or able young people for whom college opportunity is lacking, or adults in need of developing new interests and abilities for whom neither school nor community is making any provision. And so on.

What extensions of the educational program would satisfactorily correct these lacks? Attention would be on the scope of the program in terms of people to be served, the variety of offerings, when and for how long offerings are available, and the like.

What changes in the organization of the school for teaching and learning are desirable? Concern would be to develop patterns of organization and ways of working with children, youth, and adults that will bring to light their individual interests, needs, and capacities and enable each to progress at rates and along lines best suited to him.

What resources and what lacks in the total environment must be taken into account? Where there are inadequate provisions for the arts, library services, recreational activities, and the like—and this is true of many rural communities, the schools will need to provide the services or to work with the community to see that they are provided in some other way. A special resource of most rural communities is the rich nature environment; schools may need to provide guidance in the appreciation and enjoyment of its various aspects.

Other questions might be listed. However, many of them have equal significance for the consideration of others of the four objectives we are exploring.

Human relationships.

We see the objective of developing good human relationships as taking on increased importance. We have noted that many problems faced today are so complex that only by persons working together who

have different competencies, can best solutions be found. We have been reminded that schools must help to develop the social, moral, and spiritual values which will guide us to desirable uses of scientific and technical developments, and we see this as involving human values. We have noted, too, that our greatly increased control over nature through science and technology can lead to a false sense of power and even a lack of respect for other people. And, we are told, with specialization has come a loss in ability to communicate, one group to another.

These ramifications of the need for developing good human relationships grow out of changes in our economy which have taken place at an accelerating rate. They are but part of the picture of human relationships in rural communities. The sense of power and feeling of being able to "go it alone" which may come with increased control over nature are balanced by the sharp reminder, through a heavy frost, a flood, or a tornado, that man's power is limited and he needs his fellowmen. Though ready transportation and communication have given rural people more casual human contacts than previously, face-to-face relationships are still an important aspect of rural life.

Application of Dr. Dunn's principles to the objective of human relationships suggests some questions which can guide the development of an appropriate educational program. With respect to the individual growing up in the community as the center of educational effort, *what is the meaningful community of these children—or these youth or adults, whichever is of concern?* Is it one community or many? In terms of space, where are the human beings with whom, for these particular individuals, establishing better relationships is important? What part does getting correct and significant information about people play in the establishment of good relationships? What does this imply for *what* is included in the educational program?

The principle of learning through active experience suggests this: *What ways of working in and through the school will provide best opportunities to practice desirable human relationships?*

Economic Efficiency

We have noted that changes in the economy have reduced the relative number of people needed in agricultural production while numbers of children growing up in rural areas remain large. Vocationally, therefore, the majority of rural youth must seek their opportunities in rural non-farm or urban occupations. This and other factors necessitate

the development of qualities which foster adaptive behavior. We note, too, that success in present-day agriculture requires a high level of business efficiency.

We have seen, too, that the development of modern conveniences has changed the nature of many home-making tasks in farm homes. Further, we have noted that, in American life generally, there has been a major shift from productive orientation to consumer orientation.

When we consider the effect of this particular environment on the individual's needs for economic efficiency, we note great differences. In farming operations the range is from highly specialized and efficient "factories in the field," with labor and management quite distinct, to very meager subsistence farms. With respect to non-farm occupations, including both the service trades and the professions, the range is from communities with comparatively few, mostly generalized, jack-of-all-trades types of jobs, to communities with a wide range of job opportunities at all levels, some of them calling for a high degree of competence or professional training. With respect to consumer aspects of economic effectiveness the range is from extreme dependence on outside services, to the more nearly self-contained family units which persist in some isolated areas or among isolated groups. In all rural communities, the land and problems related to its conservation and use are an active part of the environment. In general, opportunities for active experience as the method of learning are more easily available in rural communities than in complex urban economies.

With such facts as these affecting the situations for which we plan educational programs, questions such as these are pertinent:

What vocational opportunities are available to the people of this community? We need to know what the situation is for those who wish to engage in farming. For those wishing to find other employment within the community. For persons interested in entering the professions or skilled trades. For persons who will migrate to urban centers to find employment. We see this as including not only the work of the "breadwinner" of the family but also the work of other family members which contributes to both productive and consumer efficiency.

What educational program should the schools provide to equip people for vocational effectiveness? To determine this, some subsidiary questions need to be raised. What preservice preparation is needed for successful entrance into the various occupations identified for the people of this community? What guidance services are needed to help people

in making vocational choices both as young people getting started and as older people needing to make changes? What on-the-job or inservice education is needed to develop new skills or keep abreast of new knowledge? With respect to all of this, what is the responsibility of the schools and what can best be provided by other agencies?

How can the educational experiences and services for which the schools accept responsibility best be provided? This would involve decisions concerning new offerings such as the provision of vocational agricultural courses where they are needed but do not exist, or the provision of a greater variety of vocational courses, or the provision of an adult program, and the like. It would involve decisions regarding the emphasis or content of courses now offered; for example, adaptation of homemaking courses to the needs and potentialities of homes in this community, or the inclusion of consumer education content into various school courses. Important consideration would need to be given to the relationship of the school to homes and community enterprises and institutions in providing adequate learning experiences. The availability to the youth of the community of education at the college level is another important consideration.

Civic Responsibility

We have noted that the identification of the individual with our American system of freedom and democracy as represented by institutions and ideals is an important responsibility of all education. All citizens have a responsibility to help preserve our freedoms.

We have noted, too, that where society is complicated, people are constantly called on to make decisions in matters where the solutions of problems are obscure. Decisions made in many areas of our living may affect the preservation of our freedom. It is important, therefore, that all citizens develop the qualities and abilities which enable them to make decisions which are in harmony with fundamental principles and values of our way of life.

With respect to education for civic responsibility, *what opportunities does this community offer its citizens to understand and develop loyalty to the ideals of American democracy?* We will want to consider this for citizens of all age levels—when they are beginning to identify themselves with these ideals and as they need to understand them in

relation to changed and changing conditions. Recognizing that in smaller communities these ideals are represented by institutions and practices that are close to the people, we will want to know how the individual growing up in the community has been affected by his experiences. We will also want to know how these elements of community life can be used for further learning.

What can and should the schools do to equip people to deal with problems where choice and judgment must be exercised? Concern here will be with the development of the skills and attitudes needed in working with others, in continually seeking for true facts as the basis for judgment, in making decisions, and the like. How these qualities develop and what this implies for both the content and method of the educational program are involved. The needs of adult citizens for forums or other opportunities to study problems which are pushing them is a part of this concern.

With respect to both aspects of education for civic responsibility, we will need to ask: *What opportunities does this rural community offer for active learning experiences which draw upon community resources?* For instance, since we need experience in making decisions that really count, it is important that we know and relate learning to problems that really matter in the lives of the people. We need to think of this in terms of what is meaningful and appropriate to individuals at all age levels.

SPECIFICATIONS OF AN ADEQUATE PROGRAM

An educational program that is adequate for the people of one community will have much in common with other educational programs. It will also have certain unique aspects, for each community is to some degree unique. For this reason no single set of specifications of an adequate program will fit all situations. The intent of this chapter has been not to blueprint a program but to bring together, as meaningfully as possible, some viewpoints and information which suggest how to go about determining the scope and quality of educational programs geared to the needs of rural people. Some implications have been drawn from what is known of the ongoing needs and resources of rural environments and the social, economic and cultural changes in rural life. Some general guides for establishing specifications for the educational program have been suggested.

Summaries of suggestions regarding the scope of needed programs are given elsewhere in this volume, notably in Chapter 1 and in the address of Howard Dawson.¹³ Butterworth and Dawson in *The Modern Rural School* also give specific suggestions in a section entitled "What Overall Programs Should Be Provided in Rural America?"¹⁴ It is suggested that such lists as these are most useful in stimulating ideas and as a basis for checking the completeness of our thinking. None of them purports to be a comprehensive set of specifications, and should not be so regarded or used.

LEADERSHIP AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADEQUATE EDUCATION FOR RURAL PEOPLE

The development of the programs of education we need and want for rural people and rural communities sets tasks which challenge our best efforts. Francis Drag had this to say in the matter:

Certainly it would seem that teachers and parents and community people can learn to think and study together to better come to grips with the nature and purposes of rural life and education today. This calls for leadership. Perhaps our greatest need in rural education is the leadership spark to get things going, to move into the new frontier, to venture out, and to cause people to think beyond the common vision.¹⁵

Among the challenges which we may leave to these people and to our own future efforts, are two of great importance in the development of educational programs that serve *all the people* adequately. They are: First, the challenge to make available and accessible to rural youth the extent and kind of college educational opportunity that is implied in the call to "foster the full use of our human resources"; and second, to develop a pattern or patterns of organization for secondary education which build upon and utilize the values and resources inherent in rural and small community situations.

We challenged ourselves to set our goals high by quoting, earlier in this chapter, the statement which begins "The greatest obstacle to good education is our willingness to settle for less than the best." We may appropriately challenge ourselves to active efforts to achieve those

¹³From the address of Howard A. Dawson, Executive Secretary, Department of Rural Education, National Education Association. "Rural Education—A Backward and a Forward Look." See p. 216.

¹⁴Butterworth, Julian E.; Dawson, Howard A.; and others. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952. pp. 132-34.

¹⁵Informal statement in the discussion of Conference Division I by Francis L. Drag, *op. cit.*

goals by quoting from the concluding statement of the same publication:

For many—too many—the educational opportunities provided are limited and inadequate. These shortages will place their mark on the future.

Everyone wants good schools. The characteristics of an adequate program are known. The means are available for providing them. We cannot escape the conclusion that *we can* afford good schools. The possibilities and how to achieve them, the inadequacies and how to resolve them—these are the responsibilities of everyone.¹⁶

How shall I—and you—and all of us together—set about exercising that responsibility?

¹⁶National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

IDENTIFYING THE DISADVANTAGED GROUPS

In the rural sections of the United States there are many groups which might be classed as disadvantaged. Butterworth and Dawson point out that disadvantages consist of low income; lack of ownership of property; effective, if not legal disfranchisement; segregation, discriminations in facilities and opportunities; and the effective operation of a caste system where none is supposed to exist. They point out that among the disadvantages which characterize their situation are: poor health and health services; poor housing; limited occupational opportunities; lack of public services such as those given by agricultural extension agents, home demonstration agents, and 4-H Club workers; lack of libraries and recreational facilities; and a woeful lack of educational opportunities.¹

Social classes or stratification exist in every culture. The status of rural families in most sections of America is usually determined by such factors as the size of income, the type of tenure, national or racial identity, type of house, length of residence, extent of home conveniences, amount of education, number of outside contacts, and the degree of participation by the family in the organized activities of the locality.²

It is important that the disadvantaged groups in rural America be identified. Who are they? And where are they?

They are French-Canadians along the Maine border. They are Negroes in the cotton and tobacco growing South. They are 8,000,000 "old Americans" who live in 250 counties in the Southern Appalachians. They are to be found in the Lake States cut over areas. They are your people and my people. We cannot escape our identification with, or our obligation to them. There are three important things that we need to remember about these disadvantaged groups:

1. The rural disadvantaged are not confined to any color—white, black, red, or intermediate shades. Disadvantage is not a racial or ethnic problem.
2. The rural disadvantaged are not confined to any language speaking group. They are English speaking, Spanish speaking, French speaking and those who have spoken Indian tongues for near long enough to be forever.
3. They are not confined to any section of the country. They live along the Canadian and the Mexican border. They live in the rich delta lands of the deep South, in the rugged uplands of Tennessee or Virginia, in the tropical

¹Butterworth, Julian E.; Dawson, Howard A.; and others. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952. pp. 274-276.

²See Taylor, Carl C.; Ensminger, Douglas; and others. *Rural Life in the United States*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949. p. 312.

Education for Disadvantaged Rural Groups

IN most of the rural schools in nearly all of our states there have been changes. They have been gradual—the response to technological and scientific advances affecting other aspects of rural living. The ominous jacketed stove has been replaced by an automatic heating system; modern plumbing has replaced the old hand pump; faded overalls have given way to bright plaids; and Spring is no longer a time for bare-footed freedom. The arrival of the yellow school bus now indicates that school will soon begin; the old school bell no longer rings. Improvements? Yes, there can be no doubt.

The improvement of education in rural communities did not begin in 1944 with the White House Conference on Rural Education, but change since that time has indeed been great. The desires of that Conference were expressed in the *Charter of Education for Rural Children*. For many children in many communities the "rights of the rural child" as then expressed have been partially achieved—a modern elementary and secondary education, health and guidance services, library facilities, school lunches, transportation, better teachers, modern school buildings. For many others improvements are much more slowly being realized.

But these rights of the rural child as outlined by the Charter were said to be the . . . *rights of every child regardless of race, or color, or situation, wherever he may live.* . . . This includes those children who are among the disadvantaged groups in rural America. For them the changes in rural living with all of its technological advance has not brought about improved education or opportunity. Rather it has tended to widen the disparity between the "rights of children" and the circumstances within which they can now be found.

glades of Florida or the semi-deserts of the Southwest. Some move from one bountiful harvest to another—cotton, fruit, vegetables—wherever garnering of the earth's blessings may need hands for a short time.³

In discussing the importance of equal opportunities, Chase similarly identified the disadvantaged as the low-income agricultural workers, especially the migratory workers, many of the rural people who work in mining and manufacturing, the Negroes, the Indians, the Spanish Americans, and other foreign-language groups.⁴

Economic and social disadvantage can conveniently be passed on within a family from generation to generation. For there are many doors closed to those who are born into families of low income, into families of meager culture, into families to whom for one reason or another many kinds of opportunities are not available.

EDUCATION AND THE DISADVANTAGED

The social position of a family in a rural community is seldom determined by any single factor. A number of those which cause class distinction or social status have been indicated in the preceding section. Among them are the size of the family income and the amount of education.

Low Income and Related Problems

The disadvantaged groups in rural America are low-income groups, and there is probably no single factor which is any more important in determining status.

Recognition of the special problems of low-income groups has been described by Arthur Moore as follows:

There is always some farm poverty even in the high income areas. Illness, incompetence, localized crop failures, a farm that is too small—almost every community knows this sort of individual poverty. But sometimes nearly everyone in the area is poor and poverty is the general condition, not the exception. Area-type poverty more clearly involves public policy. It is a lot harder to work out of poverty where nearly everyone is poor, than to work out of it in an area where comfortable incomes prevail. In area-type poverty there are many more barriers to those free choices by which families can improve their lot.

Considered functionally, a low-income family is one whose income does not provide consumer goods of sufficient quantity and quality to make for

³Adapted from the address of Lewis W. Jones, Director of Research, Rural Life Council, Tuskegee Institute. "Democracy—Share or Shatter."

⁴Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, Chairman, Department of Education, University of Chicago. "The Task Ahead in Achieving Equal Opportunity for All."

the physical and mental efficiency of its members in their productive and associational relationships, as their means limits or proves inadequate for their goal aspirations, and prevents their gearing into the community institutions and the successful manipulation of the resources and techniques of the community.⁶

The problem of the disadvantaged is the problem of resources whose exploitation does not provide incomes adequate to meet consumer needs. Their schools, churches, and tax-supported institutions are inadequate to supply expected and sorely needed services.⁶

The problems of low income and day-to-day security for the large groups of migratory workers were described by an Arizona teacher whose rural school attempts to provide "schooling" for their children as they come and go.

They work from dawn till dark, sleep on miserable beds, and know always the threat of the day when it rains; there is no picking to be done. The unfortunate thing is that he can cash the cotton ticket each evening. Suppose a man goes to town, spends all the money and brings home very little food. However, there is no cupboard in the cabin where you could store food, there is no refrigerator, most of the camps have no gas or electricity. There is no use to buy fresh milk because you have no ice. Most of the women cannot sew, and anyway, how can they bring a sewing machine or any furniture, standing up on the truck?

Conditions in agriculture differ from those in industry. Methods of pay (you get your cotton tickets every day for the number of pounds picked), problems of housing, and the necessity of living often far removed from stores, schools, and the advantages of even a small town, make the problems of the migrant different from those of the factory worker. Our migrants need better housing, better medical care, and better training in thrift and home-making.⁷

The problems of the migratory workers illustrated in this description as they relate to income and living conditions are similar in most respects to those of other disadvantaged groups. But in certain other respects their problems are somewhat unique. Because they are here today and gone the next, any realistic solution to their problem extends beyond the locality of community or state.

Lack of Educational Opportunities

Over half of the school age children in the United States are growing up on the farms and in the villages of rural America. The kind of

⁶Moore, Arthur. *Underemployment in American Agriculture*. Planning Pamphlet No. 88. Washington, D. C.: National Planning Association, January 1952.

⁷Adapted from the address of Lewis W. Jones, *op. cit.*

⁸Adapted from the address of Mrs. Mary McCollom Martin, Teacher, Toltec School, Eloy, Arizona. "Children of Ill Fortune."

education received by this large proportion of our citizenry is of vital importance to the Nation, especially at a time when policy for education, as it is put into effect in America and the rest of the free world, may well determine the course of world history for the next thousand years. Any orderly review of the forces and factors that are playing upon the world today will document that fact.⁸

Butterworth and Dawson have described the educational opportunities for the rural disadvantaged as the poorest in the Nation. They indicate that where schools are available at all, they generally have: the shortest school terms; the poorest school buildings; the poorest paid and most inadequately trained teachers; the fewest high school opportunities with the most meager vocational instruction; the poorest school attendance; and instruction least related to the life needs of the pupils.⁹

For each of these characteristics of the schools which serve the disadvantaged groups in rural areas there are a few exceptions. Some of these schools have well qualified and competent teachers who understand the problems which their children have. But these instances are exceptions indeed.

School Attendance

One of the areas in which considerable progress has been made in recent years is in regard to school attendance. Of the more than two million 7 to 17 year old children in the continental United States who were not enrolled in any school in 1947, it was believed that a large majority were among the disadvantaged rural minorities.¹⁰

As efforts have been made to spread an understanding of the 16-year minimum age for agricultural employment during school hours under the Fair Labor Standards Act (which Congress put teeth into in 1950) and to make investigations to detect violations and enforce the

⁸Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, *op. cit.*

⁹Butterworth, Julian E.; Dawson, Howard A., and others, *op. cit.* P. 279.

¹⁰In 1947 there were 480,000 children 7 to 13 years old and 1,632,000 children 14 to 17 years old in the continental United States not enrolled in any school. The number of these children from rural areas was not reported separately, making impossible an accurate analysis. The development of an understanding of the problem of school attendance would be greatly facilitated if the data collected could identify more precisely the location of those not enrolled in school. For the data cited above, see U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Population Characteristics: Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 12*. Washington, D. C.: the Bureau, February 16, 1948.

law, a vital step has been made to get these children in school. The latest survey made in October 1954 reports an increase in the percentages of children enrolled in school at that time as compared to October 1947. During the seven-year period the proportion of all children 14 to 17 years of age enrolled increased from 80.2 percent to 88.3 percent for white and from 71.9 percent to 78.8 percent for non-white children. The proportion of children of the younger age groups enrolled remained about the same.¹²

At the high school level, rural farm enrollment rates in October 1954 were about 6 to 8 percentage points below those for urban areas. During the last five years, however, the enrollment rates for farm youth have improved markedly; they have now reached approximately the levels that prevailed in urban areas in 1949.¹³

It should be recognized, however, that many children, particularly those of high school age, are still not attending school. And their job opportunities are very limited. The unemployment rates were especially high among the 14 to 17 year olds who were no longer in school. Most of these youngsters have limited education and little work experience.¹⁴ The absence of the kind of specific identification of those who are not in school makes a thorough analysis impossible, but data show that the highest proportion is in rural areas.

As observed in prior surveys, labor force participation is more frequent among young students living on farms than among those residing in urban communities. This is particularly true of non-white students, about half of whom were at work during the October (1954) survey week as compared to only a third of the white students in farm areas and only a fifth of the urban residents.¹⁵

Although the relationship of these data to the children among the rural disadvantaged groups must be inferred, it seems to be clear indeed.

Education of Migrant Children

The mobility of the families of migratory agricultural workers makes the provision of an educational program for their children

¹²U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Population Characteristics, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 45*, Washington, D. C.: the Bureau, January 20, 1955.

¹³*Ibid.*

¹⁴See U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Labor Force, Current Population Reports, Series P-50, No. 58*, Washington, D. C.: the Bureau, February 21, 1955.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 2.

almost wholly a rural problem. The nature of the problem, however, makes it National in scope rather than one restricted to the locality of any single area, state or region.

The impact of seasonal migration was reported by Mrs. Mary McCollom Martin, a teacher in an Arizona school located in an area which ten years ago was desert but which now is rich cotton producing land.

Last year at our school, I teach second and third grades, I enrolled 162 pupils in my room. During one 12 week period I had an average daily attendance of from 50 to 60 pupils. But not the same 60. During that 12 week period I had 100 different children in my two grades.

They come to us from everywhere. Arizona enforces attendance during school hours. Many of these children have had less than 25 days of school during the previous year. They slip along from Texas, through Arkansas and evade the officers. One little family entered my school just before Thanksgiving. The little girl remembered that the year before mama would not let them start away until after the Valentine party. I said, "Where have you been from Valentine's Day to Thanksgiving?" and the little boy said, "Oh, we've just been a-coming."

These boys and girls come half starved, many scantily clothed—all dragged about from one camp to another—in school this week and on the road the next. There is no time for mother to sit down and assure them that this is home and all is well. There is no life nor companionship with boys and girls they have known a long time—often only the cruel struggle of cotton—hot sun, long hours from daylight to dark. Or worse—rainy days when no money comes in and the one-room cabin with dirt floor becomes an untenable place of crying babies, quarreling, hungry children, a dog or two, and a man discouraged and cross because there is no work. No wonder some become winnows, no wonder fights break out. Yet in these circumstances are thousands of our future citizens—bright, alert, pretty girls and boys. The vision and know-how which changed the desert where they work to a productive garden can change the lives of these future citizens. But it cannot happen unless they are in school.

Our job is with the children: we may not be able to do much for the adults. Our schools can encourage and give hope to the children. If a child is to become efficient in the economic world, he must learn early habits of thrift, of salesmanship, and the social forms necessary to our way of living. Children need acceptance, love, security, and confidence. They want a certain amount of routine, they want to finish a book, they like a grade on a paper; they want to feel that they are wanted; that they are accepted in the group; and that they have an important job to do.

We cannot send home books. These little children never know when they reach home at night whether they will stay in the cabin or move on. When they see their mother has tied the washrub on the back of the car, they know

they are "on the road" again. I wish there were some way that we could give out some printed material that they might study just a little as they ride along. I cut out stories—we paste them on cardboard. We copy songs and little poems.¹⁷

With regard to the children of migratory workers, provision for them is in some cases as serious a burden to the states and the local school units as are impacted areas for which Federal financial assistance is now provided. Yet there is no help with this problem. The burden may be an impossible one for local units to carry and in many cases little attempt is made to carry it. Opportunities are simply denied these children.¹⁸ Few communities really press for the attendance of migrant children in schools. When the harvests are over they are expected to move on. Their attendance in school, even if only for a few weeks, would require adjustments, create problems, and cause the already limited resources to be spread more thinly.

Education of Other Disadvantaged Groups

A detailed discussion of the problems of providing adequate educational opportunities for disadvantaged groups is beyond the scope of this report. The purpose here is chiefly to identify this real problem area and to convey some notion of its magnitude. This objective may already have been achieved.

There may be sufficient importance, however, to emphasize that the specific nature of the problems of each group of disadvantaged people and the programs designed to meet them will no doubt each need to be somewhat different.

The Negro, for example, represents quite a large segment of the population in some sections. Although there has been a great deal of shifting of the Negro population in recent years (rural to urban, South to everywhere else), much of it is still in the Southern states. Great efforts have been made recently by these states to close the gap between facilities and quality of instruction provided for Negro and white children. Accomplishments have been substantial in many areas. The full impact of the Supreme Court's decision to abolish segregation cannot yet be predicted. It is relatively certain, however, that social acceptance will not be on a basis of race, but rather on a basis of individual worth—ability and character. Improved educational opportunity can speed this process greatly.

¹⁷Adapted from the address of Mrs. Mary McCollum Martin, *op. cit.*

¹⁸Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, *op. cit.*

The problems of the Indians, or the Spanish-Americans, or any other closely-knit cultural minority may need to be approached somewhat differently. The symptoms of need may be similar and the broad program of education prescribed much the same, but the approach to the problems of disadvantage must take into account the customs, habits, and traditions of the particular group and, more importantly, the standards and values upon which they are based.

PROVIDING NEEDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Improving the status of the disadvantaged, especially that of the children, is one of our great national challenges. The way seems clear indeed. The improvement of their status involves three key factors: (1) the improvement of *health* through better services, knowledge, and practices; (2) an increased amount and stability of *income*; and (3) more and better *educational opportunities*. The first two matters are dependent in no small degree upon the third.¹⁷

Chase described four tasks which he considered to be both urgent and possible of accomplishment: (1) to give a fair start to the disadvantaged children of America; (2) to keep an open road for the talented; (3) to provide special facilities and services to enrich life; and (4) to offer education to sustain our freedoms. He stated further:

One of the best means of opening more doors for the disadvantaged children of America is to provide a level of education which will enable them to acquire the culture that is prized in this nation, to acquire the skills for vocational effectiveness, to acquire the ability to participate effectively in the making of public policy decisions. It is only through education that these children can hope to improve their lot in life. Providing a fair start for these children is only a matter of elementary humanity, of simple justice. Whatever forces need to be mobilized in state and nation to provide this fair start for children should be mobilized without undue delay.¹⁸

Improving the status of disadvantaged children, to be successful on a long-time basis, requires improving their ability to improve their own status. Legislation can remedy physical conditions, improve sanitation, and provide free medical care. But the disadvantaged must "improve" within themselves—a change in thinking and in attitudes. This cannot be done without free public education of a kind and quality that meets the *real life needs* of the disadvantaged.

¹⁷Butterworth, Julian E.; Dawson, Howard A.; and others, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

¹⁸Adapted from the address of Francis S. Chase, *op. cit.*

The Educational Program Needed

The entire structure of organized education is challenged by the needs of disadvantaged children. For them education *must be* meaningful. (It should be for all children.) They must somehow see its values . . . understand its purposes. This can not be done with a heavy diet of "Jimmy and Jane at the Circus" and the like. Life for these children is real. It is hard and often bitter. The educational program needed is one which will help them do better the things they must do anyway.

The objectives which might well be established for such an educational program were outlined by Jones as follows:

Disadvantaged children do not need a simplified education for where they are geographically or economically or socially. *They need a special education—one that will rapidly close the gap between themselves and their more fortunate brothers. They need an education that will accelerate the achievement of:*

1. Physical efficiency
2. Mental efficiency
3. Their economic aspirations
4. Successful manipulation of community resources

How to do this will be different in different places for different people.¹⁸

The accomplishment of these objectives, or of such other objectives which might be phrased for the kind of educational program needed, will depend upon the extent to which the educational programs provide for more practical and vocational activities, additional and specialized teachers, attendance enforcement, adult education, improved home life, and economic opportunity for disadvantaged families.

A recent study of the educational opportunities and experiences of agricultural migrants includes a listing of many practical suggestions for those who have responsibility for educational programs serving the disadvantaged. There may be value in reporting a few of the specific recommendations here.

To local school authorities, we recommend:

1. Employment of adequate and properly trained attendance supervisors of the same racial and nationality background as the migrants.
2. A vigorous campaign to enlist the cooperation of growers in keeping migrant children in school.
3. Work with labor contractors and crew leaders to secure their cooperation in keeping migrant children in school.

¹⁸Adapted from the address of Lewis W. Jones, *op. cit.*

4. Experimentation to determine the best method of grade placement of migrant children.
5. Employment of adequate and especially skilled teaching staff.
6. More practical and vocational courses and vocational guidance for migrant children.
7. Adult education classes for migrants.
8. Special young adult classes for migrants.

To state departments of public instruction, state legislatures, and teacher-training institutions, we recommend:

1. Tightening of school attendance laws to cover migrants; and bringing state child labor laws into conformity.
2. Provision of special state grants-in-aid to local school districts receiving migrant children.
3. Employment of supervisors in migrant education.
4. Teaching of Spanish in the teacher-training institutions in states where Spanish-American migrants are numerous.

Numerous other recommendations were included in the report—for principals and teachers, for local communities and groups, and for the Congress of the United States.²¹

Experimental Programs

The lack of social and economic status and the general level of living conditions of disadvantaged groups are easily identified and documented. The special problems which these create for communities and other social institutions rather quickly make themselves known. Developing a program which can effectively meet these problems is much more difficult.

That teachers, school administrators, boards of education, and communities know more about what should be done than they are now doing is apparent. But despite this, there are many aspects of solution which are yet to be discovered. Experimentation is essential if answers are to be found.

Within the past few years there have been several experimental programs undertaken—designed either to raise the status of certain disadvantaged groups in a specific situation or as a means of developing techniques and materials which might be applicable in other situa-

²¹For a complete list of recommendations and a thorough analysis of the problems of providing education for the children of migratory agricultural workers, see Greene, Shirley E. *The Education of Migrant Children*. Report of the Study of the Educational Opportunities and Experiences of Agricultural Migrants, National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954. 179 pp.

tions. Space limitations will not permit a description of these experimental programs here, but an indication of a few of them may be useful.

1. *Harry County, South Carolina*—A broad community betterment program involving curriculum revision, instructional methods, recreational opportunities, and skillful counseling and group work.²¹

2. *Harlan County, Kentucky*—A multiple approach to the development of a program of guidance and community betterment in a coal mining section in the Kentucky mountain area.²²

3. *Oak Center School, Waukegan, Wisconsin*—A six week experiment in curriculum building involving Spanish-speaking migrant children ranging in age from five to twelve years.²³

4. *Migrant Research Project Board*—A study of the problems of education for migrant children and their sociological relationships. Pilot studies were conducted in Florida, Virginia, Texas, and Illinois.²⁴

5. *Kern County, California*—A program of educating the migrant children and in getting them and their parents accepted as part of the social structure in the largest cotton producing county in the United States.²⁵

There are a number of other experimental programs which have been or are now being carried on. The findings and experiences of these special projects should contribute greatly to an understanding of how the special problems of disadvantaged groups can be met.

CONCLUSION

There are many disadvantaged groups in this country. They are poor in material goods and poorly educated, often illiterate. They need more and better housing, more and better health services, more and better occupational opportunities, more vocational competence, and much more education. They need more social acceptance. They need more of virtually everything that contributes to a desirable standard of living. But perhaps most of all, they need understanding.

²¹For a detailed report, see Warburton, Amber Arthur. *Guidance in a Rural Community—Green Sox*. Yearbook 1952. Department of Rural Education, Prepared for the Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department. Washington, D.C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1952. 156 pp.

²²For a detailed report, see Warburton, Amber Arthur. *Guidance in a Rural Industrial Community—Harlan County*. Prepared for the Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department of Rural Education. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954. 249 pp.

²³For a succinct report, see Greene, Shirley E., *op. cit.*

²⁴*Ibid.*

²⁵For a brief description of this program, see Stockton, Jesse D. "No Migrant Head-aches!" *The Journal of the National Education Association* 43:93-94; February 1954.

Personnel Needed for Schools Serving Rural People

THE most important need of education, especially in our rural areas, is well qualified teachers. Also important are effective administrators, supervisors, and other specialized personnel who can help teachers provide the kinds of learning experiences which foster the development of responsible and intelligent citizenship in a democracy.

Rural schools have a greater need than their urban neighbors for certain other types of personnel—school bus drivers and mechanics and school lunch workers. These important school employees, the custodians and other school building maintenance workers, and the secretarial and clerical assistants needed for the schools of most rural communities provide these schools with special problems. The supply of competent and available personnel is usually most limited and the jobs themselves usually require a broader range of work experiences than would be necessary in those school systems which need to employ more workers of each type.

How well are we providing the professional personnel needs for rural schools? The delegates to the National Conference on Rural Education sought answers to this question.

PRESENT STATUS OF PERSONNEL NEEDS

About the present status of personnel needs of rural education, T. M. Stinnett reported as follows:

A study of some of the facts shows that both in periods of abundant teacher supply and in periods of teacher shortage, rural schools do not usually get an even break in securing well qualified teachers for its schools. In time of abundant supply, when urban schools will not employ beginning or inexperienced teachers, they siphon off the experienced teachers and the rural schools employ teachers without experience. In periods of short supply, urban schools take the best qualified teachers leaving the sub-standard, the cast-offs and the incompetent for the rural schools.

There is evidence that teachers in rural schools have long been relatively poorly qualified. In a study of rural teachers in 1952-53, rural teachers had just about caught up in their level of professional preparation to where city teachers were in 1938-39. In 1938-39, 38.2 percent of the elementary school teachers in city school systems had at least four years of college. In 1951-52, 38.1 percent of all rural elementary teachers had four years of college. In 1951-52, 41.2 percent of the rural elementary teachers had less than 3 years of college training, although in that year for the nation as a whole 67 percent of the teachers had earned college degrees.¹

These figures do not reveal the full dimensions of the problem of standards in rural elementary schools. Complete data are not available, but the 1954 Teacher Supply and Demand Study revealed that in some predominantly rural states where the one-room school is still common there are large numbers of teachers who have never been to college at all or who have a negligible amount of college training.²

In Nebraska in 1953-54, an analysis of the preparation of new elementary teachers showed that about 40 percent had less than 30 semester hours of college credit, and that an additional 24 percent had no college credit whatsoever—making a total of nearly 2/3 of the new elementary teachers in that state this year who had been to college for less than a year or not at all. About 70 percent of all new elementary teachers were employed in one-room schools, so we may safely assume that the rural children of Nebraska are being taught, to a large extent, by teachers who have virtually no college preparation.

In North Dakota, among all elementary teachers, both new and experienced, nearly 45 percent have less than two years of college preparation; this includes about 30 percent who have less than one year of college work. North Dakota also has many one-room schools.

Salaries for rural school teachers are typically lower than for urban teachers. In 1951-52, the rural teachers' average salary was \$2,484. At the same time, teachers in cities of over 500,000 were receiving an average of about \$4,500—roughly twice the pay of rural teachers. The average rural teacher started the school year of 1951-52 with a personal indebtedness of about \$800—about 1/3 of his annual salary.

Low salaries of rural teachers have sometimes been dismissed with the statement that these teachers are typically young people, inexperienced, living at home with their parents, and having no dependents. This is a completely erroneous idea. . . . During the past 15 years, the rural teaching force has changed from a group of workers that was predominantly single to one that is predominantly married. Almost 3/4 of all rural teachers are married. The average age of elementary teachers is 42, and of secondary teachers it is about 34. About 1/4 are men with two or three dependents.

¹For more information see National Education Association, Research Division, "Rural Teachers in 1951-52," *Research Bulletin* 31:3-63; February 1953.

²See National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "The 1954 Teacher Supply and Demand Report," *The Journal of Teacher Education* 5:3-52; March 1954.

Rural teachers live an average of four or five miles from the school in which they teach and do not have public transportation available. They must therefore, own and maintain an automobile.

Rental housing is difficult to find in many rural areas. Therefore, it is not surprising that the majority of rural teachers are living in homes that they own—or rather are trying to pay for. However, about a fourth of the homes in which they live do not have inside toilets or bathtubs, and a third do not have access to a telephone.

Teachers in most of the relatively large rural schools have definite salary schedules and written contracts. However, there are still many rural teachers in small schools who are not under written contract. It is still rather typical in rural areas to pay secondary teachers more than elementary teachers despite equivalent education and experience.

Paid sick-leave is now common in many rural districts, but about 1/4 of all rural teachers are still without it. Most rural teachers are now granted a few days each year to attend professional meetings.

Large rural schools tend to be relatively modern and adequate, but there are still thousands of teachers working in rural schools that are inadequate. Nearly 70 percent of the teachers in one-room schools do not have access to a sink with running water; 85 percent do not have a teacher's locker; more than half have either no storage space or space which they consider definitely inadequate; 1/4 work in buildings with inadequate heat; 1/3 consider their ventilation inadequate; 15 percent have no artificial lighting and a full 1/3 have inadequate lighting.³

A number of states and many individual communities have made substantial efforts to secure well qualified and highly competent teachers and to improve working conditions and employment benefits so that these teachers might be retained. As compared to the urban centers, most rural communities, despite real improvement, have been steadily losing ground. Surveying the facts regarding our present national status does not give the parents of rural children much cause for optimism in regard to the educational program their community is providing. It is clear that a vast number of rural children are being cheated of their right to be taught by a well prepared teacher.

EVIDENCES OF PROGRESS

Though difficulties in relation to securing well qualified personnel for rural schools are many, there are some evidences of progress. Some of them will be discussed.

³Adapted from the address of T. M. Slinnett, Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA. "Present Status of Personnel Needed." See p. 375-376.

Qualifications Are Improving

Rural teachers are becoming better qualified. Fifteen years ago 62.3 percent of the teachers in one-teacher schools had more than two years of college training and only 10 percent were college graduates. Today these percents have been increased to 76.6 and 23.2 respectively. Some states are doing an outstandingly good job of securing teachers for their schools. In Arizona, for example, 98 percent of all teachers are college graduates, and the other 2 percent have had three years of college.

Certification standards are being raised in some states and this is helping to get better teachers. Kansas is an example. Six years ago Kansas was certifying teachers on 8 college credits and in a period of a few years 4,500 emergency certificates were issued. The Kansas State Teachers Association and the State Department of Public Instruction joined in partnership and recommended a graduated calendar of required certification which the State Board of Education accepted. No emergency certificates were issued last year. The degree requirement becomes effective in 1958.

These groups didn't sit down and fume about the teacher shortage. They got up and began a process of bringing up their standards until in 1958 they will have reached the degree mark. In 1957, the Kansas State Teachers Association is not going to accept any teacher as a member that isn't a graduate of an institution accredited by the profession for teacher education. It is the opinion of many educators today that low standards do not attract teachers into the profession but rather that high standards are more likely to attract capable young people.⁴

Lay Leadership Exerted

Another encouraging sign is the increasing leadership being exerted by many lay citizens in an effort to get and hold qualified teachers for our schools. The statements of Vernon L. Heath illustrated this concern:

The crisis facing the rural schools of the nation indeed is of special significance and importance, and I feel will require more than a Herculean effort to solve. . . . While exact statistical information on the teacher shortage has not been completed, indications are that approximately 80 percent of the Nation's total teacher shortage is in the schools serving rural people. . . . The Little Red Schoolhouse makes a pretty picture in rhyme or prose . . . but many schools in rural areas are obsolete. Unfortunately, education in many rural

⁴Stannett, T. M., *op. cit.*

sections of the Nation has not kept pace with the phenomenal advances rural people have made in other aspects of living and working.

At a time when the problem of the teacher shortage, both in the rural and urban areas, requires the cooperative action and thinking of all citizens for its solution, I am quite concerned by the many unwarranted attacks that are being made on our schools and on education in general. Many writers in national publications, in an effort to point out the weaknesses of our educational system, invariably single out a few disgruntled citizens in every community to make the indictments and to pass sentence on the schools. Seldom do they go to any of the many thousands of well satisfied citizens who are happy with and proud of their schools to obtain the true story of the real progress that has been made in American education. In America we have the bad habit of criticizing about ten times as much as we ought to and we praise only about one-tenth as much as we should. Our schools need more praise and less criticism. We never will be able to solve any of the major problems of education until communities and individuals are willing to remove the pressures that they are exerting on the schools and lend a helping hand to the cause of better education.³

Another example of citizen leadership was evidenced in the remarks made by Mrs. Haven Smith:

Farm organizations are making a frontal attack against the many obstacles to equality of educational opportunity in rural America. We are working for good roads, better libraries, more equitable tax systems, the school lunch program, raising standards of teachers and school reorganization. We have promoted the school program of vocational agriculture. We urge our members to inform themselves and take an active interest in the school and its problems. We have worked for years for a fair share of the Nation's income for farm people—not just so there would be more money to jingle in the pocket but so there would be more money for better homes, for better schools, for better health, for better living in rural America.

The rural teacher surely must take pride in her position in the community. Next to the minister she is the most important public worker. She is respected, honored, and revered. And how she must cherish the rich understanding between herself and her pupils. She knows that Johnnie is one of seven children and that his father is in jail for drunkenness. She knows he probably did not have enough to eat for breakfast that morning. She knows that Paula is the spoiled child of over-indulgent parents. She knows Laura has a good mind but so far she has failed to learn to use it. She knows about the domestic difficulties in Dora's home and understands her need of love and security.

And, if you folks should ask me what we the rural people most desire from your profession, I would answer "more teachers of quality and consecration." There are many wonderful teachers, but there are a few who are not so

³Adapted from the address of Vernon L. Heath, Vice President, Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Robinson. "The Nation's Stake in Solving the Teacher Shortage Crisis." See p. 255.

wonderful and very often they settle in rural schools. As I look back over my school years, one teacher stands out in my memory. She was my sixth grade teacher. I do not remember anything about the building or the equipment, both probably poor. I know we sat two in a seat. But I do remember the teacher—old, angular, homely in face but not in spirit. She left her imprint on the life of every child with whom she came in contact. There was no fooling, no coddling, but she was an inspiration. She made us want to do our best. She instilled in us the principles of neighborliness, honesty, thrift, and fair play. None of us will ever forget Miss Blakley. We need more teachers like Miss Blakley in our schools.*

Indeed what rural communities need are more teachers like Miss Blakeley. And they get them as soon as these same communities have more citizens who realize as do Mr. Heath and Mrs. Smith that to a large extent the quality of the educational program which their school provides is dependent upon their interest and effort. Standards will be no higher than the enlightenment of the people will permit. Mrs. Smith reported that "... rural America is fast becoming enlightened." The increasing efforts of lay leaders and the increasing desire of all citizens to have better schools cannot help but make communities better places for both young and old to live, to work and to learn.

Preservice Programs are Improving.

What some colleges are doing to help recruit and prepare teachers for rural schools is also encouraging. One example of an effective program is that which is being carried on in New York at the Oneonta State Teachers College. Julia M. Morey gave the flavor of this program in her report:

Are there some considerations which are particularly rural which should be considered in finding and educating teachers to function effectively? I think there are. In the first place we must have a person who understands the rural environment in which the children live. The person should know the basic elements of rural economy and the relationships of this special community in which he lives with state, national and world problems. Secondly, the teacher of rural children must be socially mature. He should have developed an ability to live happily away from the center of cultural activities which the city provides and at the same time receive an honest enjoyment and satisfaction from his associations with the people with whom he works and plays. Finally, the teacher of rural children must know how to give support to children in families, knowing something of the discipline and realism of country living which these children face. This teacher accepts the pace of country people,

*Adapted from the address of Mrs. Haven Smith, Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation of Nebraska, Chappell. "The Distinctive Educational Needs of Rural People." See p. 251-252.

maintains a reverence for the individual which the country has always had and has sufficient strength to guide each individual into cooperative work with others.

Community studies have been a part of the curriculum at the Oneonta State Teachers College for twelve years. The students evaluate this experience as one of the most thorough-going and meaningful in the college offering. Most of these studies have been in central (consolidated) school communities, although there have been studies of neighborhoods in both cities and hamlets.

The student teaching program itself contributes to an understanding of the community in which the school is located. The students take part in community activities along with their sponsor teacher. Together the student teacher and the more experienced teacher explore the community for curricular resources appropriate to the grade level. One of the most challenging experiences of the student teaching program is the home visitations made by students and sponsor teacher. Opportunity for this direct guidance in parent relationship has greatly increased in the last decade. The fact that this opportunity is available to an increasing number of our student teachers each year indicates that visiting the home of parents is an accepted practice in most of our cooperating schools.

Oneonta has an integrated professional program. There is no separate department of rural education. Sociology is a required course in the fourth year. The professor of sociology participates in the community studies our students make and has been an active agent in promoting them.

Emphasis upon community understanding should, we believe, permeate the general education offerings of the college and this emphasis is felt in many courses. The turnover of staff has made this focus rather difficult to maintain and I believe more could be accomplished along this line. For example, departments in science and social studies could present a more functional approach to both science and social studies as they are used and lived in the communities where our students teach.⁷

Another example of a college which attempts to provide the kind of education which prepares teachers for their work in rural schools is Chico State College, California. Insight into its beliefs and practices were gained from the presentation made by Glenn Kendall:

The program which seems to best typify this educational philosophy is that which is known today as "the Community School." In our way we like to think of this community school as a center of an educational program serving children, youth, and adults, accepting the point of view that education is a continuous process which includes all age groups. We think of the facilities of the school plant being utilized from early morning until late evening. We think of the curriculum of the school as being built upon the discovery,

⁷Adapted from the address of Julia M. Morey, Department of Elementary Education, State Teachers College, Oneonta, New York. "Preparation and Recruitment of Teachers for Rural Areas."

the developments and the use of all the community resources and problems. We think of the curriculum as a growing one evolving out of the cooperative effort of all the participants as it involves the resources and problems of the community and as the aspirations of the people develop and change. We also like to think that all who share in the program have a hand in its planning, in its execution and in its evaluation.

It follows that nearly every college, if it is to serve its region well, must concern itself with rural education problems. This, we are attempting to do. For example, one of the sociology professors was chosen especially for his training and competence in the rural field. The staff member in economics likewise is highly competent in the study of rural economics. Such specialists teach not only in their appropriate fields, but come into the classes in professional education to assist in the program there.

After the student has completed his General Education courses (many with emphasis upon the rural and small communities) and also his major theory courses in education (with opportunities for first-hand observation and study of conditions—some of which are especially in the rural communities) the student is given a full semester of student teaching under the guidance of the most competent teacher available and the general supervision of a college staff member. For this experience we are extending our geographic area, and some students are now assigned as far away from the college as 150 miles. They live in the community and participate fully in community life.

It should be emphasized that this experience in the local communities is sometimes a great opportunity for the citizens there to study anew the needs and opportunities of their community. The college will not send a student teacher into these local communities until the local people have made plans for reasonable living and desirable social conditions. We want to be fully satisfied that the community itself realizes that they have an obligation. It is pleasant, in one sense, to report that there are more community requests for these student teachers than we can provide.

Along with the preservice education program there is a major need to work with teachers who are on the job. Many of the schools of the region are manned by teachers who took their study programs several years ago. A major portion of these are married, live in the community and have family responsibilities. Cooperative programs are being developed with a majority of the eight counties in the service area of our college whereby college staff members and specialists in those areas of work needed in the counties are being released from a part of their teaching loads on campus to serve as consultants in county services. This is done through contractual arrangements between each county and the college.⁸

⁸Adapted from the address of Glenn Kendall, President, Chico State College, California. "Teacher for Rural Communities." See p. 245.

Some Systems Provide Specialized Help

In addition to classroom teachers, rural schools need effective administrators, supervisors, and other specialized personnel to help provide good learning situations for children. Jens H. Hutchins summarizes these needs for one county as follows:

In every branch of our program of educational services we attempt to maintain the highest personnel standards. Our county office, composed of a curriculum services unit, a business services unit, and a special services unit, is equipped to handle the perfunctory information and problems relayed to the main office by the local district superintendents and district boards. It offers many auxiliary services as well, such as educational facilities for exceptional children, health services, legal services, library services, professional services, pupil personnel services, recreation programs, research school buildings services, financial services, special teachers services, audio-visual services, general curricular development, guidance and counseling services, and special supervision of elementary and secondary education in the fields of music, art, physical education, industrial arts, and health.

We strive to encourage and support local initiative and to keep the control and responsibility for education as close to the people as possible. Within our county, we attempt to share our services and resources, to plan and act together in a democratic fashion so that our services will be truly valuable to the various districts. We try to provide for every child in every community a comprehensive program of educational opportunity so that the smallest districts may receive services comparable to those provided by urban communities.⁸

Not all school systems have developed as many services as are available in such counties as San Diego, California. Neither are all school systems financially able to support such a large number. However, to give rural communities an equal chance with urban areas, it is important that every county identify the well specialized services which are most needed to help teachers do their work as well as possible and develop programs along these lines. Though there are still many rural teachers in the United States who have few directions toward which to turn for real assistance, many school systems through district reorganization, through the development of an intermediate unit organization which can provide specialized educational services in a realistic manner, or through other methods, are finding ways to pool resources so that opportunities for rural children can be improved.

⁸Adapted from the address of Jens H. Hutchins, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, San Diego, California. "The Number and Variety of Personnel Needed."

Careful Selection and Preparation of Supervisors

To insure good quality in rural education, supervisors must be selected with care and must be educated for the task of helping schools do their work better. How this might be done was discussed by Grace Scott:

Selection is a major step in providing good leadership personnel. There are no experiences that will transform a weak, insecure, inadequate individual into a strong, secure, skillful leader. Everyone can improve, but personality factors and intellectual abilities act as a ceiling on the amount of change that can be made in a limited length of time. In selecting supervisors their accumulated feelings about themselves and others are as important as their accumulated facts and skills.

Good potential leaders acquire during their growing years a realistic sense of their own worth and the worth of others. They are able to accept all others as valuable and to feel that others accept them as valuable. They have faith in their own ability to bring about change and in the ability of others to make change.

A good potential leader doesn't need to know everything about everything, but he needs to know something about something.

Those selected for supervisory positions should reveal positive rather than negative personality factors, have a broad outlook toward education and society in general and have exemplified a high level of knowledge and skill in the area in which they are going to supervise. Upon these three factors educational programs designed to enable people to assume general supervisory positions or supervisory positions in such special areas as music and art, can be built. In such programs there should be experiences designed to help potential supervisors develop:

1. An understanding of people and of better ways of working with people.
2. An understanding of the total school program.
3. Specific knowledge, understanding and skills in that phase of the program in which the supervisor will give guidance and leadership.
4. An understanding of society and of the place of the schools in society.
5. A philosophy of education and a philosophy of life consistent with democratic values.

Discovering how to find the people who have the qualities that make good supervisors and how to provide the experiences through which these qualities may be further expanded and developed are problems which some states are now trying to solve.

In Georgia, candidates for supervisory positions are selected by a committee on the basis of qualifications predetermined by the committee. Candidates are recommended by the director of the program for placement in each of the various counties. Placement is made and training begun soon after selection.

In West Virginia, selection is entirely in the hands of employing boards of education. Once supervisors are employed, however, their education becomes

a cooperative enterprise in which many people participate. Cooperation is the key word in this program which combines work on the campus of the University of Marshall College with guided practice on the job. The program evolved through five years of study and cooperative planning and has involved college and university personnel, the State Department of Education, county superintendents, assistant superintendents, and supervisors.

The selection of supervisors must be done on a sound logical basis which insures the possession of well-balanced personalities as well as the command of subject matter skills which the job entails. Education should be close to the particular needs of the individual, and should provide for practice with the benefit of competent guidance.¹⁹

Careful Selection and Preparation of Guidance Workers

The classroom teacher is the person who must provide the dependable and valuable information so necessary for understanding the pupil. Teachers are expected to have the sympathetic understanding that comes from day-to-day association with a pupil and to be constantly alerted for symptoms of maladjustment. Good teachers should sense problems before they become serious.

Many rural school systems, in the past almost completely lacking in the provision of specialized guidance services, are finding ways to assist teachers in the work of guiding each pupil toward optimum development. Numerous examples illustrating the development of varying types of guidance programs were reported by Leonard M. Miller. He stressed particularly the importance of wise selection:

The important task of selecting qualified and interested teacher-counselors in rural areas is often accomplished by observing teachers as they participate in extension courses or in child study programs. The greatest advance in inservice training programs have been made through the expansion of child study and case conference projects directed under well qualified personnel, especially through extension programs, universities and colleges.

Preparation of guidance workers is important to insure high quality performance. Thirty states and three territories have established certification requirements for counselors. Ten states are now developing plans for certification. Some states are establishing a pupil personnel credential which will include under one certificate several specialists such as psychologist, psychometrist, school social worker, and school counselor. Minimum requirements for certification in most states include the following items:

1. Certification to teach.
2. A minimum of 2 to 3 years of successful teaching experience.
3. Two to six credits in each of the following areas:

¹⁹Adapted from the address of Grace Scott, Director of Education for Supervisors, West Virginia University, Morgantown. "Selection and Preparation of Supervisors."

- a. A basic guidance course
- b. Human growth and development
- c. Tools and techniques of individual analysis
- d. Information service (occupational and educational)

Although the guidance worker most frequently found in rural school programs is the school counselor, other specialists are being used in increasing numbers in rural areas. They include the attendance worker, visiting teacher, social worker, school psychologist, psychiatrist, health workers (nurse, physician, dental hygienist), and specialists in speech, reading, and special education. Most of these workers in rural schools function through county boards of education or through state departments of education, and state health departments.¹¹

Careful Selection and Preparation of School Administrators

Just as important as the selection and preparation of teachers, supervisors, and special service people, is the selection and education of the school administrators. Though many of the rural administrators in the United States are inadequately prepared for educational leadership, some of the evidences of progress are encouraging. There has been a great deal of experimentation and research during the past decade relating directly to administrative preparation and, when the findings are fully evaluated and their results tested in practice, our smaller school systems will undoubtedly be the first to receive the benefits of changes in emphasis.

The willingness and desire of institutions which prepare administrators to search diligently for new methods is indeed commendable. Many universities in cooperation with local school systems are now providing a guided internship experience for prospective administrators as a part of their preservice education. Clarence Newell described one such program.

The most valuable part of the internship is that it provides opportunities for the intern to learn to handle professional responsibilities through actual practice. While doing this, he also has the opportunity to interpret this experience in the light of current theory, so that he can gain insights into the relationship between theory and practice.

Of almost equal importance is the fact that the intern gets the opportunity to absorb in a relatively short period the lessons learned by an administrator during a lifetime of professional practice. The internship always involves a considerable period of time, usually requiring the full time work of the intern for at least a semester and preferably at least a year.

The program has two major purposes. One is improving the quality of

¹¹Adapted from the address of Leonard M. Miller, Specialist in Guidance and Personnel Services, U. S. Office of Education. "The Selection and Preparation of Guidance Workers."

educational leadership in the Maryland and Washington area. The other is to provide field experiences for prospective school administrators regardless of place of prospective employment.

The university coordinator is available to each of these local school systems as often as necessary to help in planning, evaluating, and with the general supervision of the intern.

At the present time, the amount paid each intern is decided upon as an individual matter. Generally, it is suggested that an intern be paid the salary of a beginning teacher with equivalent training, plus travel expenses as provided by the school system for other central office staff. Interns with exceptional qualifications might be paid somewhat more, but the amount should be small enough so that the programs can emphasize the education of the intern rather than require the intern to perform routine duties to justify a salary.

An intern normally receives 16 semester credits for an internship of two semesters. As part of the internship, he attends an internship seminar at the university once every two weeks. In addition, he may register for not over six additional semester hours of credit for two semesters, that is, three hours of credit each semester.¹²

CONCLUSION

To insure a high quality of living in rural communities good education is essential. The most important need of rural education is well qualified personnel. Though rural schools have not usually been able to get an even break in securing well qualified teachers, either in periods of abundant teacher supply or in periods of teacher shortage, there are evidences of progress. Rural teachers are becoming better qualified. Many lay citizens' groups are cooperating in programs of teacher recruitment. Improved organization of school districts and the development of effective intermediate units are helping to make better education possible. Many teachers colleges and universities are providing more functional programs for the education of teachers and for the development of effective leadership by various types of specialized personnel, supervisors, and administrators. Continual increases in the financial resources available for rural education are needed to provide the kind of education from which each local community, each state, the Nation, and the world will benefit.

¹²Adapted from the address of Clarence A. Newell, Professor of School Administration, University of Maryland. "The Selection and Preparation of School Administrators."

Physical Facilities for Schools Serving Rural People and Their Communities

PROBABLY no facet of American public education has received greater attention in recent years than the problem of providing adequate school housing for our rapidly increasing enrollments. Providing the required physical facilities for school use has, in fact, been described by many lay people and educators as the most pressing educational need today. If statistical documentation were needed to substantiate the contention that the shortage of classrooms is a critical problem, even a cursory examination of enrollment figures would convince one of the magnitude of the task which confronts us.

STATUS OF SCHOOL BUILDING NEEDS

The demand for additional school housing which this Nation will experience in the next decade has been dramatically recorded by the Office of Education. Every year since 1946 the number of live births in the United States has exceeded 3,000,000 and recently has reached the 4,000,000 mark. This rising number of births has already produced substantial increases in school enrollments and promises a further increase of approximately 1,550,000 pupils annually through 1960. To adequately house this increase will require 50,000 additional classrooms annually at an estimated expenditure of \$1.8 billion. It is further estimated that 20,000 classrooms annually are needed for replacing those which become obsolete and are no longer fit or safe for school use. This figure does not include the backlog of 370,000 classrooms which are needed to properly house the students now in school.¹

¹Foster, Emory M., and Hobson, Carol Joy. "Vital Statistics of American Education: 1954-1960." *School Life* 37: 6-7; October 1954.

To meet this backlog of 370,000 classrooms in the next five years, to keep up with the needed replacements of 20,000 classrooms a year, and to provide the 50,000 additional classrooms needed annually, we need to build 144,000 classrooms each year from 1954-55 to 1959-60 at an annual cost of \$5.75 billion. Thus, it is an inescapable fact that the United States is confronted with a gigantic challenge to bring its school plant up to the standards of capacity which will adequately house the anticipated enrollment of approximately 43 million youngsters in 1960.²

Classroom shortages resulting from rising birth rates and increasing enrollments are not confined exclusively to either urban or rural communities. Both are confronted with school housing problems. The special significance of the foregoing figures for rural schools is clearly apparent, however, when one recalls that approximately 48 percent of our present public school enrollment attends schools which serve predominantly rural communities.

²Interest in the testimony of Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and U. S. Commissioner of Education Samuel M. Brownell before the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor on March 29, 1955, centered around drastically revised figures on the anticipated need for school housing. According to estimates for the second phase of the National School Facilities Survey received from 34 states and 3 territories, and in the opinion of the Department of HEW, the Nation's school housing needs will not be as great as originally anticipated.

The first phase of the School Facilities Survey was intended to show current needs as of September 1952. From the data submitted by 43 states and territories, the Office of Education estimated that as of September 1952 there was a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. Working from this estimate experts predicted that by September 1959 there would be a shortage of 407,000 classrooms. This prediction was based on the assumption that in the seven year period from 1952 to 1959 there would be need for 20,000 classrooms each year for normal replacements, or 140,000 classrooms altogether; likewise we would need approximately 50,000 additional classrooms each year to take care of projected enrollment increases with an average of 27 pupils per classroom. The original predictions also assumed a construction rate of 50,000 classrooms a year between 1954 and 1959.

Secretary Hobby now states that the shortage of classrooms by September 1959 will be 176,000. Mrs. Hobby says this new projection assumes that the states would need to build 476,000 classrooms between September 1954 and September 1959. She further indicated that the present rate of classroom construction was 60,000 a year, and that, if this rate were continued over the next five years, we would build 300,000 of the 476,000 classrooms needed, leaving a deficit of 176,000.

The Office of Education has not yet published its final report of the second or projection phase of the School Facilities Survey, hence there is no complete explanation of the seeming discrepancy between the earlier figures and those now presented to the House Education and Labor Committee.

CAUSES OF THE SCHOOL BUILDING SHORTAGE

The declining school population and the depression economy of the late 30's and early 40's brought a definite decline, if not an outright cessation, in school building construction. This decline in schoolhouse construction was prolonged through the war years in the interest of national defense, and as a result the schools of the Nation experienced an extended period in which no significant additions or replacements were made to existing facilities.

The problem of providing adequate school facilities in rural areas has been made even more critical by numerous changes in the American socio-economic scene. The expansion and decentralization of industry into the open country and small communities, the technological advances in agriculture and subsequent changes in our rural economy, the improved means of transportation, and the discernible, even if somewhat more intangible, change in the American way of life have all brought forth a mass migration of our population which has resulted in a decreasing pupil population in some areas and a rapidly increasing population in others. The phenomenal growth of many small communities and the tremendous expansion into areas adjacent to our large cities is a pattern familiar to all.

Still other developments which are unique to rural areas have produced an unprecedented demand for more and better facilities in rural communities. Not the least important of these developments has been the wide-spread reorganization of school districts which has substantially reduced the number of school districts in the last decade. In many cases the elimination of obsolete and inadequate buildings accomplished through reorganization represents forward steps in securing adequate facilities for rural people. The reorganization movement has been accompanied by a steady increase in the holding power of schools serving rural areas—a trend which has been especially marked at the high school level. Recent figures reveal that almost identical percentages of our rural and urban youth of school age are now in school. Such evidence suggests a growing awareness of the value of education and of the necessity for good schools. Indeed, it would be a mistake to overlook the vital interest which rural America has generated in good schools during the past ten years.

LIMITATIONS OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

It is clear that the comprehensive educational program now needed to serve rural people cannot be achieved unless adequate provisions are made to carry it on effectively in each locality where children live. Certainly, the Nation can no longer ignore the gross inequalities in the educational opportunities available, the quality of instruction, and the provision of necessary physical facilities.

Many of the existing inequalities may be attributed to differences in the ability of local communities to finance the desired program and needed facilities. Further district reorganization is both needed and possible, but does not promise a completely satisfactory solution to the problem. The answer seems more properly to lie in an increased recognition of the state's responsibility for school support. There is, of course, tremendous variation from state to state in the percentage of school costs borne by the state, but even in states which have otherwise acceptable programs of state finance, frequently little has been done to assist local communities in solving their school housing problems. Reluctance to inaugurate a state supported building program may stimulate a few communities to greater effort at the local level but can do little more than delay building in other less fortunate areas.

Providing adequate school housing for expanding enrollments and an enlarged educational program poses a particularly difficult financial problem in rural areas. The discrepancy between available resources and the capital outlay needed has been greatest in the many smaller school districts of the Nation. Not only are there numerous school districts which are too small or too poor to afford the necessary expenditure for the required buildings, but there are other communities which possess the necessary financial resources but cannot use them for needed capital outlay programs because of constitutional or statutory restrictions which limit the bonding power of the local districts. Poor assessment practices and rising construction costs have been combined in many states to make this a very critical problem. Thus, the burden of financing needed construction under such trying circumstances has delayed essential construction and further accentuated the school housing shortage. The need for state and federal assistance in eliminating the school housing shortage can no longer be considered even a debatable issue.

DETERMINING COMMUNITY NEED

Although the accomplishment of further school district reorganization and additional increases in the amount of state aid for school buildings would undoubtedly do much to alleviate the shortage of facilities which now exists and insure the kind of buildings needed for a modern educational program, neither or both of these achievements would in themselves guarantee rural communities the kind of facilities which are needed to implement the desired educational program. They are essential prerequisites, but efficient administrative units, suitable attendance areas, and adequate financial resources must be accompanied by effective educational planning.

The development of adequate facilities for education in rural areas is a tremendous task. It requires careful deliberation, intelligent planning, and creative imagination to conceive and build the kind of program and facilities which are needed. Good schools for rural areas are not merely miniature or scaled models of larger schools located in urban centers. Just as instruction in the modern school is adapted to individual differences, the facilities for rural schools should be designed to meet the special curricular, extra-curricular, and community needs of the people in the area served. The size and type of building needed will vary greatly from community to community. The design of the buildings, the transportation system and the educational program will determine whether or not a small community can provide the educational opportunities its people need and deserve.

In reorganizing school districts and revitalizing the school's curriculum, the problem arises as to what should be done with existing facilities which are inadequate for a comprehensive program in their present condition. It cannot be denied that present day educational demands have made many buildings obsolete much earlier than might once have been anticipated, and unfortunately, a high percentage of rural school buildings were constructed prior to the introduction and adoption of today's modern educational program. As a result, the problem of whether or not to bring existing facilities up to a desirable standard poses one of the most difficult questions which many small communities now face. If it is considered good business, a manufacturer does not hesitate to scrap an expensive but out-dated plant when it is made obsolete by a new manufacturing process. But can we be so bold as to advocate the abandonment of school buildings which

no longer meet educational needs satisfactorily? The answer to this general problem will, of course, differ from community to community and can be decided only after a systematic evaluation of existing buildings and the careful consideration of their suitability for the proposed program and projected enrollments. No responsible person would advocate the wholesale elimination of existing facilities because they did not currently fit our educational needs—the possibilities for successfully adapting these quarters are far too numerous to justify such action. At the same time we must possess the courage to abandon buildings that do not have the necessary potential and those that would deter rather than promote educational improvement. Renovating or rehabilitating old and obsolete buildings is frequently an expensive undertaking and may not materially improve the quality of the facilities. Contemplated additions, too, should be approached with the same care and thought which one would give to the planning of a completely new building.

PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY USE

The possibilities for enrichment of the basic educational program of smaller communities are almost unlimited if adequate facilities to implement the program can be provided. Although this may appear like an impossible task in schools with small enrollments and limited financial resources, much can be done to give expression to a comprehensive program through the careful planning of the school plant. Properly designed, the rural school is capable of providing a broad variety of curricular opportunities for children. It can also serve the community admirably for the large number and variety of activities which are uniquely associated with schools in rural areas. But it can do these things only when facilities have been specifically and carefully planned to meet recognized needs.

While communities generally provide school plants and facilities primarily for a pupil instructional program, the nature of life in rural areas and small communities frequently makes the school a focal point for all community activities. There is a greater need for community use of school facilities in rural areas because the social, civic, and cultural life of small communities depends to a large degree upon the school. School facilities are, therefore, used for numerous activities which are not normally considered part of the regular instructional program. Many of these activities can be satisfactorily

accommodated in the regular school plant, provided the range of potential uses of the building is known at the time of construction. Although this may occasionally require some slight modification of room arrangement or minor adaptation of the facilities, it is usually possible to make these changes without violating the priority which pupil needs should have. Where facilities for essential community services such as library, health, or recreation are not provided elsewhere, the community is nearly always justified in including them as a part of the school plant.

The extent to which the school plant will be utilized for community activities other than those associated directly with the instructional program will vary considerably from community to community but will be determined largely by one or more of the following considerations: (1) the basic philosophy of education existing in the community; (2) the economic development of the area served by the school; (3) the degree of isolation or proximity of the school community to larger urban centers; (4) the cultural backgrounds of the inhabitants; (5) the presence or absence of specific community services by other community agencies; (6) the integration and organization of the community; (7) the quality of educational leadership; and (8) the value orientation of the citizenry with respect to overall educational goals, community improvement and citizen participation in local affairs.³

PLANNING THE NEW BUILDING

Because the school plant in rural communities serves a wide variety of educational and community needs, the building should be carefully tailored to fit the total program which is to be provided. To accomplish this task school planners should have a clear conception of probable school and community activities which are to be housed and an accurate description of the equipment and quarters which will be necessary to carry out the program. In order to provide all the needed facilities within the financial resources of most small communities the building must be extremely functional.

Some suggestions for developing buildings which are both economical and functional are outlined. These suggestions are directed at securing a high degree of utilization of school buildings.

³Adapted from the address of Theodore J. Jenson, Superintendent of Schools, Shorewood, Wisconsin. "Use of School Buildings for Activities Other than Instruction."

Multiple Use of Space

Multiple use of space must be uppermost in the minds of those who plan school buildings for rural communities. If a building is to be functional, each room should serve a variety of purposes effectively. The smaller the school the more important and necessary the requirement becomes, for unless a high degree of multiple use is planned for schools with small enrollments, building cost per capita will be unreasonably high, if not prohibitive. Therefore, multiple use of space would appear to be absolutely essential in most small schools if they are to offer a well rounded program of instruction.

There are many possibilities for combinations of rooms and dual purpose facilities. An example of multiple use of space is the elementary multipurpose room which has clearly demonstrated the possibility for successfully accommodating music, physical education, assembly, lunch room and other activities in one unit. Multiple use of these facilities has made possible an enrichment of the elementary program which would have been virtually impossible or extremely expensive if separate quarters for each activity were required.

Significant as multiple use of facilities in the elementary school may be, the need for planning multiple use of space in the small secondary school is probably even more important and necessary. Fortunately, if the need is greater, so too are the possibilities. Experience has shown that a well planned general laboratory-classroom for all of the sciences can be provided in place of separate laboratories and recitation rooms for each subject, without seriously sacrificing the quality of the science offering. Arrangements may be made to include all shop activities from ceramics to welding and auto repair in one large general purpose shop rather than numerous specialized rooms. Library-study room combinations have also proven effective. Still other dual purpose quarters such as the familiar auditorium-gymnasium or lunchroom-study room have, when used in conjunction with the above innovations, made possible a high degree of room utilization in the small school and permitted the needed expansion of the secondary school program.

The same principle of planning for multiple use of space may also be used to advantage in adapting the school building to community use. Utilizing the gymnasium-auditorium for community functions has long been common practice in many rural communities. For the

community which desires to make an even wider use of school facilities this represents a mere scratching of the surface. With the provision of separate storage areas for equipment and materials, strategic location of toilet facilities, and proper zoning of the building for public access and heating, virtually all school shops, laboratories and classrooms can be utilized for the program of adult education or for the avocational and hobby pursuits of interested citizens. Separate entrances, some expansion of the book storage area and slight rearrangement of space may also make it possible for the library to serve both school and community. Similar arrangements may be made in the health unit to facilitate dual use of these quarters. Kitchen and lunchroom facilities can serve both students and community groups, while the same room may serve as a classroom during the day and as a meeting place for community organizations in the evening. The relationship within the building of the food service area and the gymnasium offers many possibilities.

Flexibility of Space

Closely related to and identified with the principle of multiple use of space is that of flexibility, which may be described as the easy adaptation of floor space and building units to a change in function. Because schools in rural communities are frequently small, because enrollments often fluctuate from year to year and from grade to grade, and because the educational needs and desires of the pupils vary considerably, it is essential that rural school buildings be planned for a shifting or changing curriculum. Buildings should be planned to allow for the alternation of courses, to accommodate new courses and to facilitate desired changes in continuing courses, without extensive alteration of the existing facilities. These changes, additions, and modifications in the school program may be accomplished with greater ease if buildings are planned with (1) logical floor plan arrangements; (2) movable or semi-permanent partitions; (3) functional storage areas; (4) movable equipment and furniture; (5) variation in the size of rooms; (6) unit type construction; and (7) the possibility for a high degree of multiple use.

Access to Transportation

Since rural schools frequently serve a sparse population, the problem of accessibility is extremely important and deserves the careful atten-

tion of school officials who are responsible for the final location of the school. Some pupils may walk to school, a few may be transported by their parents or drive their own cars, and many will be transported by school bus. It is probably more important to locate the school as near as possible to the center of population where it will be readily accessible by motor transportation than to have the building in the geographic center of the district or area served. Although schools should be strategically located for easy access by the main travel routes of the area, it is equally important that they be located to insure the safety of children.

Selecting the School Site

School sites should at least meet the minimum recommended standards unless circumstances are extremely adverse. For elementary schools the site should include five acres plus one additional acre for each 100 pupils of predicted maximum enrollment; for junior and senior high schools the site should consist of a least ten acres plus one additional acre for each 100 pupils of predicted maximum enrollment.^{*} It should be recognized, however, that these are *minimum* standards and that the final decision on size should be based upon the nature and scope of the educational program as well as other community uses which might be made of the facilities. In most rural areas it would seem highly desirable to exceed these recommendations. Additional space may be required for bus loading and unloading stations and the service driveways which are often a necessary part of the rural school plant. Furthermore, the need for adequate off-the-street parking for pupils, staff, visitors, and spectators to school and community activities may demand a sizeable parking area on many sites. When these special needs are coupled with the regular demands for adequate elementary playground area, for physical education and athletic fields, for lawns and appropriate landscaping, and for space to make building expansion possible, the acreage requirements soon exceed the recommended minimums by a substantial margin. Nor do these demands include space which might be needed for school bus garages, teacherages, garden plots, or other special features unique to some rural schools. It is entirely possible that part of the school site

^{*}National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, Plant Guide Committee. *Guide for Planning School Plants*. 1949 edition. Copies available from: W. D. McClurkin, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee. p. 19.

might be developed by the community as a small park or recreation area, in which case an even larger plot would be required. An underdeveloped area equal to about 20 to 30 percent of the total area should be set aside on all new school sites for the unforeseen demands of the future.

Designing the Building

Since the environment of the school should create a desirable atmosphere for all learning activities, the school should be attractive both in exterior design and interior decoration. The exterior should be pleasant, harmonious, and in keeping with the natural environment in which the school is located. Moreover, the design of the building should be adapted to the climate, weather and temperature of the region as well as to the topography. Architectural design should be an individual expression of the immediate surroundings in which it is located. The building should also be an appropriate expression of the educational program it houses and the community life it serves.

In summary, it would appear that the following characteristics should be given special consideration in the planning of school buildings to serve rural people and their communities: (1) healthful and safe; (2) economical to build; (3) attractive and well suited to the immediate environment; (4) functional; (5) flexible; (6) designed for a high degree of multiple use of space; (7) readily adaptable to community use; (8) located on an adequate site; (9) well equipped; and (10) specifically adapted to the educational needs of the students and community served.

PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

The school bus is a most important part of the physical facilities needed for schools in rural areas. Today approximately 130,000 buses transport eight million children in excess of six million miles daily. Thirty percent of all elementary and secondary pupils enrolled in public schools are transported. As might be expected, this percentage runs much higher in rural areas. The cost of pupil transportation is now between 4 and 5 percent of the total public school budget or nearly \$268 million annually. Such evidence suggests that pupil transportation in the United States has indeed become a big business. Significant as this growth has been, all evidence indicates an even further expansion of pupil transportation in the future. It has been

estimated that the schools of this Nation will be transporting more than twelve million pupils daily by 1960.

Explanations of the phenomenal growth of pupil transportation are varied and numerous, but certainly the changing concept of education has promoted its growth in rural areas. Transportation is also recognized as a necessary service in equalizing educational opportunity. Legislative action has stimulated the growth of pupil transportation in many states by (1) requiring the transportation of both elementary and secondary pupils living beyond a stated minimum distance from the school, and (2) providing state-support for pupil transportation service. Past experience has further promoted the development of pupil transportation systems by demonstrating the safety and dependability of the program. There can be little doubt that the record of safety which school buses have compiled in an age of rising traffic fatalities has convinced many sceptics.

Other factors have also contributed to the acceptance, development and growth of pupil transportation systems in rural communities. Among the more important are: (1) the leadership exercised by administrators in rural communities and the directors of transportation in state education departments; (2) the development of higher standards for school bus construction; (3) improved programs of driver training, bus maintenance, and vehicle inspection; (4) more and better all-weather roads in rural areas; and (5) the reorganization of many small school districts into larger units.

Although tremendous gains have been made in the provision of pupil transportation facilities, many problems remain unsolved and many possibilities for improved and more efficient utilization of existing school bus facilities exist. For example, while most states have defined who shall be transported, they have been somewhat less successful in working out completely satisfactory programs for the financing of transportation costs. Although school buses have achieved an enviable safety record, much remains to be done in promoting the better selection, training and licensing of school bus drivers. Nearly two-thirds of all school buses are now school district owned while the other one-third are privately or semi-privately owned. More conclusive and convincing information on the relative economy, safety, and general desirability of each method of ownership and operation is needed. For many problems there are only partial and incomplete

answers. There are also places where current practice has not yet caught up with existing knowledge.

Recent and future developments may so alter and revolutionize our concept of pupil transportation that we will need to revise much of our thinking concerning the place of the school bus in American education. It has long been recognized and accepted that the primary purpose of bus transportation is to make educational opportunities available to all youth even though they may live some distances from the school. Greater attention is now being directed to the many possible uses which might be made of the school bus for supplementing and enriching the regular instructional program of the classroom.

Whether school buses are used exclusively for transporting students to and from school or for extending the school program there are three basic objectives which every pupil transportation program should strive to attain—safety, economy, and adequacy. Safety must always be a paramount consideration. Adequacy refers to the amount and quality of transportation as compared with existing needs. Economy demands that transportation programs be efficient and as inexpensive as is possible without jeopardizing the safety and adequacy of the program.

An integral part of the daily learning experience of more than one-fourth of the public school pupils in the United States is riding the school bus daily. The real value of pupil transportation programs depends in large measure on the philosophy of administrators, teachers, bus drivers, parents, and pupils. Continued improvements resulting from program evaluation are necessary.

School District Reorganization

ATTEMPTS to consolidate schools and reorganize school districts can be traced back to about the turn of the century in most states having the common school district as the basic unit of school organization. Although these efforts to develop some type of local organization which might more adequately administer an educational program have been in response to situations and conditions which have long been in existence, school district reorganization on a large scale basis can almost be considered a phenomenon of the past decade.

PRESENT STATUS AND PROGRESS IN SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

The trouble with the term "school district reorganization" is that it is too inclusive—it is used to embrace everything from the formation of a natural sociological community unit, adequate and sound in every respect, to the merging of District 14 with District 37 to form a new unit with a total enrollment of ten pupils. Consequently, when we measure progress in school district reorganization in terms of numbers of school districts in existence at some previous time compared with now, we are using a crude criterion that is admittedly open to serious question when used for any purpose other than an indication that administrative units are getting larger than they once were. Since most school districts in the past were much too small to provide anything like a modern program of education, largeness has appeared to be such an obvious virtue that we have often overlooked the shortcomings of our reorganized school districts.

Realizing the hazards of measuring progress by the number-of-districts-eliminated process, we shall begin there and branch out to other considerations later. It cannot be denied that the reduction in the number of school districts in the United States in recent years has been significant. According to Dawson and Ellena, the number of school districts in the nation was reduced from 127,529 in 1932 to

66.4/2 in 1953.¹ The redistricting that has accounted for this reduction has not been confined to any one region, although much of the recent activity has been in the Midwest and West. On the other hand, side by side with such states as Illinois, Missouri, and Minnesota, where thousands of districts have been eliminated, are Iowa, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, where there has been little actual redistricting up to the present time. No state has a completely satisfactory structure of school administrative units, and in a majority of the states, inadequate organization is high on the list of recognized problems. Realignment of attendance areas is a nation-wide phenomenon, even in states in which there has been little or no district reorganization.

Studies of the characteristics of reorganized districts reveal that most of them are still small. Fitzwater reported a median enrollment of 626 for the 552 reorganized districts that were included in a recent study.²

Evaluation of progress toward sound organization is complicated by the widely variable results that have been achieved. Undeniably, the reorganized districts are in most instances more satisfactory than were the component districts prior to reorganization.³ There are many examples of excellent reorganizations, resulting in new districts that are so far superior to the former units that comparison borders on the ludicrous. However, much of the change that has taken place falls short of recognized criteria on every count.

The job still to be done is indicated in the fact that one district in every six does not operate a school of any kind, and that only one district in five operates both elementary and secondary schools. Dawson and Ellena found that in 1953 only 6.5 percent of all operating school districts employed as many as 40 or more teachers—a figure commonly accepted as representing the minimum number that can provide an acceptable educational program under ordinary circum-

¹Dawson, Howard A., and Ellena, William J. "School District Reorganization." *School Executive*, 11:39-42; July 1954.

²Fitzwater, C. O. *Selected Characteristics of Reorganized School Districts*. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1953, No. 3. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. p. 41.

³See Fitzwater, C. O. *Educational Change in Reorganized School Districts*. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1953, No. 4. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 53 p.

stances. There were 100,000 fewer one-teacher schools in existence in 1953 than there were in 1930, but 48,735 still remained.⁴

Although many of the redistricting laws that have been written during the past decade are specifically dedicated to the natural community concept of organization, much of the activity that has actually taken place has fallen far short of the ideal, as indicated in previous paragraphs. Undoubtedly, the principal limitation of recent efforts has been their lack of over-all planning. The institutional lag that is so characteristic of social institutions is nowhere better illustrated than in the field under discussion—we know *how* to organize districts that are far more sound than the results of our efforts would seem to indicate. Shakespeare had a point when he said, "If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches, and poor men's cottages princes' palaces."

CRITERIA FOR REORGANIZING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

There is considerable merit in Butterworth's use of the term "criteria of excellence" rather than "standards," in referring to those characteristics of school district organization that are desirable and that should therefore guide our efforts.⁵ The term "standards" implies fixed minima that would apply in any situation, and our knowledge of the variability of conditions even within a single state tells us that minimum standards, if seriously applied, would have to be so low that they would have no meaning. Rather, if guided by criteria of excellence that are regarded to be flexible and adaptable to local conditions, we can avoid the confusion that arises from our advocacy of two objectives that are often incompatible: the natural sociological community, and the "standards" to which we referred previously. When a given community does not meet these standards, something obviously has to "give." To the person who regards numbers of pupils and teachers, or dollars of valuation, to be crucial, the single-community idea would have to be sacrificed. To the person who believes that the natural or sociological community holds the key to

⁴Dawson, Howard A., and Ellena, William J., *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁵Adapted from the address of Julian E. Butterworth, Professor of Educational Administration, Emeritus, Cornell University. "Standards of Organization Pertaining to Administration and the Educational Program."

desirable school district structure,⁶ the minimum-enrollment idea could not be applied to the smaller communities.

The unpleasant truth is that *neither* of these ideals is being approached in very many of our reorganized districts. They are too small to meet the recognized "standards of efficiency," and yet they rarely bear a very close relationship to any area that could be justified on socio-economic grounds. Hence, out of our confusion and our inability to establish a clear, rational, and consistent basis for organization, has come a lot of redistricting but not much *re-organization*.

The first concern of any reorganization effort must be the educational program and the services that are needed to round out that program. The criteria proposed by the National Commission on School District Reorganization in 1948 are still generally accepted measures of adequacy, for consideration in the light of local conditions.⁷ Although there are differences of opinion as to whether every local school district should be capable of providing what might be called a "complete" program of education and all of the essential services, there can be no argument over the primacy of making every element of this "complete" program available at *some* level. We shall return to this point later in the present chapter.

Another consideration in planning strong school districts is that of financial efficiency. As school districts and schools get larger, up to a point, increased financial efficiency is clearly demonstrable. This is not intended to elevate largeness *per se* to the status of a major objective, but merely to stress the importance of eliminating *unnecessary and indefensible smallness*. As far as the *process* of reorganization is concerned, the presence of financial incentives or other circumstances favorable to change, or at least the absence of obstacles, has been shown to have a high positive relationship with success in getting school districts reorganized. At the same time, rampant decentralization tends to interfere with the setting up of adequate programs of financial support. As Cushman has pointed out, where the need for

⁶The terms "natural community" or "sociological community" refer to a single center of population (town or village) and its surrounding trade and service area and characterized by (1) a high degree of community consciousness, cohesion, or feeling of belonging, and (2) the provision of certain essential services that satisfy the needs and wants of people. See Thaden, J. F. "Compatibility of Educational and Sociological Criteria in the Formation of Community School Districts." *Rural Sociology* 17:172-75; June 1952.

⁷See Dawson, Howard A.; Reeves, Floyd W., and others. *Your School District*. Report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization, Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1948. 286 pp.

equalization is greatest, it tends to be found the least—there is twice as large a percentage of financial support from state sources in the 12 states having the fewest school districts, as in the 12 states having the most school districts.⁸

A third major factor to be considered in effecting reorganization is the natural cohesion of people in neighborhoods and communities. Leaders in the field of school district reorganization are becoming increasingly concerned with the sociological ramifications of structural change. Since we are committed to a district system of organization, in order to facilitate effective local control and initiative, we must consider the characteristics of neighborhood and community groups, and organize our school and districts so as to bring together groups of people who have important interests, concerns, and values in common. In most instances the sociological community is the area most likely to succeed as a basic unit, although merely establishing a school district along socio-economic lines does not guarantee the development of real community schools. It is assumed, however, that such a procedure is the best known way to *facilitate* the development of community schools.

We now return to a point made previously, that our primary concern is the development of an organizational framework through which the child can receive the best educational opportunities that society desires and can afford. Our problem is that many school districts if organized around sociological communities as we have advocated, would be unable to provide the more specialized educational experiences or services deemed necessary in a complete program of education. For this reason, well organized, adequately supported intermediate units would seem to be essential elements in the total

⁸Adapted from the address of M. L. Cushman, Dean, College of Education, University of North Dakota. "Standards of Organization Pertaining to School Finance."

We must be careful, however, that we do not go too far in ascribing various characteristics of state educational systems to the number of school districts that they contain, or we might be embarrassed with having to account for such things as the fact that the states having the most school districts tend to have the least adult illiteracy and the largest proportion of people who finish high school. Perhaps the really significant point is that the large-district states tend to be located in the South. For a more complete discussion of the relationship between finance and reorganization, see Chisholm, Leslie L., and Cushman, M. L. "The Relationship of Programs of School Finance to the Reorganization of Local School Administrative Unit and Local School Centers." *Problems and Issues in Public School Finance*. (Edited by John R. L.; Morphet, E. L.) Report of a Committee of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. Chapter 3, pp. 65-110.

structure. Undoubtedly, one of the greatest weaknesses in most recent redistricting efforts has been a tendency to think and talk of *school district* reorganization as if it were a separate problem, apart from that at other levels. As Cyr has pointed out, "A major problem in the development of an effective organizational structure for our public school system has been that reorganization is too often carried on at one level at a time. This hampers the development of a well-organized structure in which each level, local, intermediate, and state are properly set in relation to each other."⁹ This failure to approach organization in its entirety is largely responsible for such unfortunate outcomes as the following:

(1) There have been rather widespread efforts to "do away with" the county superintendency, without considering the unmet needs of smaller school systems for intermediate-level service. The need for strengthening the county (or some other intermediate unit) superintendency, to make it capable of doing the job expected of it, is too obvious to deserve further comment. However, one does not ordinarily solve the problem of a sore arm by amputating it.

(2) All too commonly, we accept the inevitability of poor programs in small schools, without realizing that small schools *can* be exceedingly good schools if organization does not get in the way. In the past, our thinking has been confused by our tendency to define "efficiency," especially in the secondary schools, in terms of large school organization and operation, which are characterized by a multiplicity of highly departmentalized offerings, scheduled in short periods of 45 to 60 minutes. As long as the people in small schools dissipate their energies in a vain attempt to imitate their city neighbors, there will be little progress in rural education. We must find ways to get and hold in small communities the kind of leadership that will take advantage of the assets of small communities—and there are many such assets. It is revealing to note that some of the finest schools in the nation—in fact, almost all of the real *community* schools—are located in small communities. Our problem is to make the type of leadership that can produce such results the rule rather than the exception in rural education. I am convinced that small leadership rather than small schools (assuming that they are defensibly small) is the crux of our difficulty.

(3) Much resistance to school district reorganization has come from those who do not realize that the most effective safeguard for genuine local control and initiative is the natural community unit, assisted by the well organized intermediate unit. The loss-of-local-control bogey has been one of the major obstacles to sound redistricting throughout the Nation, even though it is clearly evident that no really effective local control over an adequate educational program now exists in more than a small percentage of our school districts.

⁹From the address of Frank W. Cyr, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. "Implementing the Educational Program—A School Administrator's Viewpoint."

It is difficult to lose something that one does not have. On the other hand, reorganization that ignores everything but *financial* efficiency could easily prevent wholesome local control from developing, by getting small communities lost in multi-community units.

A special problem that has been getting increasing attention in recent years is that of the organization of suburban areas around our larger cities. A completely satisfactory rationale for the organization of such areas is still lacking. The tendency toward decentralization of other services, away from the centers of cities, is gradually making it possible for residents of the typical suburb to satisfy most of their wants and needs within the suburban area itself. Where this is happening, it would seem to give support to the application of the natural community concept of organization, resulting in the existence of independent suburban school districts rather than their inclusion in the city systems. On the other hand, the same argument could be given for organizing independent school districts around some of the "shopping centers" that are scattered throughout our cities and larger towns. Many of these centers provide not only the usual retail trade establishments, but medical and dental services, movie theaters, banks—almost all of the services considered by sociologists to be reliable indicators of the presence of a "good community."¹⁰ Hence, if we push our argument far enough, we could make a case, not only for separating the suburban fringes from city school organization, but also for carving out certain areas for independent school systems within the city proper. Perhaps the time will come when intermediate units will be developed far enough to make quite plausible the decentralization of city systems into several areas of socio-economic design. Such a procedure may not actually be ridiculous or far-fetched as it probably seems at first glance.

ATTAINING SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Although no simple formula for attaining reorganization has been developed, certain principles seem to be emerging. There is a preponderance of opinion among the leaders in the field of redistricting that change should be based on public understanding, on both theoretical and practical grounds. Assuming this to be true, the success of any given redistricting program will depend upon the degree to

¹⁰Thaden has suggested as prerequisites to a "good community" the provision of educational, economic, medical, recreational, religious, and social services. See Thaden, J. F., *op. cit.*, p. 174.

which the public knows and is in sympathy with the purposes and probable outcomes of proposed changes.

It is becoming increasingly clear that those who would depend upon the understanding and support of people, particularly rural people, for progress in reorganizing school districts, must realize that neighborhoods and communities vary. Not only is every person a unique problem in communication, but clusters of people also differ to the extent that approaches to groups must be individualized. Kreitlow, in studying rural neighborhoods in Wisconsin, has found significant differences in the degree to which neighborhood groups accept selected educational programs and practices, depending upon the homogeneity or heterogeneity of their ethnic and religious backgrounds.¹¹ He infers from his study that we must individualize our approach to neighborhoods and communities, as we would to the children in a classroom, if we would deal successfully with them.

Printed materials can be of considerable value in a reorganization program, but as an addition to, not as a substitute for, person-to-person contacts. Newspaper publicity has been found to be quite ineffective in changing deep-seated attitudes concerning school district reorganization, particularly in rural areas.¹² Essert and Howard capture the essence of enlightened community relations when they say, "... the cornerstone of America's rural public school policy is still the kitchen chair—tilted back on two legs, teetering gently to the gestures and head-shakings, the chesty and deliberate reflections of its occupant. Enthroned above the curricula, the new buildings, the organizational skills and the specialized knowledge of educators, there it teeters as indisputable proof that the schools not only belong to the people, but that the school *is* the people—socially, morally and economically, today and tomorrow. Community relations begin in the kitchen chairs."¹³

¹¹Adapted from the address of Burton W. Kreitlow, Associate Professor of Rural Education, University of Wisconsin. "Standards of Organization Pertaining to the Community to be Served."

¹²Chisholm, Leslie L. *The School District Organization Program*. Lincoln, Nebr.: Teachers College, University of Nebraska. (Mimeo.) Contains an analysis of the most effective public relations activities used in redistricting programs in 29 communities in five Midwestern states.

¹³Essert, Paul L., and Howard, Robert West. *Educational Planning by Neighborhoods in Centralized Districts*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. p. 95.

Reorganization is hampered where a sound framework for bringing it about is not provided by law. As stated previously, it is likewise hampered where laws pertaining to finance place a premium on maintaining present organization. Those who would seek to bring about school district reorganization, then, must work toward the passage of legislation which stimulates effective study and action.

State-level leadership is crucial in stimulating desirable change. This has been well illustrated in New York. The State Education Department in that state assumes that its role in school district reorganization lies primarily in working to secure effective legislation, working with lay and professional groups, disseminating information, and developing policies through which all will be treated equitably and with a minimum of state domination. As far back as 1914, the individual district's power to veto plans was taken away, and the organization of units along community lines was made possible. In 1924, financial incentives, including state support for school building construction and transportation, were added. The petition procedure is now used, to assure a large measure of support, particularly among farm people, before submitting a plan for a vote. One especially worthwhile feature of the New York State Education Department's work is the assistance it gives local committees in studying proposals in great detail, including a two-day intensive study of (1) general provisions of the law, (2) educational plans for the next six years, (3) the need for additional school building space, (4) transportation needs, and (5) financial plans.¹⁴

Through such studies as those described, people make their *own* plans and are made aware that the ensuing changes will be locally determined, not decreed by the state. This, in essence, seems to be a desirable policy for continued efforts to bring about the reorganization of our rural school districts, so badly needed if schools are to provide educational programs of the quality which rural children have a right to expect.

¹⁴Adapted from the address of Francis E. Griffin, Chief, Bureau of Rural Administrative Services, New York State Education Department, "The Role of the State Department of Education in School District Reorganization."

The County Unit as a Type of Administrative Organization

IN the history of education and in the development of local school systems in America the county unit pattern is a somewhat recent development. It resulted from attempts to improve the administrative structure of education which traditionally had been the numerous small school districts. The adoption of the county unit pattern has been especially in the rural areas of the southern section of the United States.

When Louisiana, in 1879, consolidated all units within a parish (county) into a single unified school system, the county unit pattern of local school administration was born.¹ Since that time eleven other states—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia and West Virginia—have adopted the county unit type of organization, or some modification of it, without any intermediate units functioning between the local and state levels. In addition to these twelve states, there are other states which have one or more counties organized as a basic school unit. Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota and Oregon have county-units, varying from one to five in number.²

DIFFERENCES AMONG COUNTY UNITS

Although all of the twelve county unit states lack intermediate units, not all of them have only counties as the local unit of school administration. In fact, only Florida and West Virginia have coterminous boundaries for all counties and local school districts for the entire area of the state. In the other ten states will be found local

¹Cooper, Shirley, editor. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*. Yearbook 1950. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1950. p. 35.

²Adapted from the address of S. J. Knezevich, Associate Professor of Education, State University of Iowa. "The Advantages, Limitations, and Future of the County Unit of School Administration."

school districts independent of the county units, ranging from one (Baltimore City) in Maryland to 136 in Georgia. Virginia is different from the other county unit states in that the basic unit of administration is called a division, there being 110 of them. In this state a local unit (division) might be a single county, two or three counties, a county and a city, or a single city.³

It is difficult to identify any one state as a typical county unit state or any one county unit as a typical county organization because of the considerable amount of variation among them. Besides variations indicated above there are differences among their boards of education, both as to number of members and the manner of their selection. In half of the county unit states members of boards of education are generally elected while in the other half they are appointed. Even within a single state there may be variation in the manner of selection of board members. For example, in Maryland all board members, with the exception of those in one county, are appointed. Then, too, there are variations in the manner of electing board members or in the authority for appointing them. The one general agreement among the twelve county unit states seems to lie in a single lay board serving as a board of education, without any subordinate boards, in each county.⁴

There is a lack of uniformity also in the manner by which county boards of education select their superintendent of schools. In some of the county unit states the chief school officer is elected by popular vote; in others he is appointed by the board of education; and in still others he may be either elected or appointed, depending upon the particular county in question. The term of office for the superintendent also varies, generally from two to four years.⁵

There is a variation among the county unit states as to the fiscal policy. In most of these states school systems are fiscally independent of other county government. In other states, however, such as Virginia, Tennessee and Maryland, school boards depend upon the other county governing officials for financial support.⁶

A still further difference among county units, perhaps even the most significant of all in terms of the educational program provided,

³Cooper, Shirley, editor, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁴Adapted from the address of S. J. Knezevich, *op. cit.*

⁵*Ibid.*

⁶*Ibid.*

is the differences which result from differences among counties. Counties are not all alike. They vary in size, population and resources. Some counties are small in every respect; others large. These differences among counties are likely to be just as great within any given state as they are among states. In Maryland, for example, one county school system employs more than 1900 teachers, while there are other counties employing only 119 and 121. In Florida the number of teachers employed by county units range from more than 3500 to 16. In Georgia this range is from over 700 to 3 counties which employs only 15 teachers.

ADVANTAGES OF COUNTY UNIT ORGANIZATION

In spite of the variations among counties where the county unit is the type of school organization, county units offer some definite advantages to be considered by those who are interested in patterns of school administration. It should be understood, however, that pattern of organization does not solve the problems facing the school administrator; it may permit him to function to better advantage. Likewise no pattern can be considered as universally acceptable.

Educational Progress Is Facilitated

The development of county units for local administration of schools favors the reduction in the number of school administrative units within a state. One deterrent to rapid educational progress in many states has been the multiplicity of very small school districts, insufficient in size to provide the resources and leadership for forward moving programs. If 40 teaching units in a school district might be considered a minimum for an acceptable educational program, then only 6.5 percent of the operating school districts in the Nation measured up to this meager minimum in 1953. At that time there were 55,335 school districts operating schools in the United States, an average of about 1153 per state.⁷ In contrast, within the twelve county unit states there are approximately 1350 local school administrative units, or an average of about 112 per state.⁸ Although counties as basic units of local administration do not guarantee adequacy in educational programs, it can be expected that their greater size would at least set the stage for improved quality.

⁷Dawson, Howard A., and Ellena, William J. "School District Reorganization." *School Executive* 11:40-41; July 1954.

⁸Adapted from the address of S. J. Knezevich, *op. cit.*

Less Dependence Upon Intermediate Units

Where the county is the basic unit of school organization, intermediate units operating between the local districts and the state department of education have been eliminated. Whereas those states which contain hundreds and even thousands of small local school districts find it increasingly necessary to develop intermediate units which can assist them in making comprehensive programs of education possible for their local communities, the county unit states with their less numerous and larger school districts, by and large, do not experience the same need, or the need to the same extent. It should be recognized that there are in the county unit states a great number of counties which are deficient in resources and population and do not afford well rounded educational programs. They, too, could profit by cooperating and sharing in providing needed services, although the type of intermediate unit organization developed might be considerably different from that of the states which have a larger number of small districts. The smaller number of basic units in the county unit states makes the need for intermediate organizations a somewhat different problem.

Economy of Operation

Corollary to the reduction in number of local units and the different emphasis for intermediate units is the advantage of economy in administration of schools in the county unit states. For example, in Maryland there are but twenty-four school administrative units (twenty-three counties and Baltimore City) calling for twenty-four boards of education, twenty-four superintendents and twenty-four central office staffs. It is conceivable that a state of this size might have within its borders several hundred local school districts, each with its own board, superintendent and staff, albeit limited, if organized on the small local district pattern. In addition the need would then exist for eighteen or twenty intermediate units. The "overhead" costs for administration would thus be considerably higher in county unit states than is now the case with the present pattern of organization. Perhaps the increasing costs of education will cause more states to re-examine the size of their school administrative units with a view toward some type of consolidation which can effect economy.

Considerable savings in school costs can be made by the county-wide purchase of school supplies and equipment and in the operation

and maintenance of the physical plants. Buying in large quantities generally results in lower initial per unit cost, while proper accounting and special supervision helps to eliminate waste and extravagance. The county unit organization is particularly adapted to centralized business administration.

Greater Equalization of Opportunity

Perhaps the greatest advantage of the county unit type of organization lies in its possibility for county-wide equalization of educational opportunity and the furtherance of adequate educational programs. Though many in our present population were educated in one-teacher rural schools and such schools will continue to be necessary to serve numerous sparsely populated and isolated areas, the consolidation of small rural schools has in most instances materially contributed to better educational opportunities for boys and girls.

In the five year period from 1948 to 1953, more than 26,000 one-teacher rural schools were eliminated.⁸ Many more will doubtless be consolidated in the years ahead. It is especially significant that the greatest amount of consolidation of these schools has occurred in states with the least rural population and with large school districts. Consolidation is more readily effected where various vested interests and numerous local boards of control are not involved. In this, the county unit states have a decided advantage.

More Effective Pupil Transportation

Consolidation of rural schools has brought on to the American school scene a need for the transportation of pupils as public expense. If transportation were not available, the advantages of consolidation would be largely nullified since many children would then be unable to attend school and avail themselves of the better opportunities created.

In spite of the many problems caused in providing transportation, large administrative units can provide the service more efficiently than can the smaller local units. Among other things, reduction in the duplication of routes, better scheduling, control and maintenance of the equipment, and general overall supervision of the service are favored by operation of the transportation system as an enterprise covering a large area.

⁸Dawson, Howard A., and Ellena, William J., *op. cit.*

Broader Programs of Service

It has been especially difficult in many of the rural areas of the Nation to provide adequate specialized services such as the proper diagnosis of maladjusted children, programs for the exceptional, school social service, school health programs, food service, library service, and even instruction in the special subject areas. Each of these services poses specific problems, not only in the remote areas but frequently also in the somewhat more densely populated communities. Generalized classroom instruction in itself is sufficiently difficult in sparsely settled communities. Programs are doubly difficult to organize and administer when they touch only upon selected groups within the student population. When the service area of rural administrative units is sufficiently large to provide specialized services and personnel on an itinerant basis or at a location convenient to the entire area, the availability of them is expedited. It is with respect to these specialized fields that county unit systems have an advantage over the small independent local units, bringing a wide range of opportunities to rural school children.

Improved Quality of Instruction

It is not particularly difficult for the welfare and status of teachers and the quality of instruction to be equalized in the county unit organization. Resources in the various sections of the county are available for all and can be applied by the administration toward the salaries of teachers, materials of instruction and other areas directly affecting the instructional program.

However, more than pure equalization should follow. Should it not be possible to elevate the quality of instruction in the county instead of just leveling out what resources are provided by individual communities? Large administrative units favor the employment of capable staffs who can provide leadership in various areas and stimulate others to apply their special talents toward improving school programs. Not only can these larger units employ a greater number of persons with ability but also as the area and population of the school district is broadened, persons with more outstanding ability. This concentration of talent applies not only to the teaching staff but to the general population and to the combined student body as well. This increased leadership should reflect in improved participation, support, and educational quality.

DISADVANTAGES OF COUNTY UNIT ORGANIZATION

Those who advocate county units as the pattern of organization for local districts recognize that some difficulties are experienced in administering them.

Relationship of People to School Administrative Organizations

Perhaps the greatest handicap of county unit organization lies in maintaining a feeling of unity throughout all parts of the county. Educational progress is most readily realized when there is general agreement and understanding as to the peculiar problems faced by public education and the manner of attacking them. The fact that most counties cover large land areas and contain within their borders various and diverse communities creates a special problem in developing a oneness and commonness of effort. The county is not a basic sociological unit and though there may be developed over the years a certain political affinity, apparent social cohesiveness is likely to be artificial or superficial.

The "distance" between the people and the administration of their school is especially great where community centers lie close to county boundaries and interests of people in many areas of social interaction spill over into the adjoining county or counties. This problem is manifest, or likely to be so, in any instance where political rather than sociological boundaries are the basis of administrative organization. It is not limited to or entirely unique with county school units. But in these county units the problem is likely to be both greater in degree and more difficult to overcome.

The problem of developing a high degree of relationship between the people of a county and the administration of schools is not alleviated when certain communities are removed from county administration and set up as independent school districts. This frequently removes from the remaining rural area the nuclei which provide the needed unifying influence. That county which consists of but one primary community doubtless finds itself in a peculiar position and one of a very limited group of counties.

The difficulty of securing county-wide participation in the school program is serious, especially in the large county units. Just as the consolidation of rural schools without careful planning and management tends to increase the gap between the home and the school so

does the organization of county units make it more difficult to maintain local interest in educational planning. If consolidation leads to improved education for children in rural areas, then perhaps on a grander scale the combining of various local districts into a large administrative unit can be justified on the basis of its elevation of school quality. The problem is resolved to one of values, quality versus possible loss of participation. The challenge to administrators is to maintain the interest, concern, and participation of the people in school matters. Though the difficulty of active participation may originate because of physical remoteness, distance need not continue to be the deterrent. When nearness is considered as a thing of the mind and as the distance between the source of authority and the scene of operation, schools can be kept close to the people.¹⁰

Related to the difficulty of securing local participation in the school program is the possible development of a feeling among the citizens that their problems will be solved by the county seat, for school matters as well as for other governmental services. This apathy and civic lethargy can be deadening to communities and, if permitted to continue, could lead to inefficiency and waste in the school system. Indifference and waste go hand in hand. Then, too, citizens do not fully appreciate the services they receive when they are forthcoming without effort and when they can be charged to county-wide resources. It is easy, for example, to request free transportation for a particular community and expect that it will be granted if the cost can be charged against a broad tax base. The request, however, might never originate if the local beneficiaries could directly see its reflection in the next tax bill. This is not to imply that needed services should not be granted. Rather it is hoped that citizens will be more discriminating when they are not "pampered and spoiled" by receiving services without effort.

School Board Representation

Although diversity of thought among members of any board of education is desirable and wholesome, it is a hindrance to administration if it represents provincialism. When the actions and decisions of school board members are dictated by limited and narrow interests

¹⁰Adapted from the address of Forbes H. Norris, Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Rockville, Maryland. "Special Problems of the County Unit Organization." Presented at the Ninth National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents, Washington, D. C., October 2, 1954.

of the separate local communities rather than by "the greatest good for the greatest number," progress is likely to be sporadic and intermittent, if not transitory. Board members are sometimes elected on the promise that they will get the community what it wants. It demands a determination and a concentration of effort to develop a unity which will express itself in county-wide educational problems rather than in granting one community special privileges and favors at the expense of another. It would be desirable and commendable if communities were sufficiently benevolent and altruistic to be equally concerned with the problems confronting other communities as their own, and if they pursued their solution just as vigorously, but in practical school administration this seldom happens.

Curtailment of Program Enrichment

A criticism is sometimes directed at county systems of school organization for the leveling off effect they may have on educational opportunities for the wealthier communities. Apparently agreement is fairly general that there is a lifting of opportunities in the poorer communities within county units. Even for these communities, though some critics maintain educational gains are made at the expense of developing an inferiority complex and a feeling of helplessness. But with the wealthier community it is maintained that there is a lowering of the ceiling, an equalization downward. *This need not necessarily be so.* However, a challenge is presented to organizational experts and to administrators to provide opportunity for the communities with ability to raise their sights, to move ahead and to indicate to others the possibilities that they, too, might achieve.

It is possible within a county that wealthier communities feel the less fortunate ones are getting a free ride. This is not dissimilar to the attitude which wealthier counties may have toward poorer ones within a state or the attitude wealthier states may have toward equalization programs on a national scale. And, in a similar vein, the same attitude prevails in the minds of many people toward America's assistance in helping other nations solve their problems.

The advantage for understanding the problems of the less wealthy areas and developing a readiness to share resources lies with the local level. It is here that communities are relatively close together and can be kept informed if inter-community communications and relations are properly cultivated and utilized.

SPECIAL RURAL PROBLEMS

Some special problems more or less peculiar to rural areas present themselves and, consequently, are of concern to county units just as to any other type of rural school district.

Providing Competent Teachers

The staffing of schools in outlying areas poses a particular problem. During a period of critical teacher shortage, good teachers can "shop" and to a considerable extent choose the kind of community in which they wish to work. Their final selection is more often motivated by such factors as living conditions, conveniences, nearness to cultural and recreational opportunities and salary than by the challenge of the position. Though the need for capable teachers in rural areas is just as great as in urban communities, "good teachers" tend to gravitate toward the cities. Perhaps the county units with their advantage of equalization can meet the challenge.

Opportunities for Transported Pupils

Previous mention has been made of school transportation and how its efficiency can be improved by consolidation of small districts. Yet transportation itself brings certain restriction to school programs. This restricting influence is particularly felt on after-dismissal activities. Many children may be denied the privilege of engaging in numerous worthwhile activities that can be pursued and are pursued, especially in secondary schools, after the buses leave. Doubtless proper scheduling can provide for many of the activities during the school day, yet the length of the day is dictated in part by the amount of time needed in providing transportation between home and school both in the morning and afternoon hours.

Political Election of Superintendents

Another special problem of an entirely different nature is created by county units in those systems where the chief school executive is elected by the people. Though it is considered best practice to elect the members of the board of education and have them select the administrative head of the school system, there are still many school units where the superintendent is elected directly by the people. In such a county unit much time is lost by the superintendent for meeting the educational needs of the people because he is forced to use political

means and campaigning throughout the county in order to secure or hold his position. The time remaining and available for meeting the county's educational needs stands restricted, especially in election years.

CONCLUSION

It might be well to indicate some precautions which should be taken in order to insure the most successful operation of county school units. These are by no means all inclusive and will not of themselves guarantee the success of the county unit pattern.

Only persons who possess a sense of responsibility to the entire county should serve as members of the county board of education. If appointed, the appointing authority should know well the capabilities and breadth of vision of the appointee. When members are elected they should stand for election before the voters of the entire county and not of a limited area.

The board of education should select and appoint an outstanding educational leader who knows how to involve the lay citizens in the educational program as the chief school officer for their school system. This is important for any school system, but it is especially important in county unit systems. Since the county is not a primary sociological unit, involving lay people from various communities in seeking solutions to common education problems will help to develop the unity essential to the effective functioning of a county system.

Educational decisions and implementations should be made at the local community level unless they can be more economically and effectively accomplished at the county level. It is important that schools be kept close to the people. Excessive centralization of control should not develop at the county seat. To encourage grass roots participation, capable leadership must be provided in each local school. This involves the careful staffing of each school so that adequate resources in personnel are available for conducting a proper educational program for the community served. Authority commensurate with its responsibility should be delegated to each school staff.

Opportunities should be provided for the forward-looking communities within a county unit to move ahead of the county program. This means more than permission; it involves encouragement. If it requires additional financial resources, provision should be made for this. In some communities it may mean the privilege of imposing additional taxes; in others it may mean securing funds through more voluntary

sources. Progress in education develops from success in pilot centers. A county unit should be designed to promote educational progress.

Finally, it must be recognized that the county unit is not a panacea. It is a man-made device for promoting school administration and as such is subject to limitations. Whether or not the county unit type of administrative organization is suited to any particular region should be determined only after thoughtful consideration by both educational and lay groups in the area to be served.

The Intermediate Unit of School Administration

ONE of the ideas or concepts which received a great deal of attention and stress at the 1954 National Conference on Rural Education, very little at the First White House Conference on Rural Education in 1944, was that of the intermediate unit. Within a relatively few years the terms *intermediate unit* or *intermediate district* and *intermediate superintendent* have come into the vocabulary of educational administration. The intermediate unit is not a recent organizational innovation, however. In many states it has existed for more than a century. Some states made provision for an intermediate unit of school administration in the first state constitution which they adopted.

The recent consideration of and concern about the intermediate unit results from a new emphasis of what desirably should be its purposes and functions. This shift in emphasis is the result of a different and changing situation from that which once existed. The shift in emphasis is responsible for the use of the term *intermediate* as a substitute for other names more familiarly associated with the same unit of administrative organization, most common of which are "county school office" or "county superintendent of schools." And although the term intermediate unit is now rather common in usage among administrators in most states, the changing concept—the new emphasis—is not well understood.

THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT—ITS PRESENT SETTING

Historically the intermediate unit of school administration in the United States emerged and has developed, by and large, as an arm of state government. In detail its functions in the different states have varied widely but in general it has served the purposes of:

1. Maintaining, through the exercise of general supervisory oversight in local districts, the minimum educational standards prescribed by state law.

2. Maintaining the essential unity of purpose in the educational programs of local districts without the smothering effects of uniformity.

3. Maintaining a two-way flow of information between the local districts on the one hand and the state department of education on the other.

4. Exercising the function of general educational leadership in educational planning and classroom instruction.

5. Serving as a spokesman for education in the arena of county government.

With such orientation and such general responsibilities to meet, the intermediate district has been placed, not infrequently, in its relations to local districts in the roles of a stern father, an annoying inquisitor, an uninvited guest, a volunteer fire department or an old-fashioned circuit rider who went about saving people whether they wanted to be saved or not.

The intermediate district came into existence and developed during a period in which the school systems of most states was characterized by thousands of small local administrative units. For the most part, each was a district with its total educational program housed in a rectangular one-room building with one-teacher constituting the entire family. Two or three decades ago it was not at all uncommon to find as many as a hundred, and in some instances as many as two hundred, of these small districts in a single county.

In such a situation an intermediate district having responsibility for relatively routine coordinating duties fit naturally into the scheme of school administration. It was simple; it was economical; it made sense to practical minded rural people; and to a reasonable degree, it met the educational needs as they were recognized and understood by a great majority of the people.

But the structure of school administration in rural areas of the United States has drastically changed since intermediate units were created. School district reorganization, proceeding in recent years at a phenomenal rate, has reduced the number of administrative units in many counties from a hundred or even more, to six or eight and sometimes even fewer. With the resources of several districts brought together in a single administrative unit and with a new and more vigorous outlook towards education, these larger districts have employed capable superintendents who are proud of their positions, enthusiastic about their work and, perhaps, over confident about their ability to move forward "on-their-own" in developing a good educational program.

This highly commendable and most desirable local pride is by no means limited to the local district superintendent. The people flush

with their accomplishments in school district reorganization, which has been in many instances no mean achievement, are equally proud of their school district. They feel that they have gone all the way in reshaping their scheme of school administration—that they have done what needs to be done and, after the price they have paid, have a right to stand on their own feet without interference from any quarters. The intermediate district is looked upon as a challenge to their jealously guarded autonomy. This feeling has been so pronounced that in many instances newly formed administrative units have disassociated themselves from the intermediate district and are known as independent districts. Among local superintendents, school board members and local citizens in the area involved, this action takes on some of the character of a "little declaration of independence."

There have been other important changes in the situation. The kind of services the intermediate district was created to provide for the small local unit are scarcely needed in the newly created, larger and stronger reorganized districts. Professional leadership for the board of education and the teachers is provided in the local superintendent. He is capable and has the means of seeing that minimum state requirements are met. He is able to serve on the local scene and even at county and regional levels as a spokesman for education. He can compile and transmit essential information, perhaps, even more effectively than the intermediate district superintendent. And he can receive and interpret information and directives from the state government.

From looking at intermediate district and local school administration from this limited point of view, many people in areas where reorganization has progressed rapidly come to the conclusion that there is no longer need for an intermediate district of school administration. This unsound and unwarranted conclusion results from looking at the structure and mechanics of administration without, at the same time, viewing the instructional process. Changes in this aspect of public education within the last few years have been, perhaps, even more phenomenal than the progress made in school district reorganization.

THE CHANGING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Although they have by no means been confined to a single decade, there have been substantial and significant changes in the educational programs which schools provide. The scope of services which have come to be considered essential in a modern educational program has

been expanded greatly. This is generally well recognized, but because it is basic to the changing concept of the intermediate unit, there is probably some value in noting briefly the types of changes which have taken place.

Virtually all of the educational program changes have meant an expansion or extension of school services. Schools have extended the educational program upwards and now provide high school education for nearly all young people. In some communities this has come to include a 13th and 14th year. Many communities now have programs of education for adults. The educational program has also been extended downwards to include kindergarten and, in a few communities, even nursery schools.

The educational program of public schools has been broadened. Ideally and generally it is no longer limited to an academic program. The curriculum has been broadened to include agriculture, homemaking, business education, industrial arts, and other types of vocational specialization for those who will seek employment rather than college admission. Safety and the ability to drive an automobile safely and courteously have become increasingly important. The curriculum has been enriched through music, art, crafts, dramatics and the like. Social skills are now given emphasis through courses in family relations and group leadership, through student councils and various types of club activity, and through the tendency to put an increasing amount of responsibility for pupil conduct upon the pupils themselves, both individually and in groups. The educational program has become comprehensive—in skills, in understandings and in the ability to work both independently and with others.

School programs have also been greatly expanded in terms of new and additional services which have been undertaken. Many schools have now taken on responsibility of a school lunch program, the transportation of pupils and the maintenance of school buses. Schools have begun to accept responsibility for handicapped children and are frequently providing corrective programs for those with speech or other handicaps. They are providing specialized programs of pupil guidance and are helping those with emotional problems through school psychologists and the availability of psychiatric services. Health and dental services are a part of the school program. In some communities the schools are also providing programs or facilities for community-wide

services—canning centers, farm machinery repair, community library, and many others.

These changes in what people have come to understand and regard as essentials in any comprehensive program of educational opportunities have involved a tremendous increase in the number and complexity of school services. The expansion of services has been defensible—largely a reflection of the increased complexity of modern life. And although it is recognized that all schools do not provide all or even those which have been identified, there is an ever increasing number of schools which do provide all or a majority of them.

THE EMERGING CONCEPT OF THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT

Almost every aspect of the way in which people live and make a living has changed—in both rural and urban areas. Social institutions, however slowly and painfully, however much through trial-and-error, must change and adapt in order to meet the needs of the new situations and circumstances. Without responsiveness to change, social institutions can no longer serve the people or the purposes for which they were created. And at this very point in time—a recognition of change and a struggle to adjust—educational organization is in transition, perhaps what will in time be the greatest adjustment American education has ever experienced.

The intermediate unit is but one integral part of educational organization. In some states, those which have the county as the basic administrative unit, an intermediate unit does not even exist. And while this discussion is focused upon this one segment of educational structure, it cannot be understood without an understanding of its relationships to other parts of the structure and the outside pressures which bear upon it. The emerging concept of the intermediate unit is a part of this total complex of relationships and their response to change.

It is recognized that the shifting conditions within which school organization—local, intermediate, state—has attempted to provide an educational program have been relatively gradual. It is further recognized that these changing conditions have been met with certain structural adjustments from time to time. But a brief identification of the kinds of changes to which schools as a social institution are attempting to adjust can be described most clearly by looking only at the extremes—what conditions once were and what they now are. Attention here is focused only upon rural aspects.

Small, relatively self-sufficient communities have been changed by the availability of good transportation, the ease of communication, and access to all the elements of a high level of living. Whereas once the major interests of people were within the community, they are now very broad. Communities are larger in terms of the area of relationships; they are more interdependent.

The simple agrarian way of life which once characterized rural people has changed. Only a few can farm, and they, like the others, need a high level of technical skill in order to make a living.

The educational program above the elementary level was once restricted to the few who planned to enter college. Now it is generally available for all. The demand has been, and still is, for a widely expanded educational program suited to the special needs of all. Schools have responded with a greatly expanded program of services—previously described.

The cost of education was once very low—an academic program was not expensive. But with a broadened curriculum and the addition of many other services, costs have increased tremendously.

Education was once financed wholly on a community basis. Expanded services, increased costs and the limitations of local taxation has resulted in a substantial proportion of educational costs being shifted to the tax base of the state. Equalization provisions have been a significant development.

While many changes not reported here are perhaps equally important in their relationship, these few may well be adequate for this description.

Their significance is that as change has taken place, it has strained all levels of the educational structure. Relief has come in the form of structural adjustment; all levels have been affected—local districts most, intermediate units least.

Local school districts have needed to respond to the demand for more services and to find some means for offsetting greatly increased costs. Increased state support has helped. The general response, however, has been school district reorganization—the combining of a number of smaller school districts into a single administrative unit. Smaller schools which have not been involved in reorganization are in most instances both unable to provide what might be considered a desirable educational program (particularly at the secondary level) and pressed with a continuous financial insufficiency.

State education departments have greatly expanded their services, staff and influence. They have generally encouraged local districts to reorganize and have assisted them with technical help and, in a few states, even with financial incentives.

The intermediate unit has also been affected. The 100 to 200 former districts in an intermediate area have suddenly become three or five

or eight. In some states the channel of communication (or "jurisdiction") between the intermediate unit and these reorganized districts is cut. Functions previously performed are no longer needed. Jealousies over "power" arise. The intermediate unit is affected by the changes which have occurred but only in a few instances (especially Iowa and New York and, in a financial way, California) has provision been made for structural adaptation.

It is therefore clear that *the emerging concept of the intermediate unit cannot be isolated from the organizational structure of local school districts and state education departments. The reorganization of local districts, the reorganization of state education departments, and the revamping of intermediate units are not separates. They are all part of the same process—the adjustment of a social institution, i.e., schools, to meet the needs of a new situation and different circumstances.* The major difficulty has been that attention has generally been focused upon only one area at a time. They cannot be so disassociated. With this background of relationships, the emerging concept of the intermediate unit can be described rather simply. Primarily it is one of an overhaul of what have traditionally been its functions and, in most states, a substantial change in its structure.

Many of the duties heretofore performed by intermediate units can and should be transferred to local districts. Direct leadership with local boards of education, for example, should appropriately be a function of the superintendent of the local district. The intermediate unit should, however, take on new functions. Among these would be the provision of specialized educational services which the smaller local districts in the intermediate area are unable to provide for themselves. A second general function would be that of coordinating the individual efforts of its constituent local districts when cooperative action can contribute to greater educational benefits. The leadership provided should be that of assisting local districts in determining their need for specialized services, in establishing service programs, and in evaluating and improving those services it is already providing. Leadership should also be directed toward developing local districts able to perform appropriate local district functions.

Thus it is apparent that the emerging concept of a desirable intermediate unit requires an administrative structure that is sufficiently flexible to (1) supplement the efforts of all the local districts in the

intermediate area, and (2) coordinate these efforts for the maximum educational benefit of all.

PROVIDING SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Areas which are rural are so regarded because of their relative sparsity of population. Rural areas are made up of smaller villages, towns and cities and the open country area around and between them. Smaller population means smaller schools.

Schools in most rural areas are small and have limited resources. Although states and communities vary widely in their ability to provide education, there are actually very few schools in rural areas which now provide what might be considered a completely desirable educational program in terms of the *real* needs for education which the children and adults of their community have. A broad and varied curriculum is generally both impossible and impractical in small schools. *But the inability of any school district, regardless of its size, to provide an adequate program of educational services does not lessen the need for these opportunities.*

The intermediate unit can serve the educational programs of smaller school systems by providing the services which are needed to supplement what local schools are able to provide. The types of services most suited to this kind of provision are the same as those which smaller schools are generally lacking—those services which are of a more specialized nature. A brief and simple example may well illustrate the way in which this can be accomplished.

In a certain county (in this instance the county is the intermediate unit) there are six high school programs—all relatively small. The largest has 325 pupils in grades 7 to 12, the smallest 85. Only the largest school has an organized program of guidance services. Such services are needed and desired by all the schools. Cooperatively they plan to employ a guidance specialist who will be available, as a member of the intermediate staff, to work with all of the schools in the county.

The guidance specialist is employed as a "director of guidance." His time is spent among all the schools—with administrators, with groups of teachers, with groups of parents. He helps them to understand, for example, that teachers must all work in the guidance program. He encourages the part-time release of an especially interested teacher for special guidance responsibilities. He works with these part-time counselors in developing skill with specific techniques—interviewing, information services, testing and test interpretation, and the like. He continues his work with teacher and parent groups—interpreting, demonstrating, teaching. He coordinates guidance services in the entire county—each individual school program supporting the others.

The above is an illustration of a very simple program, and the manner in which guidance services are carried on in the elementary schools has not been included. In many situations where schools are sufficiently large that each has its own full time guidance specialist, or even a number of counselors, intermediate services in this guidance area would more likely be a school psychologist who could work with the full time counselors, a mental health clinic, and possibly even the services of a psychiatrist. But the illustration, however simple, does show how schools needing services which they cannot provide for themselves can obtain them by sharing with neighboring schools similarly situated.

There are many other kinds of services which are especially adaptable for provision by the intermediate unit. Only a few are suggested here.¹

Curriculum Consultant Services. Curriculum specialists provided by the intermediate unit can serve all of the local community schools in the intermediate district. Frequently these consultants will work in a particular area of the curriculum, such as, for example, a reading consultant who could work with individual teachers, groups of teachers, and whole school systems in regard to special reading problems, instructional methods and the general improvement of reading.

Services for Handicapped Children. Small school systems generally have too few children with particular handicaps to permit the establishment of a specialized program. A regional type approach within the intermediate district offers many possibilities. A specialist in corrective speech, for example, as a member of the intermediate unit staff can work very effectively with speech problems in all of the schools in the intermediate district.

Instructional Materials Services. Most smaller school systems generally have an inadequate provision of instructional materials. The establishment of a single materials center in an intermediate district cooperatively supported by all of the local school systems can soon put a library of films, filmstrips, slides, recordings and all other kinds of audio-visual materials and equipment, books, collections, models, and all manner of instructional materials within the easy reach of every teacher.

Inservice Education Programs. Inservice education programs in smaller school systems may well be approached on an area basis within the intermediate unit. Programs can be more carefully planned and of greater value and quality. Special help in kindergarten instruction, for example, is most difficult in a small school system which employs only one or two kindergarten teachers. But when the six or twelve kindergarten teachers in the intermediate district are brought together, an effective program can be organized.

¹For a detailed discussion of intermediate unit services and a brief description of many presently operating programs, see Isenberg, Robert M., editor. *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*. Yearbook 1954. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954. 259 p.

Cooperative Purchasing Service. Smaller school systems purchase supplies and equipment in small quantities and are seldom able to get the advantage of savings possible through larger quantity orders. When the orders from the separate school systems in an intermediate district are pooled and purchased in a single order (taking advantage of competitive bids where possible) substantial savings to the local school districts result.

There are many other kinds of services which most beneficially and economically can be provided in smaller school systems through the intermediate unit. The possibilities are, in fact, almost limitless.

OPERATIONAL PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The extent to which any intermediate unit is able to assist local school districts in providing a better educational program than would otherwise be possible depends primarily upon (1) the organizational framework within which it functions, and (2) the understanding which exists as to the appropriate role and responsibility of local districts, intermediate units and state education departments in providing a well coordinated educational program in every state.

Legal Framework for Effective Intermediate Units

At this time there is legal provision for some type of intermediate unit in thirty-four of the states. Although there is a considerable variation among them, it is doubtful if the legal framework for any could be considered ideal. Probably of even greater significance, however, is the fact that substantial efforts to study the possibilities for reorganizing intermediate units have been undertaken in a number of states. These efforts have in the main been confined to the past two to three years and as yet have not produced changes of the type which can be expected in the two to five years ahead. Very great improvements have been accomplished recently as regards the functioning of intermediate units but these have come about *in spite of* legal framework.

The great interest in improving the structure and functioning of intermediate units within the past two to three years has resulted in the establishment of a National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit.² This group has concerned itself with an identification of desirable legal framework and has recently issued a statement

²The National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit was established by the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents of the Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, consequent to a resolution adopted by their Seventh National Conference in New York City, October 1952, authorizing such a Commission.

of recommendations.³ It no doubt would be more valuable to review some of these recommendations briefly than to describe the variations which actually exist among the states.

In general, the Commission's recommendations are for a structure which is both simple and clearly defined and adequate to provide intermediate units with the financial resources, personnel, and legal authorization necessary for effective operation. The specific recommendations are as follows:

The intermediate unit should have a board of education. This board should be broadly representative of the intermediate district and would serve as a policy-making group for the provision and administration of the intermediate unit program.

The intermediate unit should have a well qualified superintendent. He should be appointed by the intermediate district board of education.

The intermediate unit should have a competent professional staff. The staff should probably be made up of specialists in particular areas of service.

The intermediate unit should be fiscally independent. A requirement for budget approval by an outside reviewing body is considered undesirable.

The structure of the intermediate unit should be flexible. It should permit cooperation with other intermediate units and adjustment to meet changing functions, responsibilities and circumstances.⁴

The kind of legal framework which intermediate units should have to function in terms of the emerging concept of this level of educational organization should be such that it can supplement the educational programs of the local school districts in the intermediate district, both in terms of circumstances as they now exist and as they may later become.

Role of Effective Intermediate Units.

Perhaps even more important for effective intermediate units than the legal framework is the manner in which local district, intermediate district and state education departments work together. The intermediate unit has a dual role. It is a means of assisting local districts in improving the scope and quality of the educational program provided. It is also a means of assisting the state education department in the administration of a state system of schools.

The relationships which the intermediate unit has with the state level of organization are generally quite clearly defined and there is little

³National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit. *Effective Intermediate Units—A Guide for Development*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1955. 16 p.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 8-9.

room for difficulties to arise. These relationships involve a relatively small number of people and are largely administrative in nature.

But relationships between the intermediate unit and local school districts are more difficult. More people are involved and the relationships are more likely to be concerned with educational services and instruction. Because it is here at the local district level where schools are close to people. The extent to which proper relationships are understood and given opportunity to develop will in great measure determine the quality, at the very least the comprehensiveness, of the educational programs which will be available in most rural areas in the years ahead.

The National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit has defined rather sharply what it considers the related roles of local districts and intermediate units. These roles as briefly and simply defined are repeated here.

The intermediate unit is *not* a substitute for local community school districts. Local districts are a necessary part of educational organization if control is to be kept as close as possible to the people served. Modification of present intermediate units to better serve education should in no way weaken local districts or retard efforts to reorganize them into desirable community districts. *Intermediate units function best when local school districts are strong.* Experience shows that effective intermediate units strengthen local districts.

Local community school districts are *not* subordinates of an intermediate unit. They are completely autonomous as defined by state law and full partners with the intermediate unit and state education department in providing educational services.

Democratic educational administration requires that every function be performed by that unit of organization closest to the people which can carry it out with completeness, equity, and efficiency. This should be the basis for determining how specific educational services should be provided. Intermediate units should perform only those functions and provide only those services that local districts cannot perform or provide with comparable effectiveness.⁵

Although these roles for local districts and for intermediate units are contrary to some extent to the understandings which now exist in many quarters, the Commission has recommended a number of guides for establishing programs of intermediate unit services which are consistent with local school district-intermediate unit relationships as described above.⁶ They are indeed deserving of consideration by all educational

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 11.

and community leaders who are interested in or who have responsibility for establishing or defining the kinds of interrelationships which should exist.

Much more about the proper roles of local districts, intermediate units and state education departments will be learned in the few years ahead from the experiences these administrative levels have in providing educational services in each of the several states where programs are now underway or are about to be undertaken. The relative absence of experience with the type of intermediate units now emerging does not in any way minimize the importance of developing a clear understanding of roles.

CONCLUSION

Intermediate units are an integral part of educational organization in a majority of the states. Most commonly organized on the basis of the county, intermediate units function between the state education department and local school districts. In spite of substantial reorganization of local school districts during recent years in response to increasing demands for more and improved educational services, many intermediate units function in much the same manner as when they were first established. They are handicapped by a legal organization which is not adequate for present conditions. Properly developed, intermediate units can make it possible for every community to obtain the wide range of educational services needed. This is a new and different emphasis for intermediate units. It offers great promise for rural education.

Improving the Administration of Small Schools

THE educational program available in many rural areas of the country is provided through what might be considered as small schools. A large number of these schools provide education only for the elementary grades, some provide only a high school program, and some provide both. There is probably value in any discussion of small schools to identify "smallness" since a common base is most necessary for both understanding and interpretation.

The "small school" in this report includes both elementary and secondary schools. The small elementary school as considered in the program of the Conference was a one-, two-, or three-teacher school. Small high schools were considered to be those serving fewer than 100 pupils. There are no doubt some who would consider a three-teacher elementary school or a 100-pupil high school as "large"; others would consider these limits much too low.

PRESENT STATUS OF SMALL SCHOOLS

Although there are many who regard the "little red schoolhouse" as an institution of pioneer days, it has by no means vanished from the American scene in some sections. School district reorganization and consolidation have greatly reduced the number of small schools, but in 1953 there were 48,735 one-teacher schools operating. It has been estimated that more than half a million pupils are enrolled in one-teacher schools at the present time. These schools are very different from each other, however. Some have only one or two pupils; some have 60 or 90. Some have modern buildings and equipment. Some have good teachers.

More than two-thirds of the high schools in the United States have fewer than 200 pupils. There are 600 high schools which now are offering a four year high school program with a total faculty of only two teachers. High schools with total 9 to 12 grade (or even 7 to 12

grade) enrollments of 17 or 23 or 34 pupils and a faculty of three or five or seven teachers are much more common. It is not the purpose of this report to pass judgment on these schools but merely to emphasize that they are the type of school which a large number of rural children attend.

For a number of years there has been a division of opinion among both educators and lay people regarding the relative values of these small schools. Some have believed that the problems of rural education could best be solved by abolishing the very many small schools through consolidation and reorganization and replacing them with larger centrally located schools. As reported in a previous chapter, much has been achieved in this direction.¹ Others have felt that the smaller rural schools can provide as good an educational experience to the rural child as a large school. They further point out that smaller schools are a means of keeping the vital function of education near to the rural homes and of maintaining a "community" center within easy reach of every farm. It is perhaps sufficient here to report that both points of view are still strongly and sincerely held, the majority of opinion being in favor of the larger units if statistics on school district reorganization and consolidation are an adequate measure.

This discussion, however, is based primarily upon three major premises about which there is little room for disagreement.

1. *There will always be need for a number of small schools.* Tucked away in remote mountain valleys often isolated for weeks by winter snows or perhaps separated from other centers of habitation by great stretches of desert or unproductive land lie ranches, logging centers, lumber mills, small hamlets, mines, oil wells or power dams. Here there are children; here there needs to be a school. There now exist instances, for example, where children are transported 40 miles to a one-teacher school; there is the case of the small one-teacher school that is 45 miles up the canyon from the nearest population center, a village with fewer than 200 people.

2. *Small schools have certain unique administrative and instructional problems which are a direct result of their smallness.* The same statement could be made regarding large schools, especially the too-large schools, although the problems would be different.

3. *The educational program of every small school can be greatly improved.* Some small schools are good schools; many are not. This

¹See Chapter 10, "School District Reorganization."

statement, too, is applicable to all schools—regardless of size. The manner in which improvement is accomplished is the point at which school size requires somewhat different and unique consideration.

It is upon these three premises that the subsequent section of this chapter is based. Because the special problems of the one-, two- and three-teacher school differ in many respects from those of small high schools, these two types of small schools are considered separately.

THE ONE-, TWO- AND THREE-TEACHER SCHOOL

The special administrative problems of the many small elementary schools which have from one to three teachers are basically of two general types. The first of these is associated with the character of its school district organization while the other is primarily one of the teacher's organization of time and effort for effective instruction. There are a number of specific problems which come within each area and considerable variation among schools as to their nature. It will not be possible to identify all of them here nor to discuss them in great detail.

School District Administration

One-, two- and three-teacher schools are sometimes a part of a larger school administrative unit. Such is the case in states where the county unit type of organization exists. West Virginia, for example, which has only 55 county districts had more than 2000 of these small schools in 1953. In these situations the problems of school district administration are completely those of the county board of education and superintendent of schools. A similar situation exists in some of the reorganized school districts (not county units) where a few of these small schools are maintained as branch schools.

In most instances, however, the small school is the only school in the district. These districts do not employ administrators. Frequently they designate a head-teacher if more than one is employed. This head-teacher (or *the* teacher if there is but one) usually assists the districts' trustee or trustees or board of education, whichever the case may be, in the completion of required reports, purchase of supplies, and other routine administrative matters. Generally, however, their responsibility is that of managing the school itself. The greater amount of district administration is carried on by the trustee or board with the assistance of the county school superintendent.

The small districts which maintain small schools have certain problems which are generally the result of their small size. A few of these will be identified briefly.

1. *School buildings and equipment.* Although there are some exceptions, small district schools are generally lacking in facilities which by modern standards would cause them to be rated "unsatisfactory." The schoolhouse in many districts is more than 100 years old and, with the exception of electricity and sometimes a modern heating plant, have been improved very little if at all. A survey of rural schools completed in 1952 indicated that teachers in one-teacher schools had inadequate facilities in many respects. The percent of one-teacher schools having *no provision* for drinking fountains was 48.3; inside toilet facilities, 46.0; facilities for preparing hot lunches, 63.2; audio-visual equipment, 74.9. Teachers in two- and three-teacher schools, while slightly more fortunate, were also generally lacking these facilities.²

2. *Enrollment.* Many small district schools have a very limited enrollment. There are numerous instances of schools which have one or two or three pupils. It has been reported that more than one in six such schools have fewer than 10 pupils; more than half have fewer than 20.³ At the other extreme are the schools with exceptionally large enrollments. In Breathitt County (Kentucky), for example, there are 87 schools scattered over 483 rugged square miles. Three or four have an enrollment of less than 20 pupils; ten or fifteen have an average enrollment of about 32 children to the classroom, while the remainder have an enrollment of from 40 to 87 children in one room.⁴ The difficulty with small districts in regard to the extremely small or extremely large enrollments is that they are usually unwilling or unable to do very much about it.

3. *Costs.* The costs of education are frequently expressed in terms of annual per-pupil cost—the average number of dollars required for each pupil for one year. Since more than half of the one-, two and three-teacher schools average less than 20 pupils per-teacher, the annual per-pupil costs of most small schools is considerably higher than it is in larger schools.

4. *Teachers.* Small school districts have many problems with regard to their teachers. Generally speaking and recognizing that there are many exceptions, teachers in small schools have lower certification, lower salaries, relatively poor living accommodations, and few employment benefits (tenure, sick leave, definite salary schedule, etc.). It is increasingly difficult to attract competent and well qualified teachers for small one- to three-teacher schools—harder still to keep them. Teacher turnover is high.

5. *Providing for High School Pupils.* Small elementary districts do not generally provide any educational program at the high school level. They

²National Education Association, Research Division. "Rural Teachers in 1951-52," Research Bulletin 31:5-63; February 1953. p. 35.

³*Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴Reported at the Conference by Mrs. Marie Turner, County Superintendent of Schools, Breathitt County, Kentucky.

must therefore depend upon other districts for this service. The most common method is that of sending their children to a nearby village high school on a yearly contract basis. Provision of transportation then becomes an additional administrative responsibility unless provided by the receiving district. The special problem of contractual agreements is that the sending district sacrifices completely its control of the secondary education its pupils receive. Contracting districts have no direct relationship to or for the high school board of education and the quality of the education provided. In a few states the area of a small elementary school district might also be a part of a separate high school district (overlapping districts), although the problems thus created are equally great—two tax rates, poor coordination, competition for tax funds, bond levies, and the like.

6. *Access to the School.* The major alleged advantage of small schools is that there can be a school within the walking distance of every child. Walking distance is not usually clear cut—it may be one mile or less or may be several miles. When the distance is more than a minimum, parents often transport the younger children. The alternative is true for most children—they walk. But what of the case of the young child whose parents drive him the three miles to the district school over an unimproved road which crosses a "mud flat" when a school bus goes "right by the door" on its way to a neighboring district.

7. *Finance.* The tax base of many small districts is made up completely of farm and residential properties. Tax rates in these districts are necessarily high and bonding or borrowing power extremely limited. Even a small increase in the school budget might mean a substantial increase in tax rates. The tendency to keep the budget the same as that of the previous year frequently results in the postponement of building repairs, the purchases of new equipment, a salary increase for the teacher, etc. It sometimes results in a shortened school term if this is permissible, the employment of a "low cost" teacher, and a curtailment of all provisions for enriching the program.

There are a number of other special problems which small school districts frequently have as a direct result of small size and limited resources. (Some of those which have been indicated are also problems of other types of school districts.) Many of these problems can be eliminated or substantially reduced. They do not always need to persist. Specific suggestions for improvement have not been included here because solutions to these problems are suggested by the problems themselves.

Organizing for Instruction

The special administrative problems of the teacher in a small school generally are limited to the area of "managing" the school program. As previously indicated, even when designated as the head-

teacher, the responsibilities which most teachers have for school district administration are largely limited to routine matters. But the management of the instructional program is usually at least a full time job.

The special problem which the teachers of one- to three-teacher schools usually have centers around the fact that they have within their classrooms two or more grades or age groups. Many teachers have a few children in eight different grades. The average teacher in a one-teacher school teaches children in six different grades.⁵ The administrative problems which the teacher has are associated largely with this necessity of guiding and directing the learning activity of these various groups of children simultaneously.

The illusion that children can be classified into neat and comfortable groupings—a sorting into bins is the picture that comes to mind—doggedly persists, though experience disproves it daily. So teachers whose classrooms are inhabited by lively assortments of six- to fifteen-year-olds, or some lesser combination within that range, still struggle with a graded system that fits no group of children and is at its disastrous worst in the multi-graded schools where age differences dramatize the individuality of all personality. Little wonder that, for many a teacher, the small rural school has come to mean a task so complex that he wants none of it. That this situation is a hurdle more apparent than real in no way lessens the difficulties it presents.⁶

As is suggested in the above quotation, the problems of organization which the teacher has in trying to teach six or eight classes (more than that if there is a "grade" large enough to group) of reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, science, history, geography, etc., . . . each day is most impossible if that is the approach the teacher makes. But also suggested is the possibility that there may be other ways to "get it all in." But the possibility that this can be done requires some adjustment.

A first and very important adjustment in small rural elementary schools is a mental adjustment made by the teacher. From it can and do come many specific adaptations and adjustments helpful in making the school a place where rich living and learning can take place.⁷

The problems which teachers in small schools have in organizing time for effective learning on the part of children can be overcome. Doing so necessitates the application of teaching methods which have

⁵National Education Association, Research Division, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁶Clark, Lois M. "For These Children in This School." *Phi Delta Kappan* 36:20-24; October 1954.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 21.

long been recognized and recommended but which all too frequently are not employed. A few of those which were identified by the Conference are reported here.

1. *Developing a Flexible Schedule.* The teacher in a multi-graded school might be able to "teach" on a schedule that begins at 9 o'clock and stops at 4 and has little parcels of time—10 minutes for this, 8 minutes for that, recess at 10:45; 17 minutes for arithmetic, etc.—which come out even at the end of the day. But it is doubtful that children learn much. The daily schedule that is flexible, that is realistic, that helps rather than handicaps the teacher in working with children, that can be used and adjusted as the special needs of each day arise—this type of schedule is needed. It need not provide time for children to recite. The teacher will know their accomplishments.

2. *Teacher-Pupil Planning.* Pupils need to know what they should be doing and why. Together with the teacher they can consider what was left undone yesterday, plan what needs to be done today, and think ahead to what else. This planning process is learning itself. Teacher guidance is most important. The skills of planning develop slowly through many experiences. Some days plans do not work out and need to be modified. Often it may be necessary for the teacher to ask the group or an individual child what the plans are, thus checking the children's understanding. A part of planning is saving time each day to evaluate, to see if plans have been accomplished, and to make suggestions for the next day.

3. *Grouping Children for Effective Learning.* The effectiveness of the day's planning sometimes depends on how the children are grouped for learning. Ways of grouping depend upon individual and group needs for a particular day or a particular activity. Sometimes children interested in the same activities form a committee to read about, or find out about, or do something. Committees or informal groups are sometimes formed to plan school tasks. Now and then it is helpful to children to be grouped with their special friends for certain kinds of school work. The teacher may find it helpful for children who all need to learn the same new skill—how to do multiplication or division for the first time—to be taught in one group until individual differences begin to appear.

4. *Curriculum a Part of Real Living.* Drilling children in the so-called "fundamentals" is of little value to children when application to life is not apparent. The learning situation needs to be tied to something that is real and meaningful to children. The small school should be made more informal, more home-like, and more functional. Major emphasis should probably be given to helping children improve and enrich their living within their own community environment. Reading materials, for example, can be constructed about the things children are doing, have done, or expect to do. The environment of every rural community is rich with resources to draw upon.

5. *Home and Community Can Contribute.* In a small community everyone can feel that he is important to the school. The County Agent has a contribution that no one else can make in enriching the school program. The parents

of the immigrant family have experiences which could be most valuable to children. There are mothers who can help the girls with sewing. There was a carpenter and plumber who constructed a jungle-gym from old pipe. Every community has many resources which are "on call" for every rural teacher—the health department, the county librarian, the county school superintendent, the sheriff, the high school, the local minister, the dairy farmer, etc. All are ready to come to the school; but they will await the call of the teacher . . . or of the children. Outside the school the resources are even more bountiful.

There are numerous other suggestions which could be utilized by teachers in small schools to assist in improving the quality of the educational program and in making the task of organization more manageable. These are described more fully and descriptively elsewhere.⁸ It is perhaps more important here to point out in a general way that the school program of each day should provide for every child a balance of work, play, rest and relaxation. The experiences which each child should enjoy are:

1. A happy existence
2. Healthful living
3. Practice in democratic living
4. The acquisition of basic skills
5. The development of special individual and/or avocational interests
6. An appreciation of nature, art, music, literature

The small one- to three-teacher school can be a good school. But like any other school, *not without a good teacher*. In fact here the teacher is more important than ever. In the one-teacher school *the* teacher is generally all the children have.

THE SMALL HIGH SCHOOL

While consideration of the small high school is focused upon those which enroll 100 or fewer pupils, many of the administrative problems which these schools experience are also problems of larger schools. Likewise certain of these administrative problems are shared with the one- to three-teacher elementary schools. Differences are in many instances more likely to be in degree than in the type of problem. A few of these can be briefly identified.

1. *Finance*. Most small rural high school districts are poorly financed. Even in areas of sparse population, the geographic area of many small high school districts is small—often limited to the corporate limits of a town or village. With a small tax base and consequent high tax rates generally the rule, most small high schools have considerable pressures to keep costs down. This rather general characteristic often accentuates other problems.

⁸See Division 12 of the Selected Bibliography, p. 436

2. *Buildings.* The school buildings of most small high schools are relatively poor. Few of these schools now operating in most sections of the country have been involved in school district reorganizations and an even smaller number have been able to provide a new building or to substantially improve existing facilities. Therefore buildings are now generally obsolete to some degree which tends to strait-jacket the educational program. Also rather general in regard to these buildings is poor maintenance, both day-by-day and long range.

3. *Educational Program.* The most serious problem of the small high school is its inability to provide a broad educational program. Small high schools are seldom able to provide a curriculum which extends much beyond academic subjects. Some schools in the upper range of the "fewer than 100 pupils" are able to provide instruction in agriculture, homemaking, and occasionally business. Some are able to provide specialized instruction in music; few have art. Practically none provide other vocational opportunities. Most are limited to what might be termed a "classical" or "college entrance" program and even these are often void of chemistry, physics, biology, modern foreign languages, advanced mathematics and an adequate library—essentials to any good college entrance program. The co-curricular activities are also generally narrow in scope, consisting chiefly of athletics, band, and a limited program in dramatics. Many students "drop-out" before graduation—a higher proportion than in most larger schools.

4. *Instructional Materials.* The chief teaching tool in most small high schools is the textbook. School libraries are usually inadequate and community or other public libraries non-existent or inaccessible. Laboratory equipment, if any, is often the left-overs of other years plus whatever supplements the meager current budget can provide. Audio-visual materials and equipment, except where there is an agricultural program, are generally extremely scarce.

5. *Administrative Responsibility.* All small high schools have an administrator. In most instances (except in county unit states) he is the chief administrative officer of the district. He is responsible for budgets, buildings, buses, discipline, guidance, public relations, purchasing, inventories, instructional supervision, teacher selection, and the whole range of school administrative duties. He has no assistant and very often little or no clerical help. He may be required to teach one or two classes or may have a full teaching load. He must keep within the limited budget and keep both the school board and the teachers happy and satisfied. He frequently is responsible for an elementary program as well as the high school, but having little understanding of what the elementary teachers are doing or should do, must generally neglect it. He finds himself with little time to do anything as well as he could. He is closely scrutinized by the community and seldom remains on the job for very long—either because he is asked to leave, because he has an opportunity to move to a larger school, or because the pressures of the job make a comparable position in another small high school look more attractive.

6. *Schedules and Classes.* Scheduling classes in a small high school becomes complicated when students desire or need two or more different courses scheduled for the same period of time. Classes are given when teachers are

available, and frequently schedules do not fit the needs of students. Class size in many courses is small—not infrequently one, two or three students. Per-pupil costs are extremely high. And teachers often attempt to use methods more suited to larger groups; the results are disappointing.

7. *Teachers.* Instructional personnel are a major source of problems in the administration of small high schools. Salaries paid are often slightly lower than those of reorganized districts and larger systems. Not only is it difficult to compete with other schools for teachers but the teachers employed must have a wider range of abilities. Each must be able to teach in two or three general subject areas. Although class size is often small, the number of classes taught is greater than average. Housing accommodations available for teacher rental is frequently disappointing. Teacher turnover is high.

The above identification of problems, while not at all complete, are those which generally characterize most small high schools. There are, of course, some exceptions in each of these problem areas. Some districts have a large enough tax base to provide a good building, well maintained, good salaries for teachers, adequate instructional materials, and even an enrichment of the curriculum. Some districts have found it helpful to provide housing for teachers. But these districts, by and large, are indeed exceptions.

The preceding discussions of administrative problem areas or "sore spots" is not intended to imply that small high schools are without advantages. They frequently have certain advantages which larger schools must strive very hard to achieve. They are close to the people in the community. The administrator and the teachers *know* the parents and homes of their pupils; they *know* the members of the board of education, their homes and their families. They can easily discover resources with educational potential which the community provides and how to get access to it. Contacts are informal; social distance is small. School activities are for all—children and adults alike. Every pupil participates. The school is frequently the community's largest and most important enterprise.

IMPROVING THE SMALL SCHOOLS

There are many small schools in this country and there will always be need for some. It is most important that teachers and boards of education and parents combine their efforts to make it possible for the children who attend these schools to have the best possible educational opportunities obtainable. Present schools are far from achieving this goal. There are a number of things which could be done.

Because small schools, both elementary and secondary, need teachers with an extra amount of resourcefulness, every small community should make an effort to attract the *very best teachers*, not necessarily from among those who are seeking jobs, but the very best. But the community cannot stop there. They must make certain that desirable housing is available and that everything is done that is necessary to keep the good teachers once they are found.

Teachers in small schools need *instructional materials*, perhaps even more so than larger schools. Children are often "on their own" more and need materials to work with. The key to any good school is the teacher. But even the good teacher is a better teacher when he has the right tools with which to work.

Small school districts should look at their school buildings. Adults who extoll the bounteous benefits of the small school can hardly have the school building in their own district in mind. For those areas where small schools are a necessity, districts should provide the most useful and comfortable and attractive schoolhouse that can be had—one that even children can be proud to attend.

Small schools, both elementary and secondary, should look to their *intermediate unit* (or their county board of education in county unit states) for the kinds of specialized services which their own school cannot provide. Here is a potential source of all that is needed to make the educational program of the small school rich and comprehensive. Instructional assistance, curriculum coordination, health services, guidance services, library services, instructional materials, art, music, physical education, vocational education, education for handicapped children, speech correction, administrative help of all types—any one or any combination of these and many other services are possible when several or all of the schools in an area participate in them cooperatively. In most areas of the country a wide range of cooperative services is not yet available. But *the potential is there*. Programs are being developed rapidly, even despite organizational handicaps. Small school districts need to look to their intermediate unit. But they need to do even more. They need to press for the services they need to make the education they provide adequate. They need to encourage and assist in making the intermediate unit able to serve them. They need to be willing to support the intermediate unit—with money—in proportion to the special services they receive.

These are but a few suggestions for improving small schools, for reducing if not completely eliminating certain of their administrative problems. Everyone will recognize that these suggestions are expensive—they will cost. And they will indeed. But as Waurine Walker, NEA President, so tersely stated in opening the Conference, "*Good schools cost more, but poor schools cost the most.*"

The one-, two- and three-teacher schools and the small high schools which are now operating are expensive. Per-pupil costs in these schools are far above the average for larger schools. This fact in itself is not so frightening. But what is most unfortunate, especially for the children who have no alternative, is that the general level of education being provided is grossly inadequate. People are paying high costs for poor products.

This chapter might well conclude with a statement of the thread which has run through this entire discussion, the major emphasis with which all those who have concern for small schools must consider. *The key problem to a good small school is the quality of the educational program provided. It is not the size of the school but the personnel, the administration, the materials and equipment, the building, and, together with the concern of the community, the funds required to provide these other necessary components—all top quality.*

Financing Rural Education

AMERICA is committed to the great ideal of universal education for its children—that every child, regardless of where he lives, should have the benefits of a comprehensive program of educational services. The success of every democratic form of government—government by the people—depends upon the ability of all people to manage their own affairs. As civilization has become more complicated and Nations more interdependent, education is more than ever the one essential which can assure stability and prevent decadence. There is absolutely no disputing, and most leaders recognize it, that the future of this Nation depends upon the quality of education of all our people.

Means by which a more satisfactory educational program can be provided have been identified and emphasized throughout this report. Emphasis has also been given to the fact that many children and communities do not now have adequate educational opportunities, a great portion of the inadequacy being in the rural areas and smaller communities. It is immediately obvious that corrective measures must be financed. that they will be expensive, but that the expenditures required are the necessary investment in the American belief, not wholly shared throughout the world, that democratic government can succeed over even a long period of time in the history of civilization and competently meet every crisis situation which arises.

The financing of education, with emphasis primarily upon the financing of education in rural America, is here considered with respect to three major aspects of the problem: (1) some of the special types of facilities required for rural education; (2) the various problems encountered in financing rural education from state and local funds; and (3) an attempt to bring the controversial issue of federal financial support for education into focus with respect to rural education.

SPECIAL FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF RURAL AREAS

Our forefathers had a sufficient respect for the values of education and sufficient foresight and courage to set up a public school system

to serve the educational needs of their day. They organized school districts, levied taxes, built buildings and employed teachers to make the education they desired possible. Since that time men have struggled to change, adapt and improve these early provisions for education as the demands for more education have increased and as modern technology has changed our ways of living and earning a living. The rapidity of change in American life has multiplied the need for reorganizing school systems, constructing new buildings and refinancing education. Rural areas have certain types of demands which make for somewhat unique financial problems.¹

School Buildings for Rural Areas

The need for new school buildings is one of the most urgent problems now facing American education. The shortage of school building facilities in rural areas is due largely to population migration, the reorganization of school districts and the inadequacy of small local districts to finance the school buildings needed.

Population decreases in some rural areas and increases in other rural areas has created a situation in which to some extent school buildings are no longer located where they are needed. The widespread reorganization of school districts has made many school buildings obsolete and created the need for a great deal of new construction in rural areas. Many rural communities have been able to move ahead with building programs and it is of some significance that many of the finest school buildings in the Nation are in rural areas. Many other communities with inadequate local resources, however, have been forced to delay needed construction, and this has tended to further accentuate the building shortage.

One of the characteristics of most rural community programs of education is that the school building is frequently the major community center. The school lunchroom, auditorium, gymnasium, library and other facilities are often used by community organizations outside of school hours. In planning school building construction in rural areas, this type of use should be an important consideration.

¹Adapted from the address of Frank W. Cyr, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. "Making the Provisions Necessary to Implement an Adequate Educational Program."

Pupil Transportation

The financial burden of pupil transportation falls disproportionately upon small towns and rural communities. The transportation of pupils in rural areas is essential, however, in order to make high quality educational opportunities available. The tremendous growth in the provision of transportation and the improvements which have been made in rural education have to a great degree been hand-in-hand. The yellow school bus on the highway is rapidly becoming a symbol of public education in rural America. But it is a symbol which puts an extra financial burden upon rural people.

Specialized Educational Services

In addition to suitable buildings and transportation, rural schools should be provided with a large array of special services—audio-visual and other instructional materials, library services, guidance services, services to exceptional children such as cardiac cases, those with speech defects, the hard of hearing, those who should have sight-saving classes, and so on. Such services can almost always be provided for rural schools better, more effectively and economically, through an intermediate unit. Research is needed to determine the best ways to finance these specialized educational services in rural areas.

PROBLEMS IN FINANCING RURAL EDUCATION FROM STATE AND LOCAL SOURCES²

Although rural areas have some unique financial problems, they also share many with urban areas. It is significant that all people, rural and urban together, have worked shoulder-to-shoulder to improve financial provisions so that there might be provided better education for all children.

Increased State Support

In recent years there has been a substantial increase in public school revenues derived from state tax sources. While the number of school age children in the United States increased from 21 million in 1900 to 31 million in 1950, state contributions to public school support increased from 38 million in 1900 to over 2 billion dollars in 1950.

²This entire section has been adapted from the address of E. L. Lindman, Professor of Educational Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers. "Present Problems in Financing Rural Education."

The percentage of public school revenues derived from state sources increased from 17 percent to 39 percent during the same period. Although much of the total gain in revenues merely reflects the declining value of the dollar, the *relative* increase in state funds contributes much to the improvement of education in rural communities.

Improved Apportionment

Perhaps more important than the total amount of state funds provided are the improvements made in the methods used to apportion these funds. In 1900 most state funds were apportioned to local school systems on a school census or, at best, on a school enrollment or attendance basis. These plans of apportionment gave little consideration to the peculiar problems of rural areas.

Although progress has been spotty, today most states have some provision for using *teacher units* and *pupil transportation* in their state school support program. Similarly, most states have some form of state equalization aid for schools. Although there is yet much room for improvement, the increased state school support and the improvement of state apportionment formulas have done much to improve the financial position of rural schools in many states. It should be noted, however, that in a few states little progress along these lines has been made.

Improved Teacher Preparation

Rural areas have shared with urban areas state financed improvements in teacher preparation programs and in state teacher retirement systems. State supported colleges have increased their capacity for preparing teachers, have improved the quality of their instructional staff, and have greatly increased the competency of their graduates as "beginning teachers." At the present time in many states there are tremendous programs, many long overdue, to improve the facilities of these institutions. During the present shortage of teachers, however, urban school systems have a distinct advantage in recruiting these better qualified teachers.

Financing Small Schools

Although progress has been made, many states do not provide adequate funds for financing the small isolated school. Only a few states have recognized the responsibility of the state for adequately

financing small high-cost schools *after it has been determined that some such schools will probably always need to be maintained*. This special problem needs to be given careful attention and recommendations for solution supported by both rural and urban citizens. City school leaders must recognize the fact that extra state funds will be required for these small schools. On the other hand, rural leaders must recognize that many of the existing small schools cannot be justified in terms of a state finance program. In many instances the one-room school "a quarter of a mile down the road" must be closed and the children sent to a larger more economical school. Even though it may be desirable to maintain some of these small schools as attendance centers, they can seldom be justified as separate and independent administrative units.

Financing Pupil Transportation

Although some state financial support for pupil transportation is provided in most states, there are some where no such aid is provided. In Nebraska, for example, the entire cost of pupil transportation is borne locally. In Nevada, state pupil transportation funds are available only for one- and two-teacher elementary schools; no such aid is provided for the rural high school. New Hampshire provides some state funds for transporting elementary pupils but none for those attending high school. Clearly, action is needed to provide adequate funds for pupil transportation in such rural states.

Some of the better arrangements for state support for pupil transportation are found in states having a comprehensive foundation program. In such states, the cost of pupil transportation is included in the foundation program and is financed from state and local funds on a partnership basis. The inclusion of adequate allowances for pupil transportation in the state aid program requires continuous emphasis.

Financing the Intermediate Unit

An aspect of school finance of special interest to rural school leaders is financial support for the intermediate unit. Services provided by intermediate units are especially important to rural schools since most rural schools are not large enough to employ full-time specialized professional personnel in these areas of special service. Arrangements for financing the intermediate unit have not as yet been extensively

investigated in almost every state. The problem is complicated by the fact that county boundaries, the most common determiner of present intermediate units, are in some instances not large enough to establish an adequate program of intermediate unit services.

Intermediate units are presently financed in several ways. The county property tax is the largest single source of support. In a few states a substantial amount of state funds is provided for the intermediate unit service program. Some of these services are financed by cooperative and contractual agreements involving contributions from the several local administrative units which participate in the service program. A number of recommendations for desirable means of financing intermediate units have recently been advanced by the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit.³ But it remains that the organization and administration of intermediate units and the adequate financing of appropriate educational services present a most challenging problem for state and rural school leaders.

SOME PROBLEMS FOR RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOL LEADERS⁴

Although certain aspects are almost uniquely rural, the financial problems of rural education are closely related to general school finance problems. The familiar issues of adequate state support, of improving assessment of property and of developing citizen concern for better schools and school needs apply to financing rural education. Most of the problems of rural school finance are the same as those of urban school finance.

Assessment Practices and Equalization

What can be done to improve local property assessing practices? Have carelessly drawn state equalization programs tended to subsidize and reward poor assessing practices? A large number of states still allow equalization payments to local school districts based wholly upon a locally chosen assessor's findings concerning taxable resources of the school district. This is obviously a practice which provides state reward for low assessing and has tended to undermine the property tax base.

³National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit. *Effective Intermediate Units—A Guide for Development*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1955. 16 p.

⁴This entire section has been adapted from the address of E. L. Lindman, *op. cit.*

Some states have succeeded in minimizing this effect by one of three methods: (1) authorizing the state tax commission to equalize assessment ratios among towns or counties; (2) using an objective index of taxpaying ability to determine the state equalization payment; (3) designing the equalization program so that only a few very poor school districts share in equalization aid, the others participating in a large fund flat grant type of program.

Emphasis on Minimum Program

Most state finance programs have been based upon what has been termed the "minimum program" which should be guaranteed for all children. Has too much emphasis been placed upon "minimum" in school support programs? School and lay leaders are now extensively engaged in a basic study of school finance directed toward the development of an "adequate program of education." Is this just a trivial alteration in language or does it reflect a significant effort to raise the sights of the state school support program above the minimum concept? A very disturbing finding of one recent study was that the people of sixty separate school districts expressed complete or almost complete satisfaction with their schools even though the educational programs in these districts were actually very poor. It is obvious that there is a tremendous task in public relations and adult education as to what constitutes a good school program.

Complexity of State Support Programs

State support programs which provide an equitable distribution of funds and take into account the wide variations which exist among local school districts—especially since many have developed on a "patching up," "putting grease on the wheel that squeaks" basis—are necessarily complicated. What can be done to simplify state school support laws so that legislative committees can readily understand school needs? Some states still have a dozen or more different state aid funds; others have fewer funds but have apportionment formulas which defy explanation. The so-called minimum budget approach, used in several southern states, has done much to clarify school needs to state legislatures. However, there is some indication that this approach fosters the belief that the state program is a complete and adequate one.

Competition for State and Local Funds

Every phase of public works or public welfare is legitimately in need of funds and support. These varying demands for public funds upon relatively limited state and local resources actually creates competition among public agencies for adequate support. Recently schools have been placed at great disadvantage in their bargaining position with the participation of Federal government matching funds in road building, hospital construction, and the like. This is an increasingly serious problem which must be faced realistically in every state.

Other Problems

There are many questions regarding state and local financing of education which need to be raised. Have school districts become too dependent upon state financial support in some states that local initiative has disappeared? Are people saying that the state provides through the foundation program an amount of funds determined by it to be adequate? Our teachers receive an annual salary based upon state "minimum salary" regulations. Does this mean that the state has determined that the salaries required in this manner are enough? Why should local school districts tax themselves more to pay teachers higher salaries? Are these attitudes hampering local efforts? Are we losing a healthy competition in the improvement of educational quality?

Will the pressing need for school construction cut into available current operating funds? In some states the need for state financial aid for school construction has sharply increased the burden on the state tax structure. Will local school district debt service levies have a similar effect upon local school revenue sources? Is Federal aid for school construction a feasible approach to the problem?

Has everything possible been done to get maximum returns for the school dollar? Should cooperative purchasing of certain of the larger standardized items be extended? What other possibilities are there for greater economy and efficiency?

These are some of the questions that rural and urban school leaders must answer if the shortage of teachers is to be met, if the shortage of school buildings is to be corrected, and if the quality of our educational programs is to be raised to what might be considered even a satisfactory level. There is no simple answer to these questions universally applicable in all states. Educational leaders and community

leaders have a responsibility to study each problem and point the way to a solution in each community and in each state.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

It has been said that public education in the United States is a local responsibility, a state function and a national concern. It is certainly true that the Federal government cannot afford to stand completely aside when the quality of education provided its youth will determine to so large a degree its future levels of production and standards of living, the intelligent participation of its citizens in democratic government (now being challenged in many parts of the world), and the strength of its defense.

The Fear of Federal Control

The objection to Federal aid to education most frequently advanced is the fear that support from the Federal treasury will result in the taking over of control of education by the Federal government. It is extremely doubtful that this fear is well founded. The legal authority for state control over education is well established. The granting of financial support by the various states for their local school administrative units has not tended to lessen the controls which the local administrative units exercise. Although the extent of state controls have in fact been increased in a number of areas—certification of teachers, specifications for school buses, approval of school building plans—it is seriously doubtful that any can be traced directly to the substantial increases in state financial support. Furthermore, at the Federal level, there is no political party or even any body of opinion in the Nation but that favors keeping the respective roles of the states and local administrative units as they are. A representative Congress could scarcely do otherwise.

The Justice of Federal Aid

An objection to Federal aid to education, perhaps more deeply felt although not nearly so often advanced, is that any Federal financial program based upon the principle of equalization would take tax moneys from one section of the Nation to spend it in another. This is considered by many as unjust and inadvisable. It is sometimes represented as something new and un-American, when in fact it is an inevitable consequence of national government.

The history of our country has a number of interesting examples which are parallel. One example of the transfer of economic resources from one part of the Nation to another part through the intervention of the Federal government can be seen by the effect of a protective tariff. If the period for analysis were limited only to the years between the Civil War and World War I, there was a protective tariff on manufactured goods imported into this country in force during practically all of that period. Because of this tariff, the agricultural South and West paid more for manufactured goods bought in the industrial North and East. As a consequence of the tariff, hundreds of millions of dollars were transferred from the agricultural areas to the industrial areas by way of higher prices. This policy was probably a good one, for through it, at least in part, the Nation developed an industrial system which carried it through two great wars and is now a model for much of the world.

But if it was just and good to tax the agricultural South and West for the benefit of the industrial North and East to increase manufacturing, it is now just and good to tax the wealthier industrial areas, if necessary, to improve the educational opportunities of children in the less wealthy agricultural areas. In the latter case, as in the former, the welfare of the Nation is vitally concerned.

CONCLUSION

In many areas of the country the educational opportunities which are available for children and communities are grossly inadequate. This Nation cannot continue to be prosperous and cannot continue to demonstrate to the world that a democratic form of government can be successful over a long period of time without a high level of education for *all*. It is possible that one of the major handicaps to better educational opportunities is the lack of adequate financing. Educational finance is, at best, complicated. But every community and every state should do all in its power to make available to schools the funds necessary for a satisfactory and adequate level of education. If these sources of funds are not sufficient, the Federal government should move quickly to make sure that the funds needed for education are provided. For each day and each year there are children who are using up the only opportunity they will ever have to obtain an education. The nature of their opportunities will determine to a large extent their life-long social, economic and civic competence.

is a minority on his own home ground—the countryside. Year after year farm population has continued to shift from farms and villages to cities and suburban areas. In spite of the dwindle in farm population, however, the present 21 million farmers are able to produce the food and fibre for the nation, with a surplus for hungry people in other parts of the world. Science and machinery have wrought a revolution in farming methods.

In the last 30 years, farming has become an independent business. As an independent businessman, the farmer has to concern himself with many complex problems: management, power, storage, marketing, labor costs, machinery, and financing. During this period, agriculture has prospered and the farmer has maintained his rightful place in our Nation's economy. But even today a million or more farmers still make a cash income of less than one thousand dollars a year. The small family-type farm is struggling with low income and difficult financing.

Today, fewer and fewer young people are entering farming as a livelihood. To enter the farming field requires large investments in land, buildings, machinery, seed, and fertilizer. A college education is almost a requirement because of the multitude of problems involved in successful farming.

The farm community must now deal with problems that tax the resources of the community, state and nation: rural electrification and soil conservation; irrigation and dams; farm-to-market roads and telephone service; rural sanitation and health; more scientific marketing measures; adequate farm housing and storage; machinery and repairs; more highly skilled farm labor; better schools and a more realistic school program; farm loans and the ever-increasing tax burden.

Changes in farming have brought about changes in home and school. Tasks once performed by children and young people are now easily done by electricity and machinery. Recreation that formerly revolved around family life is now transferred to the facilities of town and suburban areas. TV and radio have lessened the one-time thrill of reading a book. Parents are involved in the complete business of operating the farm. Young people are restless. Lack of economic opportunity requires that more than half of them leave the farm every year.

Another development which has significance for our rural communities, homes, and schools is the so-called rural non-farm population. Good highways and fast transportation fulfill the urge of city dwellers for a place in the country. Some travel 20 to 100 miles each day to their jobs in the city. In addition to this influx of population, thousands of industries are moving into the open country and smaller communities, bringing with them factory workers who are both union and non-union members.

The small rural school has given way or is now rapidly doing so to a consolidated system. The rural teacher is faced with new and difficult responsibilities. How to prepare the students to get and hold a job; how to instill a sense of civic responsibilities and a respect for democratic processes; how to develop firm convictions about family life and its importance; how to translate the moral and spiritual values of our nation into terms of everyday living. All of these competencies the teacher must deal with, along with the basic skills of reading, writing, arithmetic, speaking, listening and understanding.

Like our schools, the many other agencies which operate educational programs in rural communities have been affected, although perhaps not yet greatly influenced, by the changed and still changing pattern of rural living. Organizational leadership, just as public school leadership, tends often to cling desperately to the "this is the way we have always done it" policy and to resist the forces of change which they consider encroachments upon a program designed to meet the real needs of the day now past. Programs which have been developed yield traditions and methods of working which frequently lose their effectiveness. The reverence of those who nurtured their development becomes an impediment to the constructive change of either emphasis or procedures, however necessary under new circumstances.

The reluctance of leadership to recognize the need for change, however honest and sincere in its point of view, has influences which are not limited to the particular organization itself but tend to spread out into other areas of community activity to cause dissension, bitterness and frustration. Change does and should come about slowly. But changes must be expected and appropriate modifications made to meet it. Community agencies and organizations which alter their programs to meet the changing demands of those whom they serve tend not to lose their value and effectiveness. Those which do not

The Schools and the Educational Programs of Other Agencies

IN every rural community there are many organizations and agencies, both formal and informal, which contribute to the knowledge and understanding of all those who participate in their programs. The school is but one institution. The school has a specialized and necessary place in every community. But it does not have and should not claim exclusiveness in carrying on an educational program.

It is important and essential that our rural schools be aware of those independent agencies which carry on educational programs in their community, both for youth and for adults. For many of these organizations this identification is made easy by the existence of special committees on education and, in some instances, even full-time educational directors. Certain of the other groups have not formalized their educational efforts to this extent and may not even consider education as one of their major functions. Their contributions to the development and spread of ideas, however, definitely point to their relationship to the total educational effort of every community.

An indication of some of the organizations which function in most rural communities with definite educational programs for youth was given by Charles Bennett:

It is necessary for community schools to maintain close and friendly relationships with the various youth organizations. Of course, in many instances this is done automatically. As an example, the Future Farmers of America are under the supervision of the vocational agriculture teachers in the community high schools.

There are other important youth organizations, however, which do not necessarily tie into the school as such. Undoubtedly the most widespread of these youth groups are the 4-H Clubs, an adjunct of the Extension Service, which have as their senior advisors either 4-H Club Agents within the counties or, where such are lacking, the County Agents. The Grange also is well organized and has both a very active Juvenile Grange for youngsters from

five to fourteen and a Grange Youth Department, made up of young people between fourteen and thirty.

Still another organized youth activity in rural America is led by the Boy Scouts. This work is done under the Rural Scouting Service and includes Lone Scouts, single boys who are too remote from towns to fit into the pack or the troop in those communities where there are enough youngsters to compose such units.

The Future Farmers of America has a closely related affiliate, The Future Homemakers of America; and, while the 4-H Clubs are "co-educational," the girls who belong have their own "homemaking" units. In addition, the American Farm Bureau Federation has a Youth Department which works through the Bureau to interest young people in Farm Bureau activities, and many farmer cooperatives, especially the milk cooperatives, have Young Cooperators, organizations dedicated primarily to educating young people in the concepts of farmer cooperatives.

While there are any number of additional peripheral youth groups of one kind or another, the foregoing covers the principal operations in this field in rural America. There is an overall group called Rural Youth, U.S.A., which attempts to bring together representatives from all of the rural organizations and stages one meeting a year, but it is not an operational organization on a day-to-day basis.

Obviously, close relationships between the community schools and these major youth groups is highly desirable. Establishment of free and cooperative relations with these groups depends primarily on the initiative, skill and ability of teachers working both with the members of these organizations directly and with their adult leaders. From such cooperation can come much good. Without it, many difficulties and unnecessary conflict may be the result.¹

Most of these youth organizations have their adult counterparts—the Extension Service, Grange, Farm and Home Bureaus, Farmer's Union, the various cooperatives, and the like. In fact, for most of these groups, the adult emphasis has always been the major program. In almost every rural community there are numerous other groups, agencies, organizations, and media which make definite contributions to the total educational program: the churches; the Public Health Department, the Red Cross, and other health organizations; public and private libraries; radio, TV, newspapers, magazines; service clubs; and many others.

CHANGES IN RURAL LIFE DEMAND CHANGES IN ORGANIZATION PROGRAMS

Within the past three decades, unprecedented changes have altered the face of rural America. For the first time in our history, the farmer

¹Adapted from the address of Charles Dana Bennett, Special Consultant, Farm Film Foundation. "Youth Organizations and the Community Schools."

change tend to become not only constructively impotent but also destructive forces to community solidarity.

Those in attendance at the National Conference on Rural Education were provided with an illustration of how necessary it is for any organization or institution to change the emphasis of its program to meet new and different conditions or circumstances. Although the setting for the illustration is a large urban center, the need for adaptation is equally great in every rural community.

In the heart of Atlanta, across the street from the State Capitol, there is a noted church. Whether this be providential design or sheer irony, I sometimes wonder. At any rate, the church is there. It serves a section where once were impressive homes, spacious lawns, and the slow, quiet tempo of gracious living. There were other churches in the neighborhood in those days, big, beautiful churches with throngs of people on Sunday mornings.

Well, the impressive homes have long since disappeared! The spacious lawns have gone. There is no longer the quiet, unperturbed air of an upper class residential section. Noisy traffic, concentrated industry and big business have claimed the quiet shady streets where people lived and went to church on Sunday. And just beyond the buildings and the stores and the warehouses and the parking lots, there are low rent apartment projects, and just beyond these are filthy streets and wretched houses with the paint peeling off and dirty children running in and out.

Most of the churches have long since gone—lock, stock and pew. They have folded up. They have tossed in the towel. They have followed their flocks, an undignified thing for a church to do, to the suburbs and set up shop there. They have left the downtown area because they have feared for survival.

But the church of which I speak still stands in the same spot in downtown Atlanta. Its Sunday School attendance goes constantly upward. It has absolutely no debt and its budget is \$150,000 a year.

I asked the pastor, a man of unusual vision, how come. This was his answer: "Any church that is to survive in a downtown area must meet the needs of the community in which it is located. It will draw members from all over the city, but to survive, it must minister to its immediate community."

Well, for years this church has done that. For example: Twice a week the Church opens its doors for a baby clinic. The Church furnishes space, medicines, nursing help and volunteer workers. From 12 to 20 of the best pediatricians in Atlanta give their services and frail, anxious-faced mothers from the poor neighborhood about the church bring their sick babies to the clinic and the babies are healed! Last week the clinic admitted its 20,000th baby.

That is why the church remains and moves from strength to strength in a downtown area. It serves its community.²

This illustration attaches to a single urban church the characteristics which should and must be reflected by all groups which will continue to have purpose in the rural areas of our country—a willingness to adapt to change and a genuine desire to serve people and their community.

THE IMPORTANCE OF A BROAD APPROACH TO EDUCATION

Recognition of the kinds of educational programs which are needed in the rural areas of America is increasingly given by the leadership in all of our major areas of activity. In each case, the expression of points of view represents an emphasis of more meaningful educational programs than are now generally provided. Each stresses the inter-relationships of the interests and well being of any single group with those of other groups. Among the major viewpoints expressed were those of education, agriculture, labor and business.

Education

There are three areas of relationships which I believe must be developed and exist at a high order if schools in rural America are to meet their responsibility to the children and adults of the communities and to this nation and our world.

The first area of responsibility which I wish to discuss prompts me to say that one of our limitations is perhaps a static concept of the world community. The first community I wish to talk about is as wide as the United States. I do not believe that there is room for any school in America that is a good school to develop a system of relationships which does not have as its first guideline an adequate system of relationship between the school, its content, its program, its policies and its procedures, and our system of freedom and democracy as represented by institutions and ideals.

I would remind those of us who are interested in rural education that perhaps no school in America is so particularly set up, so well set up to capture the genius and the romance of the background of the development of freedom in this country as the rural school in America. Yet we find that most of our rural schools today are centered too exclusively on reading, writing and arithmetic and not enough of an interest in the other basic orientations that must be developed and maintained if this school is to serve its purpose.

The second area of orientation, one of the major areas of relationship between the rural school and its environment, ought to be the relationship of

²Adapted from the address of Douglas G. MacRae, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Fulton County, Georgia. "The Community School from the Viewpoint of Suburban Development." See p. 360.

the school to the land. By the land I not only mean the soil but I mean the moisture, the forest, the ground covering, the minerals and so forth. If I understand properly, there is only one procedure available to us to keep education from being academic, theoretical and floating around in misty blue, and that is to root it realistically in the realities of the community where the education is taking place.

It is essential that the school knows what is happening to the soil and other natural resources where the school is located. The school has a community responsibility to share in the planting of trees, in the terracing of hillsides, in the development of new methods of food processing and marketing. For the youth who remains on the soil this is a great experience. For those who migrate to cities, such experiences develop an appreciation of the problems involved in producing, processing, and marketing food and fibre.

In connection with all school-community relationships, we need to be continuously aware that the American community is an ever changing concept, being made and remade as new aspects of American life develop.

As workers in education and in rural life, we need research so that we can have at our disposal some of the best insights as to what changes mean. We have need to learn how to recognize and how to use the untapped resources lying loose around every school in this country, rural schools in particular, that are ready to give its program an enrichment and a quality that many teachers and communities and children have not yet had an opportunity to experience.³

Agriculture

No nation is stronger than its people. No people can be strong without being informed. Our security and our freedom depend on an informed people.

Not only the future of agriculture, but the future of the Nation depends on how well we develop our young people. The young men and women from today's farms will be tomorrow's leaders—in the cities as well as in rural America.

Many Americans in positions of leadership today proudly point to their rural heritage. And yet they would be quick to point out there are grave disadvantages in farm and rural living. The greatest is the comparative disadvantage in educational opportunity. Although many of our leaders have been able to overcome this handicap, there have been many thousands in our rural population who were unable to develop their talents, who remained submerged.

We cannot afford to submerge the talent of our rural people—rich as we are. We cannot afford the luxury of unused abundance—and that applies to our youth as well as to our crops. The connection between education and successful farming is crystal clear. Broadly speaking *education adds up to income*.

³Adapted from the address of Willard E. Goslin, Chairman, Division of School Administration and Community Leadership, George Peabody College for Teachers. "The School in the Community—An Educator's Viewpoint." See p. 270.

The educational challenge of tomorrow is even greater than the challenge of the past. We are a growing Nation. Our people make ever greater demands upon agriculture. To meet these demands, our farmers will have to increase efficiency, improve quality, and lower costs. The American farmer is today the best informed farmer in the world; but he must be even better informed tomorrow.

It is obvious that the changes taking place in agriculture require more general knowledge and specialized skills than were needed to become a successful farm operator in the past.

We have been well aware of this problem. That is largely why such stress has been placed on research and agricultural education. We know how important research and education are to farmers. One of the major problems today is to get research results translated into action. The time lag between the discovery, or the development, of research results and their application on the farms of the Nation has been, and is, too great. We must all work harder on this phase of the research-education pattern. We need a better system of two-way communication between research and farmers.⁴

Labor

One of the important jobs for which all of us need to accept some responsibility is that of creating one American community in which farm families and city families stand together as neighbors. The objective facts show, as they have shown for a long time, that the welfare of the farm dweller and the welfare of the city dweller are essentially the same, seen only from two different angles. However, these facts have not been brought home to our people sufficiently to dispel the distrust and misunderstanding that has separated farm people from city people in so many areas of our country.

Many problems of farmers and farm workers are similar to those of the factory worker. For reason of economic security organized labor has fought for minimum wage laws and a voice over their own wage rates. Understanding the parallel needs of farmers, labor has supported farmers' demands for price supports and other planks in the farm program.

Today, within an hour's drive from his farm, the farmer may have his choice of two or three metropolitan areas, with their attractions and their problems. When we see the same TV shows, read the same newspapers, perhaps elect the same Congressmen, and send our sons off to the same wars, when our living standards rise together and the same economic declines bring catastrophe to both of us, our attitudes toward each other ought to reflect the closeness of our lives rather than create an artificial isolation.

Organized labor has recently set out to explain to its members the relationship between the farm and city dweller. It is a well established economic fact that a prosperous agriculture is the keystone of a healthy economy. Prosperous

⁴Adapted from the address of the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, U. S. Secretary of Agriculture. "Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Agriculture." See p. 296.

farmers buy the things a prosperous worker makes. Prosperous city workers buy more of the goods and food produced by farmers.¹

Business

A very large percentage of businessmen come from rural areas. Many workers in their factories and other businesses have migrated from the farm. The form of business organization which this country has developed depends upon a free economy. It is, therefore, obvious that Americans everywhere must understand and support a competitive, free enterprise system. And businessmen everywhere must understand and support public education.

Businessmen now are giving more thought and financial support to public education than ever before. The National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the Committee for Economic Development are three great business organizations stressing the ties between education and business. Businessmen are interested in developing skilled manpower, in school guidance programs, in good citizenship, in school construction and equipment, in school financing.

Although formal education is the leader in educational effort, there are other forms of education aside from school programs—travel, books, libraries, newspapers, and magazines. Education and the magazine press—two of the most powerful educational influences in the nation—have recently joined forces on a purely voluntary basis to bring facts about our schools to citizens and to suggest constructive citizen-teacher action for solving school problems.

Businessmen have an acute and growing realization of the importance of our American public school system, and that is just as true of the rural schools as it is of the city schools. All of us must be concerned with the curriculum of rural schools, the teachers, buildings, and facilities necessary for a good educational program for young men and women. This includes those who remain on the farm and thus provide our future national agricultural leaders, and those leaving their rural communities to build their careers in the cities. There they go to work in business and industrial establishments.

We must be sure that these young people, when they come to the city, come with an educational background and with sufficient marketable skills so that they can adjust to the working environment of the plant and the social environment of the city with the greatest satisfaction to themselves on and off the job. They must be prepared to compete for jobs and progress on the jobs with the young people who have been educated and trained in the urban educational institutions. They meet with keen competition, and I am referring particularly to the young people who come to the cities before they complete their high school or upon completion of high school, but with no college background. Certainly it takes money for the rural communities to provide the facilities and the educational program that I am referring to. Competent

¹Adapted from the address of Victor P. Reuther, Assistant to the President, Congress of Industrial Organizations. "Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Labor." See p. 284.

teachers with adequate salaries, salaries comparable to those in urban communities, must be provided. Industry and business must help.⁶

There are, of course, other viewpoints than those reported above. The significance, however, seems to be that from whatever the viewpoint there is concern among our national leaders that our educational programs be improved. The urgency with which they stress the need for improvement and the specifications which they prescribe call for a total effort in every community. Our schools and all other organizations and agencies which have a real educational function, realized or unrealized, must adapt their programs to meet the ever changing conditions of our complex society.

A DIRECTION FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

How well are our schools and the programs of other educational agencies making the kinds of adaptations which new circumstances require? There can be no simple answer. But the question must be continuously raised . . . and answers sought . . . and programs evaluated in terms of findings. The National Conference on Rural Education sought to appraise present programs in terms of the perhaps more obvious but as yet inadequately met needs of rural adults and youth. The findings may well represent a point for departure in a comprehensive study on a community by community basis.

Conference consensus identified these adult needs:

1. More general adult education on the problems of rural everyday living: marketing, food processing, storage, home planning, health and sanitation, crop diseases and drought, child care and nutrition, farm loans and taxes.
2. More information on social and economic problems as they affect the farmer in his relationships with other Americans: farm cooperative enterprises, rural electrification and hydroelectric plants, irrigation and dams; soil conservation; farm prices versus consumer prices; the relationship of the farmer to organized labor; the advancement of our free, competitive enterprise system; farm subsidies and food surpluses.
3. More guidance in intercultural relations in understanding ethnic, racial and religious groups in this country.⁷

⁶Adapted from the address of Walter D. Fuller, Chairman of the Board, Curtis Publishing Company, "Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Industry." See p. 293.

⁷Such a project, initiated at Iowa State College in 1952, was reported by Joseph N. Ginter, University of Rochester, formerly at Iowa State. Its purpose was to explore ways and means of incorporating intergroup and intercultural programs in the Agricultural Extension Service which sponsored the project. There was excellent participation in these programs in Hardin County, Iowa, where the pilot program was conducted and called, "Your Neighbor, Near and Far." A bulletin will be published at Iowa State College in 1955 as a guide for Extension Services in other states.

4. More easy-to-read information on people of other lands. The modern farmer wants to know what the social revolutions mean as they rumble across the farmlands of Asia and Africa. He wants to understand the problems of our Latin American neighbors and their agricultural progress.

5. More help for farm parents in dealing with the needs and problems of youth: preparation for careers and jobs; emotional problems of growing up; boy and girl relationships; recreation and the wise use of leisure time; family relationships; hobbies; and matters of discipline.

Conference consensus emphasized these needs of rural youth:

1. The importance of always bringing youth into any discussion of their problems. Since young people know a great deal about themselves they want to be consulted about programs designed for them.

2. More about how to solve their personal, social, scholastic and vocational problems. They are concerned with having opportunities to gain work experience and with the selection of a job or career best suited to their own particular abilities and interests.

3. How to get along with other people and how to be a good family member. They don't know how to budget their time nor their money. Many don't know how to study or whether they should go to college. Citizenship responsibilities are often too vague to understand. Some can't tell right from wrong. Most of them worry about the next war. Sex problems disturb them. Many have no appreciation of farm life and its natural environment.

4. How to get adults to be willing to make an effort to understand their problems. Are these needs real? Is their expression legitimate? Are not our schools and the educational programs of other youth serving and adult organizations and agencies already cognizant of these problems? Are they not working diligently to provide assistance?

It makes a difference, perhaps, in which direction you look when you ask these questions. In many rural areas, novel ideas and experiments for meeting adult and youth needs have been undertaken and are now underway. But answers, really honest answers, cannot be found in the initiative of a few scattered communities. They must be sought in *my community*. Is my community truly aware of the educational potential of its school, of its many other groups? Have their programs been modified to the new look in rural life? Are they aware of the concerns which the youth and adults of today have? Do their programs take them into account? If my community really does, it is indeed a strong community. And strong communities grow.

The answer to these questions can be found only in the kind of planning and the extent of cooperation developed between school and community. When teachers and organizations plan together in order to do what they are best suited for, the results have proved significant. Frictions have thus been eliminated. Youth has been channeled into groups best serving his needs. Adults have been brought into community leadership.

Rural Education on the World Scene

PEOPLE everywhere are desirous of improving their level of living. Throughout the world there is slowly developing a desire for independence, a desire for greater opportunity for all people. Resources alone cannot provide an improved standard of living for any group of people. They need both resources and the economic competence to develop them. Economic competence can come only through education.

Education is the key to the freedom and independence which all people seek. And this problem of education is chiefly a problem of rural education. For two-thirds of the world's population are engaged in agriculture or living in small towns or villages. They are living off the land, most of them in a most primitive way. The relationship between education and the level of living of a people is direct. Those nations which have an inadequate program of education for rural people or no program at all are also the nations with the poorest economic conditions.

COMMUNICATION IS ESSENTIAL

There is an almost complete freedom of communication between the United States and the other countries of the free world. This situation can facilitate an exchange of ideas on promising and significant developments in rural education. Exchange of information relative to educational experimentation in rural areas is vital for there are a number of conditions, even in the underdeveloped nations of the world, that have their counterparts in regions of the United States. Social and economic forces which influence the character of good education are not unique to any particular locality, state or country. There is need for an understanding of world education problems and a uniting of our efforts with those of others to help bring about a higher level of education for the great rural masses. The rural people

of the world look to the United States for leadership and help, and, if significant leadership and help is to be provided, knowledge of rural problems and progress must be world-wide in scope.

American educational techniques and philosophies provide a valid solution to many of the problems of countless millions of people in countries less fortunate than our own. But only when such ideas and techniques are deliberately adapted to meet existing local conditions, sometimes quite foreign to our own. Merely to teach men to read and write is not enough. The "3 R's" for many people of the world may well be health (sanitation and nutrition), agriculture, and co-operation. American educational methods, however basically sound in terms of the laws of learning and other psychological principles, may well need to be modified to meet the particular obstacles with which the peoples of many other nations regularly deal. With this in mind, Caldwell said, "We must help our friends in other countries to isolate the specific economic, social, and political obstacles which stand in their way and then help them to adapt our educational philosophies, our experiences, our techniques, and our general know-how so that these obstacles may be removed or overcome."¹

At least fifty percent of the people of the world old enough to be able to read and write are unable to do so, and are therefore totally illiterate. An additional fifteen percent are functionally illiterate. Thus, the problem of illiteracy is one which includes approximately sixty-five percent of the world's population. The size of the problem varies in different areas of the world and among different sections of the population. In some countries where education has long been compulsory and almost universal the proportion of the population unable to read and write is relatively small. In other areas, progress in the reduction of illiteracy has been very slow, owing to the lack of sufficient means to provide educational opportunities for the whole population, especially where the population is increasing faster than the facilities of education.²

In nearly every country, including the United States, the greatest

¹From the address of Oliver J. Caldwell, Assistant Commissioner for International Education, U. S. Office of Education. "Implications of World Programs for Education in the United States."

²United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Progress of Literacy in Various Countries*. Monographs on Fundamental Education, No. 6. Paris, France: *Firmin-Ditot et Cie*, 1953, p. 9.

amount of illiteracy is among the people in the rural areas. The percentage of illiteracy in Asia, Africa and South America, all predominantly rural, is much higher than the world average. The gap between the social realities in rural Iran and rural America is extremely great. To bridge it effectively and to adapt the educational ideas and techniques which work (or could work if applied) in the rural areas of America to the needs of rural Iran—or any other country in Asia or Africa which is striving to reduce the extent of illiteracy as an essential step towards social, economic, and political stability—needs almost super-human wisdom and skill. Every nation needs to capitalize upon the experiences of others, wherever it may be, in order to help solve what is actually a world problem—providing adequate educational opportunity for all people.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR OTHER NATIONS

Rural education has increasingly become an important aspect of and adjunct to the implementation of the foreign policy of the United States. Many American educators during the past several years have been invited to undertake leadership roles in programs largely concerned with rural people in what are sometimes called underdeveloped countries. This is an opportunity and a privilege that American educators dare not fail. It is fortunate indeed that so many nations are looking to this country for assistance in shaping or revising their educational systems.

Technical assistance programs began during World War II when funds were allocated to assist Chinese students stranded in this country. Since VJ-Day, there has been a gradual expansion of international education as an instrument of foreign policy. First came the Fulbright Act of 1946 which provides that some of the foreign currencies owed to the United States as a result of surplus-property sales abroad may be used to finance exchanges between the United States and certain foreign countries for study, teaching, lecturing, or advanced research. Some 26 countries are now cooperating with the United States in this program. The Smith-Mundt Act followed in 1948 providing the general basic authority for a reciprocal exchange program between the United States and other countries. Then followed several related acts, such as the one which allocated the unpaid balance of the Finnish War Debt to educational purposes. A similar but smaller program was established to expand the Iranian Trust

Fund for educational purposes. Presently, at least sixteen existing acts of Congress authorize the use of American education, its personnel and its institutions for international assistance programs.

Federal international education programs are administered through (1) the U. S. Department of Defense; (2) the Foreign Operations Administration; and (3) the U. S. Department of State. Simultaneously, there has been an increase in many private American activities in this area, particularly those financed by philanthropic foundations. A substantial number of additional programs have come into being under the auspices of various specialized agencies of the United Nations.

American educators, rural and urban alike, have an unlimited opportunity in this relationship with needy and friendly people everywhere. The position of world-wide political and economic leadership which the United States now holds requires acceptance of the responsibility for service in education. Those who share in the various programs will receive as much as they give; they will learn as much as they teach. As they are able to serve throughout the world, they will establish intellectual roots which will bring to our own schools new breadth and vitality. Those who teach abroad will return to their pupils with new knowledge and increased wisdom. For living in and serving a changing world requires a maximum knowledge of that world and the people in it.

A better understanding of the peoples of the world is an essential foundation of international peace. Technical assistance, or Point Four, or whatever it may be called, operates on the assumption that by sharing our skills with the peoples of other nations they will develop for themselves a better standard of living. Without education that will not be possible. These programs are a most promising indication that new methods of cooperation and of learning to appreciate and understand each other are being developed. They should, by their nature, scope and objectives, be of urgent concern to and a prime responsibility of all those who demonstrate an interest and special competence in the provisions of educational opportunities for the people, children and adults, who live in rural areas.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

The most difficult problem of every country is providing educational programs in the rural areas where the greatest numbers of people

live. Archer reports some of the characteristics of world-wide rural educational programs and the causes of its retardation.

Rural schooling in most countries is of shorter duration; teachers are not as well educated; school buildings, teaching materials and equipment are inferior; and literacy of the rural population is much lower than in urban sections of the same country. Generally pupils travel longer distances to school and good teachers tend to migrate from rural to urban sections.¹

It is important, however, to note that educational reforms in many countries of the world give evidence that substantial gains have been made in recent years.

One of the especially significant developments in many areas is the extent to which the status of women has more nearly reached that of men as regards leadership activities in social improvement programs. For example, in Pakistan, a Moslem country, women during the past several years have taken much responsibility for social leadership and are experiencing, almost for the first time in the history of their culture, an intense interest in and desire for education. It is difficult to visualize the obstacles to education in India where 80 percent of the 360 million people live in rural villages. Prior to the establishment of the new government seven years ago there was no real comprehensive effort made to provide education for all children. At this time, however, one of the most extensive school and community development programs anywhere in the world has been inaugurated. Despite the many handicaps, most children of India now have access to at least a limited elementary education.

The most significant sign of progress throughout the world has been the development of rural school community centers. In these the school furnishes the leadership for learning, both by adults and children, through the solution of economic and social problems. Improved agricultural practices, better sanitation, better health, greater literacy, more attractive homes and communities result from the cooperative efforts of people to help themselves, with teachers seeking to develop the necessary local leadership.² Among the countries where such developments have made substantial gains are Puerto Rico, Egypt, Korea and the Philippines.

¹Archer, Clifford P. "Signs of Promise Beyond Our Borders." *Phi Delta Kappan* 36:63-66; October 1954.

²*Ibid.*, p. 63.

Puerto Rico's Community Education Program³

To alleviate the problem of an increasing population in Puerto Rico it was considered essential to increase the dignity, self respect, and self control of each individual. This could not be accomplished if the masses continued to depend on a powerful elite, public or private, to plan, finance, and manage their lives for them. Motivation was needed to make people aware that they themselves, with the resources and skills they already possessed, could take the initiative to plan and do for themselves and each other more than they were presently doing.

About ten years ago, Puerto Rico experienced a political change. Since then, the Popular Democratic Party has controlled its legislature and has given virtually all-out support to Governor Luis Munoz Marin. After initiating a series of bold programs, chief of which are land-for-the-landless and industrial development schemes, Governor Munoz and his advisors sensed something lacking. The people were leaning too heavily on government, looking to it for their every want. To counteract this situation the community education program was launched. This illustrates the present government's chief distinguishing characteristic, its careful avoidance of paternalistic planning for the people, and its emphasis on stimulating the people's own initiative.

Many "experts" have now learned the art of discovering local leadership and power patterns in order to enlist the cooperation of locally influential people and groups. Getting to know both the town fathers and also "little Joe," the informal leader, is an old story now. It has been taught to many technicians in recent years before sending them out to see what they can accomplish in strange places.

While the community education program recognizes the necessity of working within the existing leadership and power structure of a community, its real purpose might be described as helping this structure to evolve and grow. Wide participation is the key to unlock a community's potential of growth, which of course presents the opportunity for new leadership to develop.

³From the address of Ellery Foster, Formerly Community Development Advisor, Point-Four Program. "The Work of the Division of Community Education in Puerto Rico."

*Rural Community Schools of Egypt**

It is difficult to understand the rural education programs now rapidly gaining momentum in Egypt without knowing something about the village communities which nurture them.

Egypt has a population of approximately 22 million, 75 percent of whom live in small villages. Life in an Egyptian village is hard; unspeakably dreary to an American. The water borne diseases common to all countries with vast irrigation systems keep a majority of the people ill. It is a common saying that "if a village mother wants four living children, she must bear ten." Illiteracy is appallingly high—approximately 80 percent for the country as a whole.

The internal political revolution of 1952 released a great deal of the tension generated by prolonged frustration. The young Army officers who spearheaded the *coup* formed their cabinet, the Revolutionary Command Council, and began the long task of rebuilding their country. From the beginning they have assumed that the Republic—declared on June 18, 1953—could not succeed without an educated citizenry, and the development of a national system of functional education has been a major goal. The large estates have been confiscated and money from the sale of royal palaces and vast landholdings has been set aside as a national trust to finance programs of social welfare.

Many of the obstacles confronting the new government seemed insurmountable. Adequate finance was not available and the small amount that was available had to be budgeted for defense, health and welfare as well as for education, with the most urgent need having the highest priority. The Ministry of Education under the Revolutionary Government inherited one of the most highly centralized systems of public education in the world. Control of buildings, budgets, programs, curricula, teacher training and teacher assignment had rested completely with the Ministry in Cairo. School personnel were not free to meet even the most pressing local needs without express permission from the Ministry. This had a stifling effect on individual zeal and effort.

The community development movement, under way in the villages since 1942, through the rural welfare center program sponsored by

*Adapted from the address of Muriel Brown, Specialist in Community Education, U. S. Office of Education, "Developments in Rural Community Schools of Egypt."

the Egyptian Ministry of Social Affairs, was based on the assumption that given the right kind of help, people in communities could work together to solve some of their most pressing problems at the local level. The village school was recognized as a means to marshal efforts to raise the level of home and community living.

In 1953, committees were appointed by the new Republic's Minister of Education to prepare functional courses of study for grades 1-12. Also, steps were taken to create a uniform pattern of basic schooling—a six grade elementary school organization. Opportunities were provided for secondary education through a five year Post-Primary School offering vocational education in agriculture, home economics, and preservice training for teaching in the rural elementary schools.

While the curriculum was being prepared, leading Egyptian educators were appointed to a committee to discover ways and means of improving teacher standards. The two most difficult problems facing this committee were: the need for recruiting many new teachers to provide a teacher for every classroom then available; and the need to orient the 4700 teachers inservice to the new functional curricula being prepared.

The United States assisted in this great undertaking, sending four consultants—a teacher, an educational administrator, a curriculum expert, and a specialist in community education. The very pleasant associations developed in this first joint enterprise between American and Egyptian educators have grown into an effective working partnership known as the Egyptian-American Joint Education Committee.

The United States Technical Assistance Mission is now assisting the Egyptian Ministry of Education, with the approval of the Revolutionary Government, in developing successful rural community schools. Plans are underway for cooperative projects pertaining to the education of teachers for rural elementary schools in Egypt, the production of educational materials, rural school development, post-primary school development, teacher guidance in health education, educational research, fundamental education, and vocational education.

Among the major problems confronting the development of successful rural community school programs in Egypt are the following: (1) the existing educational pattern prevents the full mobilization of local professional personnel in solving local educational problems; (2) a shortage of well qualified teachers; (3) an almost complete

lack of physical facilities; (4) inadequate facilities for providing the technical and vocational training necessary.

The methods now being used to remove these obstacles are those which have in the past released creative potentialities in thousands of people in other lands. There is cooperative planning at village, regional, and national levels. Village teachers are being trained to lead and to serve on local fact finding committees, which will provide Ministry officials with a basis for national planning they have needed but never had before.

Korean People Begin To Build⁷

In spite of seemingly insurmountable obstacles the people of Korea share a firm determination to rebuild their schools. During the Japanese occupation the supply of elementary school teachers decreased 38 percent; secondary teachers 20 percent; normal school graduates 41 percent; and college and university staff members 54 percent. The communists later took a heavy toll of school teachers and those few remaining were paid salaries too low to permit a decent standard of living. Textbooks, rewritten after the occupation, were often destroyed when the country was overrun by communists. After the occupation, the Minister of Education reported that only 33 percent of the elementary, 39 percent of the secondary, and 25 percent of the normal schools were using their own buildings. Others were meeting in the open air or in temporary shelters.

But the Korean people have a profound belief in the importance of their schools. Even parents who are poorly fed, clothed and housed manage to somehow contribute a little from their meager resources to support education. The UNESCO Mission is lending a helping hand in the program of reconstruction of the education system. Progress within the next few years should be especially marked.

Community Schools of the Philippines⁸

An outstanding feature of rural life in the Philippines is the leadership furnished by the school in community improvement. The teacher and the school enjoy considerable prestige in the more than 20,000

⁷Adapted from the address of B. I. Hummel, Extension Sociologist, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. "Problems and Prospects of Education in Korean Villages and in Japan."

⁸Adapted from the address of Francis Drag, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, San Diego County, California. "Rural Community Schools of the Philippines."

towns or *barrios* of the country. Because of this attitude of people toward their schools, it has been logical that schools be used as the agency to improve living in rural communities. After the withdrawal of the occupation forces of World War II, the economic status of rural families was low, sanitary conditions bad, and illiteracy common.

The Bureau of Public Schools and the Philippine Association of School Superintendents embarked upon a program of local community betterment through the school. Training programs in community development were set up for teachers in the various provinces. Teachers learned how to use the community organization called the *parok*, a section or block of the town or *barrio*, to which the people were accustomed. Through the cooperative efforts of the people in each local community, problems have been faced realistically and are now being solved. Schools, homes, and roadsides have been cleaned up and made more attractive. Sanitation has been improved. Adults as well as children are learning to read and write. In many communities, leadership is being furnished by the school in improving farm operations. New crops and better livestock have been introduced and the farm population have better hopes of earning a good living. Both high schools and elementary schools have a community improvement program.

The high schools of the Division of Cebu are presently engaged in a reforestation program. Every high school student is required to plant and take care of at least one hardwood tree. The lunch counter in Argao, Cebu, serves not only the students and teachers but also the public; the Dalaguete Provincial High School opens its library facilities to the public in the evening. Halili High School in Bulacan enrolls adult women in dressmaking classes and furnishes vocational bulletins on important developments in agriculture and industries.

In the Palawan province a high school runs a retail store which provides facilities for the farmers in nearby communities to market their products. The school retailers act as middlemen, buying the farm products from the different *barrios* to be sold to the townspeople. Fish projects in high school demonstrate to rural people the most effective methods of fishing. In one province the high school is conducting a campaign for more gardening because of shortage of food in the area. Community assemblies are organized to teach better production methods and demonstrate the use of fertilizers, seed selec-

tion, and control and prevention of animal pests. Homemaking and beautification, sanitation, recreation, repair of tools and furniture and the encouragement of food production are common school projects. The curriculum of the school is intimately related to problems of living in the community.

IMPLICATIONS OF FOREIGN PROGRAMS FOR RURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The programs of other nations which have been briefly described, the experience which American educators have in working with them, and the increasing recognition being given by our Federal government to the "power of education" in developing and maintaining a satisfactory level of living for all people—all have implications for the educational programs of the United States. A few of these might well be pointed out.

Underdeveloped Areas in the United States

The educational programs being developed in many other countries, starting where the people now are, are at a very low level. While it is true that the level of living and the general level of education of the "underdeveloped" countries of the world are not in the least comparable to average or even submarginal conditions in the United States, the problems which many of the underdeveloped areas of this country have are basically the same. Differences are almost completely that of degree. Some of these "underdeveloped schools" were described by Luther Ambrose as those which . . .

. . . provide education for the Negro in the South, the foreign child of our city slums, the American Indians on our reservations, the children of itinerant workers on our truck farms and cotton fields, and the children in forgotten valleys of the southern Appalachian or canyons of Colorado and Montana. We have in the United States, areas which because of topography, poor roads, poverty, low tax bases, lack of adequate educational leadership, limited educational vision, offer educational services quite as meager as those found in many areas receiving help under our foreign aid program. For example, in 1950 there were 44 counties in Eastern Kentucky where the median family income was \$1169; the median years of schooling for adults was 7.6 years. There were 15,315 adults who had not completed even one year of school. In some counties more than half of the school teachers held emergency certificates. One county had 47.7 percent of its children aged 7 to 13, 58 percent of those aged 14 to 15, and 66 percent of those aged 16 to 17 who were not in

school at all. The Kentucky county with the lowest assessed valuation per child (highest permitted by law) can raise only \$6.25 per year per child, while in the same state the county with the highest assessed valuation can raise \$127.20 or 20 times as much.*

While we are sharing with others all over the world the techniques of education and research, we must not forget our own blighted regions. The techniques needed to develop morale and self reliance in underdeveloped regions of the world also apply to such regions of the United States. We may need a "Point Four" program in the United States and surely need to give greater attention to the welfare of all.

Education Must be Functional

An important characteristic of rural educational programs throughout the world is that, if they are meaningful to people and to have value in helping them solve the problems associated with improving their level of living, they are closely related to real life situations.

In some aspects of curriculum, American rural schools have been especially able to develop reasonably functional programs. This is especially true of vocational agriculture. (Many functional programs have been developed in other vocational areas also, although for the most part, these are not available in rural areas.) The Secretary of Agriculture called attention to this as he said, "Education in all phases of farming and farm living has helped American agriculture keep pace with technology . . . to improve and increase the Nation's productivity . . . to better its home environment . . . and to spread the goodness of its harvests across 365 days of the year."¹⁰

In many other aspects of curriculum, the programs provided in our rural schools are too academic . . . too abstract. They need to be made more functional.

Interdependence of Rural and Urban Areas

It has previously been noted that throughout the world birthrates tend to be higher in rural areas. The consequence of this fact in almost every country is a migration from farm to city. This movement of people is not confined to the United States. The welfare of

*Adapted from the address of Luther Ambrose, Chairman, Department and Division of Rural School Improvement Program, Berea College. "Implications of World Programs for Education in the United States."

¹⁰Adapted from the address of the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, U. S. Secretary of Agriculture. "Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Agriculture."

farm and rural people is closely tied to the welfare of urban people. The security and well being of each depends to a very large extent upon the security and well being of the other. The quality of the educational programs which are available for the children and adults of rural areas within a few years is reflected in the level of living, the productive capacity, and virtually every other aspect of urban life. Rural education needs to be everyone's concern.

CONCLUSION

Economic and social progress of the world's people and the quality and quantity of education provided are concomitants.

No nation is stronger than its people. No people can be strong without being informed. Our security and freedom depend upon an informed people. Freedom and security go together.¹¹

A succinct conclusion might well be the following quotation:

Signs of world progress in rural education are beginning to appear. These point the way for a billion and one-half people—two-thirds of the population of the world—who live in rural areas. Brightest spots are those where schools lead the way to solution of the problems of rural life. Post-war educational reforms have not yet reached the millions but they are the leaven at work. Leaders of vision who recognize the possibilities inherent in rural centers of learning are needed. These can be the salvation of democracy as the masses are led to solve basic problems of living.¹²

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²Archer, Clifford P., *op. cit.*, p. 63.

The Next Decade

TEN years, a single decade—time passes so quickly. And yet so much can happen in that short space of time. Ten years ago "atom bomb" (and all of its derivatives) and "jet propulsion" were not even words in the vocabulary. Today their ominous significance is world-wide. Ten years ago television was a laboratory gadget; in many sections of the country it has now become common in almost a majority of households. However quickly each ten years passes, it is always filled with developments and discoveries which evoke a whole range of adventure, surprise, satisfaction and fear.

The decade since the First White House Conference on Rural Education has been one of marked improvement in the educational opportunities of most rural children. Although this report has tended to focus attention primarily upon specific problem areas, a procedure which almost always results in a somewhat negative or pessimistic outlook, the progress made during the past ten years in creating conditions favorable to better educational opportunities in rural areas has been remarkable. And despite the problem or trouble-spot emphasis of the preceeding chapters, *etc.* has reported gains which have been made. In summarizing the Conference, Cooper identified some of these accomplishments for rural education.

1. Increasing state aids have equalized the burden of school support.
2. Opportunities for secondary education have been extended to many more rural youth.
3. Teachers are better prepared and in a much more stabilized professional position.
4. They have more and better teaching aids and equipment.
5. A larger percentage of rural children are coming to school and staying longer.
6. The range and quality of their educational opportunities have been markedly increased.
7. Improvement in local school district organization has been phenomenal.
8. Programs of adult education have been strengthened.

9. A new concept of the purposes and functions of the county superintendents' office is emerging.

10. The improvements made in the professional leadership serving smaller school districts and county systems is one of the brightest spots on the entire educational horizon.

These are but indications of what professional school people and the lay citizens whom they serve in thousands of rural communities throughout this country have done to create a climate that is conducive to good education. In many, many instances the efforts made have been tremendous. In many instances the price in terms of emotional disturbances has been high. It is an accomplishment of which this Conference, and the entire profession—yes, an accomplishment of which all rural Americans can be justly proud.¹

But pride in past achievements, however much deserved, cannot be permitted to obstruct—a realistic approach to the continuing and emerging problems of rural education. Ten years ago Murray Lincoln, an Ohio farmer, challenged all who share responsibility for determining the purposes and character of the rural school: "The day is past when the rural school can sit comfortably on its acre and a half waiting for business. It must move with bold steps into the realm of the living American community."² His challenge emphasized that democracy is not a birthright but a responsibility demanding the intelligent and unselfish participation of every citizen. The decade since has not changed this responsibility nor will the decade ahead.

What does the next decade have in store for rural education? There is no crystal ball sufficiently clear to permit intelligent perception. And there is no prophet sufficiently wise to predict with reasonable certainty.

During the past decade there has been change. New conditions have resulted. Trends or tendencies have been begun or continued. Some have been accelerated. It is very likely that many of these will continue, and that, during the next decade, they will have implications of great significance for rural education. And while the direction of present trends could be shifted by any number of forces not yet discernible, it is reasonable, perhaps even valuable, to identify what they now seem to be.

¹ Adapted from the address of Shirley Cooper, Associate Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association. "One Man's Interpretation of the Conference."

² Lincoln, Murray D. "Building the Future of Rural America." *The White House Conference on Rural Education*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1945, p. 53.

The past decade has seen the acceleration of two great movements which have their origins in decades long past. The first of these is the trend toward specialization—in agriculture, in industry, in almost every aspect of living. To some this tendency toward specialization has been distasteful. But, during these past ten years, the application of science and invention to the things men do has resulted in a degree of specialization previously unknown. And regardless of how desirable or undesirable it is considered to be, it will undoubtedly continue.

Specialization in its broadest sense is largely responsible for the second great movement—the movement of people. People everywhere are moving, but then mobility has always characterized America. From its very beginning this has been a Nation on the move—from Europe to America, from the seaboard to the frontier, from the South to the North, and, in the latest phase, from everywhere to the West Coast. The past decade has seen a tremendous upsurge in mobility, and in every state it has been from rural areas toward urban centers. Sparsely populated areas have become more sparse; the more densely populated areas have become more densely populated. The growth of suburban areas around every major population center has been tremendous. This trend, too, is likely to continue.

These two movements have had widespread effects, not the least of which has been the strain they have put upon social institutions. Schools and all other institutions have felt the pressures. Social structure is now struggling to adapt, a struggle which may be even greater and more desperate in the decade ahead.

The implications of these emphases for rural education are many. They are perhaps a key to what may develop during the next decade—to what may need to be the concerns of all rural leaders. Again in broad outline some of these implications may be sketched briefly. Again they cannot be considered as predictions but only as an extension of present trends based upon facts now at hand.

Perhaps the most significant implication reflects upon the educational program itself, both its scope and quality. During the next decade, as in the past, a large proportion of rural youth, perhaps even a majority, will be forced to leave their rural communities in search of economic opportunities. Rural America cannot provide education with the expectation that children will remain indefinitely in the community of their birth. A few of them will, but most will need to

be prepared to meet different places, different people and different circumstances. The need to provide an educational program which can equip rural young people *and rural adults* with the competencies, skills and understandings necessary for making a satisfactory adjustment to a new and different environment has previously been identified in this report. This need has long been recognized by some of our educational leaders. But, all in all, our attempts to meet it have been most inadequate.

The next decade will no doubt see a continuation of efforts to revamp administrative organization in order to meet the challenge of more and better educational opportunities in rural communities. There is every indication that the tremendous efforts to reorganize local school districts into larger administrative units and to consolidate schools will continue at a high level. There is perhaps some likelihood that the qualitative factors of reorganized school districts will receive nearly as much emphasis as numerical factors. High costs, high taxes and the shortage of school buildings will encourage reorganization. Perhaps the most important contributor will be the inability of smaller local districts to compete with larger and stronger districts for well qualified teachers, ever decreasing in supply. Another aspect of organizational adjustment which may well be the highlight of rural education in the next decade will be the development of effective intermediate units. Recognition of the importance of education to national welfare and of Federal responsibility for insuring its quality may well result in a substantial increase in Federal financial participation. That the Federal government has a concern for education has been well proved.

The next decade will bring into sharper focus a number of the needs of rural education. The school is only one of the facilitating devices for educating rural people. The need for a new unity of effort and for a spirit of cooperation among all groups and organization and agencies serving rural people will become more widely recognized. The need for research will become more evident—not the kind of research which deals with statistics and quantities but the kind which deals with the way people work together, with human processes—the kind of research that needs to involve psychologists and sociologists and social psychologists as well as educators—the kind of research that can give guidance to educational leaders in efforts to keep people edu-

cationally informed, to help them understand school programs and problems, and to encourage their active participation.

But these are needs which must be attacked on a broad base—state and national. Education is something closer to people. But close, too, is responsibility, for the true quality of the education provided in rural communities during the next decade will depend largely upon what the people in each community do. And there are many things that each community *can* do. A series of sound and proven principles which could well serve as guides for any rural community concerned with improving educational opportunity were outlined by Cooper.

1. Realistically assess your own resources and capabilities. Decide what you, personally, and your organization can do best and get busy. Don't wait for a more appropriate time or for a special invitation. The time is ripe now and you have already been invited in a most pressing manner by your schools, your children, your neighbors, and your country.

2. Don't try to do everything at once. Break out a segment of the task that is manageable and workable and see it through to a successful completion. Even though it may seem to be insignificant, worthwhile progress has been made when the job is successfully completed. Remember that great journeys are made by taking thousands of small steps.

3. Don't try to do everything yourself. You have neighbors who have unique capabilities too. You know institutions, organizations, and agencies that have special resources. Get each started at doing what can be done best.

4. Begin with what needs to be done now and move step-by-step towards broad purposes and goals.

5. Begin where the people in the community are in their understanding of educational methods, purposes, and needs. Community educational improvement is a growing, learning, evolutionary process.

6. Exercise care in what you do. Changes in educational organization, operation, methods or objectives cannot easily be reversed. It's expensive for communities to back up and start over again if mistakes have been made.

7. When problems are complicated or technical, get competent professional advice to lessen the risk of disastrous errors.

8. Keep people in the community well informed as to what, why, and how things are being done.

9. Make use of the existing organizations and agencies. It is a waste of energy and even confusing to create an organization or agency to do a job that could be done just as well or perhaps better by an organization or agency that is well known in the state or community.

10. Work on the basis of trying to help people do what needs to be done rather than doing the job for them.

11. Be practical and down to earth. Approach problems in a manner and on a basis that can be understood by the people vitally concerned.

12. Be guided by tried and proven educational principles.
13. Get something done about something that is important now.³

The next decade for rural education shows great promise. Rural people and educators should maintain an air of optimism. Progress is on the move. But whether or not it continues will depend to a large extent upon what people do and not so much upon what they say. It has long been recognized that a good home in the country is probably the best place in the world for a child to grow up. But even the child in the best kind of rural home needs good schooling if he is to be prepared to meet the complex problems of living which he will be forced to encounter. There is no good reason why the schools in small communities should not provide rural children with the best education available to any child anywhere.

³Adapted from the address of Shirley Cooper, *op. cit.*

Major Conference Addresses

Papers presented at General Sessions and
Conference Assemblies, sequentially arranged.

AS I SEE RURAL EDUCATION AT MIDCENTURY

WAURINE WALKER

President

National Education Association, 1954-1955

The little country school house is still the symbol of education in the minds of the American people. In the early period of our Nation's history, our educational program suited the needs and demands of a simple self-sustaining agricultural economy. Today the quality of education enjoyed by rural people is of enormous significance, not only to the social and economic welfare of rural America, but also to the entire Nation.

When we consider the problems of the nations of the world which have the major part of the earth's population, we realize that their problems are largely rural. The nations where we find the greatest poverty are nations of farmers. In these countries, illiteracy and lack of modern science and technology are prevalent. Whatever else may be required to solve the problems of the world, it is certain that without education—rural education—the proposed answers will be futile. In recognition of the importance of rural education in today's world, it is advisable that we evaluate our own progress and consider the needs of rural education at this midcentury point.

It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure, as president of the National Education Association, to welcome you to this National Conference on Rural Education. The National Education Association is fully cognizant of the fact that public education for rural America presents some unique and urgent problems in a unique and changing world. In the platform of our Association is the emphatic declaration "that education is the inalienable right of every American, that it is essential to our society for the promotion and preservation of democratic ideals . . . that every child, regardless of race, belief, economic status, residence, or physical handicap should have the opportunity for fullest development in mental, moral, social and physical health, and in the attitudes, knowledge, habits and skills that are essential for individual happiness and effective citizenship in our democratic Nation."

In making realities of our proclaimed ideals, the National Education Association directs special attention to the educational needs of children in rural areas. This includes not only the children of farmers but of disadvantaged groups: Negroes, Latin Americans, and migratory workers whose children follow them wherever work is available. These have particular problems and need particular attention in order that the common ideal of education for all may be realized.

I believe that the direct interest which the NEA has taken in rural education is responsible for the participation and support which rural teachers give their national professional organization. The large increases in NEA membership since 1942 have come chiefly from teachers in rural communities and small cities. Since 1942 NEA membership has increased from 217,943 to 561,708.

We are delighted that rural teachers are responding to the NEA program and are participating in its work. I particularly want to honor the teachers of the 443 counties in 27 states that have 100 percent membership in their NEA. We sincerely hope that this number will continue to grow.

It is indeed appropriate that here, today, this conference has been called to take stock of the accomplishments during this decade and to take a look at the road ahead. The theme, "Education for Rural America—A Forward Look," is indeed a challenge for thought, discussion, and action. I am particularly pleased to see that you have put first things first on your program. The first of the major assemblies of this conference has as its theme, "The Teacher." We must emphasize again and again that the school is only as good as its teachers. I sincerely believe that the most important considerations before this conference—or before any other group of American citizens considering the education of their children—are: (1) the quality, character, and number of teachers needed for an adequate school program, and (2) the conditions, policies, and rewards which are going to be necessary to secure the teachers required.

Dr. Carr asked me the day after my election as NEA president what was the one thing I wanted to emphasize in the year of my administration. I answered, "More and better qualified teachers for America's children." I said that not because I think one year of anybody's administration can completely solve that problem. I said it because I do believe that it is the one basic, the one most crucial problem facing American education, and I believe this is the year we can and must lay the foundation for the solution of the teacher supply-demand problem.

We can build school buildings of such magnificence that they will be monuments to local pride, we can fill these buildings with every conceivable kind of aid in teaching equipment, but until we can put into each classroom a competent professional teacher who knows his job, who can serve as an inspired guide for our youth, our educational system will remain inadequate. Now, do not misunderstand me, I know that poor schools and poor teaching equipment account for the loss of many teachers, and I am for fine buildings and superior equipment. We can have, we must have these, *plus* superior teachers. But we cannot accept bargain basement concepts of teaching which drive young, capable people away from our teaching profession.

The U. S. Office of Education reports that we began school this fall with a shortage of 124,000 qualified teachers. We already had in our schools 72,000 teachers on emergency sub-standard certificates. Do I need to point out to you that if this condition continues we are undermining the very foundation of the teaching profession, we are endangering adequate education for every child? Do I need to remind you that the real emergency in teacher shortage is in rural and village schools?

It is an established fact that we shall need from 150,000 to 200,000 new teachers each year from now until 1965 at least. The population experts tell us that a child is born every 8 seconds in this country. That is 10,800 a day and over 3 million a year. This birth rate alone requires 360 new teachers each day and 141,000 new teachers each year. Add to it the fact that we lose qualified teachers at the rate of 75 to 100,000 each year. Today there is such instability

in the teaching profession as to threaten the very structure of our public school system.

Is there any effective solution to this problem? Indeed there is. It is a solution for which we must now fight vigorously if the problem is to be solved by 1960 or 1965. Our actions cannot be regulated by meekness or by wishful thinking. This Nation has the wealth to secure whatever it wants strongly enough to pay for it. This Nation has the wealth to secure and maintain adequate classrooms and competent teachers for every child. This Nation can get its needed supply of qualified teachers if the Nation is willing to face the facts, willing to pay the cost. But the public will not be conscious of this need as long as educators are reluctant, timid, and afraid to tell the public the truth about the actual, urgent needs of our schools. We must have an informed and concerned public opinion if we are to get the needed support for our schools. You who are educational leaders are responsible for a more vigorous and positive approach in public relations in efforts to establish a better working partnership with the public.

There appeared this fall in a Washington newspaper an ironical cartoon. It showed a statesman haranguing an audience, demanding that \$50 billion be spent on the highways in this country in the next 10 years; because he said: "We look to the future; we seek to build for the future." That cartoon showed a young school child pulling the statesman's coat-tails saying: "Here I am, mister, what about me?" Can we view this proposed 10 year, multibillion dollar highway program, and not be disturbed that the same imagination and foresight has not been applied to planning for the schools of this Nation?

I would like to propose briefly five things that I hope you will discuss thoroughly this afternoon in the major assembly program on teaching:

1. *Establish professional standards of preparation for all teachers.* As rapidly as possible, without making increased standards retroactive against teachers already in service, all states should establish a minimum standard of four years of college preparation for all teachers—and that includes teachers in one-room and rural schools.

2. *While this program is in progress, we must hold the line against pressures to lower our present standards.* We school people, especially administrators, are responsible for this vicious practice, because we often accept the easy remedy rather than exerting the energy and tireless effort to search for qualified teachers. Let me remind you that there are 2 million people in this Nation who hold valid certificates who are not now engaged in teaching. Many would be available for our schools if they were conscious of our need. Let's set up state-wide facilities for locating these potential teachers, let's exhaust every possible source before we accept a sub-standard teacher. Let me refer you to the state of Kansas as an example of what can be done when a united effort is determined to hold the line.

3. *Establish recruitment programs in every school.* There are young people in every classroom who have the qualifications to become good teachers. Let's find and encourage these capable young people to become teachers and to return to our communities to teach. Let us by our own example show these young people the service, the satisfaction, and the achievement that can be made by teaching in rural schools.

4. *Encourage colleges to offer practical courses in rural education* in order that teachers may be prepared to understand and meet the needs of children in rural communities.

5. *Improve teacher welfare in rural communities.* We must improve the salaries, tenure, working conditions, sick leave, and living accommodations so that they will approximate standards found in our urban sections. Some of these improvements depend upon legislative action. All of these improvements to some degree depend upon administrative action, school board policy, and public opinion, and all these improvements are going to depend upon the action and vision of rural educators themselves.

Yes, good teachers cost more, but never forget that poor teachers will cost this Nation the most. Let me say I believe that rural schools can be the best schools. You can have the best schools because of the close relationship between the teacher, the pupil, and the family so that the educational process can be developed between individuals that know and understand each other. All phases of school administration and planning can be close to the people. Your school can be the best because your instructional program can be developed in terms of the whole community. The school can become a true community school with all of its program centered around community needs, resources, and activities.

Yes, our rural schools can be the best schools, but sometimes they are not. It will depend on leadership, imagination, and the vision of rural educators to mobilize the resources of their own communities. Three reasons why rural schools may not be good schools are:

1. *Lack of adequate financial resources.* Lack of finances means that good teachers and administrators are lost to the larger schools. Lack of finances often means tumbled-down buildings, ancient furniture and equipment.

2. We cheat the children in our rural areas because we do not give them the kind of educational program they want and deserve, and the *narrow curricular offerings* rob the rural child of an adequate education.

3. *School programs are not related to the community.* Often the program attempts to copy a city school instead of capitalizing upon the unique resources inherent in rural situations.

If the ideal of American education is to be realized we are going to have to give equal educational opportunities to every child in every rural section across this country. The democratic policies which initiated and guided American education through its formative years originated among rural people. There were no large cities when free public schools began in this country. The ideal of education for all originated in pioneer days when each sparsely settled community established its own school . . . a school imbued with a spirit of freedom and of good will, not only toward one's own children but also toward neighbors' children. Unless we bring into actual reality that ideal of educational opportunities for all children, the ideal of American education can never be fully realized. Here is the forward look in rural education for America.

AS I VIEW RURAL EDUCATION

SAMUEL MILLER BROWNELL

*Commissioner of Education**United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*

We in the Office of Education share your concern for the educational programs of our rural areas. And we share your desire to seek better schooling for rural youth so that they may develop to the fullest extent their capabilities and interests and as a result be able to make the fullest possible social contribution.

Perhaps the most appropriate remarks for me to make are some observations of how I see the problems of rural education in the perspective of our total picture of education in this country. I think you are entitled to find out the line of thinking of your Commissioner. I would remark about:

1. Why adequate rural education must be the concern of urban as well as rural citizens.
2. The impact of the major educational problems of the Nation on rural America.
3. The importance of citizen interest and understanding in solving the problems of rural education.

The problem in rural education is in some respects like urban education. In some respects it is a very special one. I am sure we all agree that it is not purely a rural problem to be solved by rural people only. What happens in rural communities affects all of America. Urban people have a vital stake in the education of rural children.

In our approach to the problems of rural education, we need to bear in mind certain changes that have occurred in the rural areas.

Between 1870 and 1945 the farm population declined from 75 percent to 17 percent of the total population. In the same period those employed in agriculture declined from 53 percent to less than 15 percent of the working population. Today less than one-fifth of our people are farmers.

Between 1939 and 1945 the production of crops increased 30 percent and of livestock 40 percent. This was during a time when farm population decreased 15 percent. The war years clearly indicated that if we were to apply all our technology to farming for maximum production, we could do so and still reduce farm population by one-half. This is a conservative estimate.

This ability to produce more food with less manpower because of the vast technological changes has had two principal effects upon our rural areas which have a particular significance for rural education.

The first of these is that about one-half of our rural youth are not needed to maintain farm production. Employment in the cities for them is to the advantage of the farm and the city. This is true because population increases in the rural areas are greater than in the urban areas, while cities have not produced enough births to maintain themselves. They depend upon the rural areas for their population increases. High birth rates on farms, the pressure of popula-

tion on the land, favorable employment opportunities in cities—all these factors have brought about a wide migration from the farms in recent years. For the seven-year period ending in 1947, farm territory sustained a net loss of 3,200,000 in the interchange of population with non-farm territory. The farms simply cannot support their own population increases. The urban areas need them. The obvious implication for rural education is that five of every ten youths born on the farms must be trained to live and work in an urban environment.

The second effect which the technological changes have had upon rural areas is that those remaining on the farms require a considerable amount of technical training to prepare them adequately to do a job demanding more and more preparation and complex skills.

The successful farmer today is an entrepreneur. Many farmers have a capital investment in their farms of \$50,000 or more, and the technical know-how needed to operate their farm enterprises efficiently is vastly greater than what was needed fifty years ago. They must have a knowledge of machinery and its application to the job of farming. They must know the intricacies of marketing. They must have a great deal more than a mere grasp of the rudiments of the science of agronomy. Farming has become a highly skilled profession requiring extensive training.

The migration of 50 percent of the children born on the land to the urban areas and the increasing need for technical training for those remaining on the land constitute a singular problem for rural education. Rural education, then, should point two ways: First, it should provide those migrating to the cities with the necessary training for them not merely to survive but to live productively in an urban environment; second, it should provide those remaining on the land with the technical knowledge required for successful farming and with the education for citizenship that goes with the increasing responsibilities of today's farmer.

It is the rural areas which provide our Nation with a continuous supply of manpower, both rural and urban. The rural areas must therefore be recognized as a major national source of new personnel strength. For national well-being this personnel requires the education essential to sound citizenship and competent performance in the many walks of life open only to those with good training.

Others, during this Conference, will present to you in varied ways evidence of the magnitude of the educational tasks which challenge us to the greatest educational effort in the history of this country. I shall touch on the problems very briefly. They grow out of these conditions:

1. *The extremely rapid advance of transportation, communication, and technology.* These advances make it necessary for citizens in a democracy especially to have more knowledge and skill and understanding of complex nature than ever before in order to survive and in order to enjoy the good life.
2. *The rapidly increasing number of persons that need to be educated.* Today the schools and colleges enroll 38 million. By 1960 the conservative

estimate of enrollment is 45 million—an increase exceeding 1 million per year. We are faced by the need for better and more education for each individual and at the same time we have ahead greater numbers for which to provide education. Besides that we have a deficit in facilities—a shortage of buildings and a shortage of qualified teachers. We started this year with an estimated shortage of 370,000 classrooms and 120,000 qualified teachers. At the same time we know that we are losing from schools before high school graduation about one-third of our youth, many of them capable of being prepared to fill some of the shortage areas in science, in nursing, in teaching, and in many other fields. The deficit figures given do not recognize that if we were not wasting precious potential manpower we would be short even more buildings and teachers.

The growth of population is greatest in rural America. The shortage of adequately prepared teachers is greatest in rural America. The shortage of adequate secondary school buildings is greatest for rural youth, and here it is that the greatest proportion of youth leave school at an early age. The impact of the problems facing American education thus lies especially on rural areas.

As we, gathered here in Washington, survey the problems of rural education and consider how they may best be met we can be sure of one thing. The solution does not lie here. It does not lie in the action of this group or in the action of Congress. And when I say that I do not discount your influence on helping to bring about solutions or the power of Congress. Rather what I wish to do is to emphasize that the determiner of the destiny of our schools is the people, the citizens of the Nation. Solutions to the educational problems, more than any other of the problems of the Nation, are responsive to action at the local and the state level.

The determination of the amount, the quality and the character of schooling provided rests to a very great extent in the hands of the voters and the school board members of the nearly 70,000 school districts in this Nation. The deprivation of adequate school opportunities to children or the provision of adequate schools can and will be determined by the action taken in each of these districts and by the action taken by 48 state legislatures. And their action will be taken, I am certain, well and wisely if, and only if, they have the facts, *all* of the facts concerning present conditions and problems of the schools. They will do what is necessary to provide adequate schools, I am certain, because it has been demonstrated repeatedly that when the interests of youth are involved citizens want to and will provide for them—even to the point of considerable sacrifice.

Citizen interest in improving the schools has increased greatly in the past few years. PTA membership has more than doubled in the past six years. School expenditures have increased by more than \$500 million in the past year. School construction awards were up \$196 million the first seven months of 1954 over those for the same period in 1953. Whereas in 1950 there were approximately 1,000 citizen groups operating to study and help in school improvement, there were more than 8,000 by early 1954.

By action of this past Congress, funds have been made available to each state for state conferences that will bring together citizens and educators to face

up to the problems of education in each state and to serve as a stimulus to developing action programs that will move education forward more rapidly in each state.

You have a great chance at this meeting to plan for and to develop information helpful to these conferences. The public needs information that portrays the facts and the problems about rural education. This should include its strengths and its progress as well as its shortcomings and needs. Citizens want this information in language that they can understand.

In these remarks I have tried to make clear that the education of rural youth must be of concern to citizens in urban as well as rural areas, for half of those so educated will stay and half will migrate to urban living. I have tried to point out the special impact of the major problems of education on the rural sections. It is difficult enough to prepare youth who live in urban areas to live competently as urban citizens. The rural areas need to prepare half of their youth for such living apart from urban aids and with the shortage of prepared teachers and school buildings greater than in urban areas. For the solution of these problems we have a resource that has proven that it will respond to needs once the evidence of action is clearly shown. It is the resource of an informed citizenry.

RURAL EDUCATION—A BACKWARD AND A FORWARD LOOK

HOWARD A. DAWSON

*Executive Secretary, Department of Rural Education
National Education Association*

Ten years ago today I delivered the opening address at the First White House Conference on Rural Education. The title of the address was "Trouble at the Crossroads," a title that has been praised, condemned, and discussed while the ideas presented have been widely quoted and accepted. Now we are assembled again to confer on rural education, to take a look at what has happened during the last decade, to appraise where we are, and to chart the course ahead.

IDENTIFICATION OF RURAL EDUCATION

There are persons, some in high places, who question that there is such a thing as rural education. They say that the principles of good teaching and good school administration are general and universally applicable, and that the effort to identify rural education is a futility. That many competent and interested persons have a different point of view is evidenced by your presence at this great conference.

If the propositions are accepted that people learn in terms of their past experiences and from environmental influences, and that rural children and youth have unique experiences and environmental influences, it must be granted

that the education of rural children and youth presents unique and identifiable problems. These unique experiences, resources, and problems constitute the field of rural education. Rural education is a distinctive field in much the same sense that elementary education, secondary education, kindergarten education and other fields are distinctive. To ignore this distinctiveness may result about as disastrously for rural education as it would for these other fields if the logical rationalization were carried to the extreme.

Two clearly identifiable characteristics of rural America are present aids in identifying rural education. The first is relatively low density of population. Rural people live in smaller groups and farther apart than city people. The second characteristic is that rural people are primarily engaged in farming, or extracting natural resources, or in processing resources of the immediate surroundings, or in performing services for people so engaged. This concept includes open country, farm villages and communities of people engaged in mining, lumbering, fishing, and related processing activities, and also the people engaged in personal, professional, and business services in such communities.

The traditional definition of rural as including places having fewer than 2,500 population is convenient for statistical purposes, but hardly fits the concept here presented as a basis for identifying rural education. An operational definition may and often does include places with many more than 2,500 people. Many cities especially of the South and Middle West, are primarily "farmers' trading posts." Rural education is not confined to small schools, nor merely to schools located in the open country or small villages. When rural children are transported by bus to school in town or city they do not cease to be rural. The receiving school has acquired a responsibility in rural education.

It will help in our deliberations if at the outset we clearly identify rural education in terms of two major aspects:

1. Rural education involves the development of curricula based upon the experiences, environment, and life interests and needs of the pupils involved—children and adults—and the preservice and inservice education of teachers who can develop and use such curricula. We may designate these aspects as qualitative, philosophical, and internal. They are the most important and most difficult part of our field.

2. Rural education also consists of a number of external or operational problems, the most important of which are school district reorganization, school finance, school buildings, pupil transportation, the development and operation of the intermediate unit, the provision of numerous services now known to be necessary to a comprehensive program of educational opportunities.

Some of the most poignant problems of rural education were recently summarized by Dean M. L. Cushman of the University of North Dakota and the Immediate Past President of NEA's Department of Rural Education. I quote:

"In many parts of the country semi-nomadic rural people follow the seasonal harvests of many agricultural crops, throwing sudden and heavy loads upon the educational facilities of communities where they work temporarily,

an impact comparable to that found in many "federally impacted" areas but which is not reimbursed by comparable federal, or even state funds. Four-fifths of the Nation's teacher shortage and the inadequate classroom instruction thus produced are currently borne by rural people. In many places adequately prepared, professional, administrative leadership is not available to help rural people solve their problems. Rural people also have more than their share of the Nation's school building shortage. Rural education is distinguished then by the difficulty, the uniqueness, and persistence of many administrative problems."

THE STRUCTURE OF THIS CONFERENCE

The point of view I have expressed and the aspects of rural education I have identified determine the structure of this Conference. Its four assemblies and fifteen discussion groups will deal in detail as fully as time will permit with all of the unique problems here identified and others as well.

RURAL EDUCATION STILL A MAJOR ENTERPRISE

The public schools in the rural areas of the United States affect intimately the 41.2 percent of our people who live in rural areas, about 23.6 million in farm areas, and about 38.6 million in villages not exceeding 2,500 population. They enroll about 11,898,000 pupils, or about 39.5 percent of the Nation's total. Of these pupils about 5,150,000 or 17.1 percent of the national total, live in rural areas, and about 6,748,000 or 22.4 percent, live in villages. They have about 467,000, or 47 percent of the Nation's teachers. They expend a total of about \$2.5 billion for current operations, about 39.5 percent of the national total.

In charge of the rural schools are approximately 10,250 local superintendents and supervising principals, 977 superintendents of county unit systems, and 2,362 county and other intermediate superintendents. Of the 17,000 school administrators in the United States employed with the title of superintendent, or its equivalent, fully 70 percent are rural administrators. In addition there are about 2,500 supervisors of instruction whose duties are chiefly rural.

Over 20,000 schools are served by about 130,000 buses and other vehicles for the transportation of about 8,000,000 pupils to and from school daily. The buses travel about 6,000,000 miles a day at a cost of about a quarter billion dollars annually. Over 120,000 persons are employed in the operation of this enterprise, the safest transportation system in the world.

A DECADE OF ADVANCEMENT

Ten years ago it was reported that many of the best and most of the poorest schools in the Nation are found in our rural areas, but that a comparison of rural schools as a class with urban schools as a class clearly revealed that millions of rural children were seriously handicapped in their educational opportunities. Those statements are applicable today, but to a considerably less degree. Let us examine some of the measures of advancement.

LACK OF STATISTICAL DATA ON RURAL EDUCATION

As a preface to the presentation of some of the statistical measures of improvement in the status of rural education, it is necessary to point to the dearth of statistical information of an official and comprehensive character. Not since 1942 has there been a tabulation or publication of statistics on rural schools, or rural pupils, or rural teachers, or rural school finance, or rural school buildings by the United States Office of Education. Many states make no effort to identify such data. The reasons for this situation are many and complex. Chief among them are: (1) The job is difficult and complicated, but no excuse for neglecting it; (2) The Congress and high officials in the Federal Security Agency, now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have failed to make funds and personnel available to do the job; and (3) Professional persons in advisory and official positions have naively fallen victim to the assumption that rural education is no longer a distinctive field of operations.

The situation is not likely to be changed until many people, such as those in this audience, vigorously support action to change the present situation.

CHANGES IN POPULATION DISTRIBUTION

The last decade has witnessed marked changes in population distribution. The rural farm population has declined in numbers as well as percentage wise, while the rural non-farm population has increased. Between 1940 and 1950 the rural farm population declined from about 30.2 million, or 23.0 percent of the national total, to about 23.6 million, or 15.6 percent. At the same time the rural non-farm population increased from about 27.0 million, or 20.5 percent, to about 38.6 million, or 25.6 percent.

It is quite significant that during that decade there was but small change in the total number of rural pupils enrolled in school. The change in the distribution between farm and non-farm enrollments was relatively insignificant.

The decline in farm population has been the result of increased productivity of farm workers and farm acres. Mechanization, fertilizers, better soil use and conservation, plant and animal breeding have all played their part. These changes accompanied by an expansion of the industrial economy have largely relieved the oversupply of labor in farm areas and have been good for the national economy.

The significant point that we dare not miss is that the farm population situation has probably reached the stabilization point. The farm population is not likely to become less in numbers than it now is. That fact should make it much easier to perfect our educational operations in rural areas than it has been in recent years.

We may, however, expect a continuous increase in rural non-farm population.

EXPENDITURES FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

For the first time in our history the amount of expenditures for education in rural areas, taking the Nation as a whole, compare favorably with urban expenditures. Ten years ago rural children constituted more than half the

Nation's children, but they had only 38 percent of the school money; today they are 39.5 percent of the children and have 39.5 percent of the school funds.

Ten years ago expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance were \$86 and \$124 for rural and urban pupils respectively; today the estimated expenditures are \$244 and \$246 respectively. In terms of purchasing power these latter amounts are worth \$126.70 and \$127.90 respectively.

The reasons for the improved status of rural school finance are (1) the increase in state support of schools from 31.3 percent state sources in 1942 to 37.3 percent in 1953-54, and (2) the improvement in the relative amount of income received by farm people as a result of better farm prices. In 1944 the farm people had 29.0 percent of the Nation's children of school ages and 9.3 percent of the national income; in 1950 they had 20.6 percent of the Nation's children and 10.1 percent of the national income. The ratio of children to income dropped from 3 to 1 to a ratio of 2 to 1.

RURAL TEACHERS' SALARIES

Ten years ago the average salary of rural teachers was only \$967 as compared to \$1,937 for urban teachers, about half as much. Today the average salaries are estimated to be \$3,000 and \$4,450 for rural and urban respectively, the rural being about two-thirds as much as the urban. In terms of the purchasing power of the dollar today these salaries as compared to ten years ago are worth \$1,557 and \$2,310 respectively.

EDUCATION OF RURAL TEACHERS

The qualifications of rural teachers have greatly improved during the last decade. Unfortunately, the exact data for rural and urban teachers separately are not known. It is known, however, that in 1953 about 38 percent of the rural elementary teachers had college degrees, a standard attained fifteen years earlier by urban teachers. In one-teacher schools, 23 percent had degrees compared to 10 percent fifteen years earlier; 77 percent had two years of college preparation as compared to 62 percent fifteen years previously. Of rural high school teachers, 95 percent had degrees, 20 percent Master's degrees. Approximately one-third of all rural teachers have annually been in attendance at summer school. Contrary to opinion in some quarters typical rural teachers are neither inexperienced nor superannuated. Rural elementary teachers average fourteen years of experience, rural high school teachers, eleven years. This favorable situation is all the more remarkable when it is noted that rural America has a disproportionate share of disadvantaged groups such as low-income farmers, Negroes, Spanish Americans, Indians, and workers in rural industrial slums.

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF RURAL YOUTH

High school education has not become universal among rural farm youth. Only 80.0 percent of the rural farm youth 14 to 17 years of age are in school as compared to 87.6 percent for urban youth and 87.0 percent for village youth. That the situation has been greatly improving is shown by the fact that for the sixteen and seventeen year-old group in 1940 only 56.8 percent of the farm

youth were in school as compared to 75.6 percent of urban youth of the same ages.

In 1953 the comparable figures were 68.4 percent and 76.5 percent respectively, an improvement of about 20 percent in the status of farm youth. Although the differences among the lowest and highest states in the percentage of farm youth sixteen and seventeen years old attending school is less than it used to be, it is still too great for complacency. In 1950 the percentages of rural farm youth enrolled in school in Kentucky was only 54.0 percent for those 16 years old and 39.2 percent for those seventeen years old. In Utah the comparable percentages are 93.2 percent and 86.9 percent respectively.

SMALL SCHOOLS IN RURAL AREAS

To a large extent rural schools are small institutions, and the community and neighborhood structure of America being what it is, it can be expected that most of them will be relatively small in the future. Proper teaching in small schools, the expansion of their instructional offering, and their administration is one of the most highly specialized jobs in education. Teacher education institutions have a responsibility for equipping teachers and administrators for these schools far beyond what most of them are now trying to do.

The long-time trend in the reduction of the number of one-teacher schools has moved steadily along. Ten years ago there were 108,000 one-teacher schools; today there are about 45,000. Nobody knows how many two-teacher and three-teacher schools there are, but there are probably about as many as there are one-teacher schools.

Rural high schools are still relatively small institutions. The small ones are remarkably tenacious and their numbers seem to be highly stable. Of the approximately 24,700 high schools of all types the median size is about 140 pupils. About two-thirds of the high schools have fewer than 200 pupils. In fact over one-third have fewer than 100 pupils. Practically all such high schools are rural, being an estimated 17,000 in number.

One of the most urgent problems in public education in the years ahead is further study of the small high school, the devising of means of expanding their curricular offerings, the addition and expansion of services needed by them through cooperative arrangements and through the intermediate unit, and the promotion of fundamental reorganization and consolidation in keeping with adequate standards of community integrity and of educational efficiency.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF RURAL PEOPLE

The level of educational attainment of rural people in America has improved during the last decade. In 1940 only 31 percent of the rural adult population 25 years of age and over had gone to school beyond the eighth grade; in 1950 nearly 40 percent had done so. In 1940 only 10.3 percent of rural adults had had four years of high school education; in 1950 there were 15.3 percent with that amount of schooling. In 1950 the percentage of rural adults who were college graduates was more than a third greater than in 1940. However, there

is still much to be desired, since the number of rural functional illiterates (persons with less than a fourth-grade schooling) is well over twice as great as the number of college graduates.

DISADVANTAGED RURAL GROUPS

Educational opportunities for several million rural Americans are still below tolerable standards. Who these disadvantaged Americans are and where they live is well known. They are the low-income people in agriculture, especially the migratory agricultural workers, many of the rural non-farm people engaged in farming and manufacturing, many Negroes, Indians, Spanish Americans, and other foreign-language groups. No part of the Nation has a monopoly on the disadvantaged population. They are found in every part of the country.

The disadvantages consist of low income; lack of ownership of property; exclusion from legal benefits of social legislation; effective (if not legal) disfranchisement; segregation; discriminations in facilities, opportunities, jobs, and public services; poor health; poor housing; limited occupational opportunities; lack of public services such as those given by farm agents, home demonstration agents, and 4-H Club leaders; lack of health services, libraries, recreational facilities; and a woeful lack of educational opportunities.

There are many parts to the solution of the problems of these minorities—minorities in privileges not mere numbers. Some of the solutions are matters of legislation and public policy; others are matters of attitude and a sense of fair play on the part of the majorities. Fundamentally, all solutions depend upon equally available educational opportunities consisting of education that faces life situations and needs of the disadvantaged people as well as the needs of society for their cooperation and services.

That progress has been made in meeting the educational needs of many of the disadvantaged people is evidenced in several important respects.

1. Most of the states have increased the financial support of education and increased the degree of equalization.
2. There is considerable evidence that the enforcement, or better, the supervision of compulsory school attendance has been made increasingly effective.
3. The Fair Labor Standards Act of the United States Government has been amended to forbid the employment of children of compulsory school ages in commercial agriculture during school hours.
4. Several states, notably, California, New York, New Jersey, and Michigan have made excellent progress in getting the children of migratory agricultural workers in school and improving the quality of their education. Recently, Palm Beach County, Florida, and Northampton County, Virginia, have begun encouraging programs of supervision and teacher-community cooperation in the education of migrants.
5. Cooperative community efforts at educational improvement in Harlan County, Kentucky, and Green Sea in Horry County, South Carolina, are indicative of efforts that should be made in many communities. The story of these

projects has been published in two volumes by the Alliance for the Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department of Rural Education, NEA, under the titles, *Guidance in a Rural Community*, (\$2 a copy) and *Guidance in a Rural Industrial Community*, (cloth, \$4 a copy, paper, \$3 a copy.)

6. Great strides have been made in the improvement of educational opportunities for Negroes. The efforts of some of the states, notably North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Virginia, and Louisiana to construct new buildings for Negro pupils and to equalize teachers salaries have been almost phenomenal.

I suppose that many people think I should make an evaluative statement of the recent Supreme Court decision relative to segregation. As I see it, nobody could now make such an evaluation. That will have to come a few years later. We certainly face new obligations imposed by the "law of the land." The obligations are imposed by Federal authority. A major, if not the major, question before us ought to be whether the Congress of the United States is going to make it financially possible to carry out the obligations imposed. It seems to me that Congress ought to be willing to pay the financial burden of making effective the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court—and that includes educational obligations imposed.

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

School district reorganization has long been a major concern in American education. Horace Mann was talking about it 117 years ago. It was one of the principal subjects of discussion at the White House Conference ten years ago.

But much has happened in recent years. As a result of reorganization, the number of school districts in the United States has been remarkably reduced: from 127,529 in 1932, to 98,132 in 1948, to 66,472 in 1953. This reduction is almost half in 21 years, the rate having been greatly accelerated the past six years. Seven states alone—Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa, Kansas, and South Dakota—account for half of the current total number of school districts. In contrast seven states—Illinois, New York, Texas, Kansas, Missouri, Mississippi and Arkansas—account for 63 percent of the reduction in the number of school districts since 1932.

The number of school districts is really less than it seems. In 1953, only 55,335 actually operated schools. The other 11,137 districts either had no pupils or sent their pupils to neighboring districts.

Most school districts continue to be relatively small. Last year about 30 percent of all operating districts employed nine or fewer teachers. The trend, however, is reflected in the fact that in 1947 almost twice as many operating districts had nine or fewer teachers. In this six-year period over 37,000 small school districts were abolished. Relatively large districts, however, are still the exception. In 1953 only 6.5 percent of all operating school districts employed 40 or more teachers.

The trend in school district reorganization is reflected by the fact that in 1952-53 a total of 1,088 reorganized school districts were proposed. Of that

number 995 were adopted and only 93 defeated. The usual method of action was by popular vote of the local people affected. What can be expected in the future? I think that within the next two decades the number of basic school districts will be about 10,200. In addition there will be about 2,100 intermediate districts maintained as service units for community school systems.

The chief problem in the future of reorganization is probably the making of necessary adjustments between the demands of protecting and conserving the integrity of genuine communities and putting into operation the well-established standards of educational adequacy.

NEED FOR AN INTERMEDIATE UNIT OF SCHOOL SERVICES

Most of the Nation is fully committed to the community unit of school district organization. Such units have many virtues and some limitations. The chief obstacle they face is that many of them are too small to afford a comprehensive educational program and necessary services, and there is hardly any probability that they are in the foreseeable future going to become large enough.

Several states have undergone extensive school district reorganization mostly according to the community unit plan. In not a single instance do more than 25 percent of the new districts have 40 or more teachers, the minimum size through which a minimum acceptable program can be expected.

Since school districts are for the most part not going to be large enough alone to do the job required of them, they obviously are going to need services from some larger unit and they are going to have to work cooperatively with their neighboring community units. The available instrumentality for meeting the needs arising from this situation is the intermediate unit. In a majority of states the county is the most logical unit for that purpose although there are instances in which counties will need to be combined for that specific purpose.

The intermediate unit of school service is the least understood concept in the field of school administration. It is an organization within the legally established structure of school administration which includes the territory of two or more basic administrative units. It serves as the intermediary between the state department of education and the quasi corporate units having immediate responsibility for maintaining schools. It may have a board or officer, or both, responsible for performing stipulated services for the basic administrative units and for exerting leadership in their fiscal, administrative, and educational functions. Through leadership and services the intermediate unit promotes and strengthens local control and responsibility. It assists local districts and the state education department in finding and meeting more effectively the educational needs of children and communities by performing functions which can best be administered by an intermediate type of organization.

The idea that where school districts are reorganized there is no longer a need for the county superintendent as head of an intermediate unit is a very mistaken one. The statement is frequently heard that the county superintendents are consolidating themselves out of a job. The truth is, that if educational leaders will envision the scope of the educational program really needed, reorganization of school districts alters but enhances the job of the county superintendent.

There has been progress in the development of the intermediate unit. Since 1947, Iowa and Michigan have established county boards of education with power to select county superintendents of schools on a professional basis and have made provision for furnishing needed services to constituent school districts. Other states that now have the necessary structure for development are Arkansas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, the New England States, and New York. The problem ahead is the development of program. The pace in program development has been best set in California.

A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND SERVICES

There is one simple reason for the reluctance of many citizens to reform the traditional patterns of educational organization, namely, the lack of understanding of what is included in a complete and adequate educational program. The specifications of an educational program originate and become meaningful in relation to the educational needs of pupils and the community served by the school. The specifics in a program should and do vary according to circumstances in the community involved.

Recognizing this fundamental premise and without spelling out the details, it is desirable to present in broad outline the specifications of a comprehensive program as follows:

The first essential is elementary education designed for children from kindergarten age at least through the sixth grade. The program should include as a minimum offering instruction and activities in the fundamental skills, the communicative arts and skills, studies and activities that make for successful living together, knowledge of the material and natural environment, manual skills, citizenship, and understanding, appreciation, enjoyment, and some skill in music, literature, dramatics, painting, drawing, modeling, designing and other activities intended to enrich and beautify life.

A comprehensive program of secondary education should include as a minimum the program for grades 7 to 12. The time is rapidly approaching when the scope of secondary education may include grades 13 and 14. The particular plan of organization does not seem to be important. The program through grade 12 should certainly provide the following opportunities *as a minimum*: A general program to continue education in the knowledges and skills needed by all members of society; a college entrance curriculum to provide for those who should pursue higher education in the liberal arts and the professions; vocational education for those who expect to take additional training for semi-professional and skilled occupations, for those who do not go beyond the secondary school in their formal education, and for those who drop out before completing high school. Vocational educational opportunities should include instruction in agriculture, business, homemaking, and industry.

Still other programs, facilities, and services are needed before a comprehensive program of educational opportunities is made fully available. Among them are the following:

1. A school community program which includes adult education, school and community library services, school and community recreational facilities, summer activities that include athletics, dramatics, music festivals, classes in art, music, drama, industrial arts, handicrafts, and non-commercialized entertainment.

2. Services focused on the needs of pupils, including supervision of attendance, specialized guidance and counseling services, psychological and psychiatric services, health services, library services and materials bureau, special teachers in such areas as art, music, and manual arts and crafts, and special services and instruction for exceptional children, who, excluding the hard-of-hearing, constitute about 10 to 12 percent of the school population.

3. Services that help teachers, including supervision of instruction, inservice education, professional library facilities, curricular services, and instructional and audio-visual materials and aids.

4. Services of an administrative nature, including personnel work, business services, school plant operation and maintenance, pupil transportation, operation and maintenance; research related to pupils, teachers, community needs, and financial and administrative affairs, evaluation of educational programs, and coordination of educational programs of related communities.

THE TEACHER SITUATION

Ten years ago the shortage of teachers was referred to as a crisis. Now we can say that the crisis has become chronic. There are about 70,000 teachers teaching on emergency or sub-standard certificates. About two-thirds of those teachers are in rural schools, a disproportionate number when compared to the fact that only 47 percent of the teachers employed are rural.

When the need for additional teachers is calculated on the basis of the numbers necessary to replace those who die or retire, to relieve over-crowded classes, to replace sub-standard teachers, and to take care of increasing enrollment, it is found that 185,000 additional teachers are required. To supply that need only 85,000 qualified teachers are being graduated annually from all our colleges and universities.

How to supply these deficits is of necessity a major problem of rural education. The answer would seem to be found in concentrating on where the problem is rather than using shotgun methods as most of the research in this field now seems to do. The first thing to do is to improve salaries, tenure, and other employment conditions of rural teachers. The next important thing is to induce teacher education institutions to pay proper attention to equipping teachers to cope successfully with the complicated problems of teaching in small schools and communities. The other important thing is to make needed services available through development of the intermediate unit.

THE SCHOOL BUILDING SHORTAGE

That there is a school building shortage is a well established fact. The government has already spent some \$3,000,000 dollars to find out that there is a current deficit of 341,000 classrooms and that at the present rate of construction the deficit in 1960 will be 757,000 classrooms.

The primary need at this time is for new school buildings to make the fruits of school district reorganization possible. It is an established fact that there is a deficit of nearly \$5,000,000,000 in the available funds for school building construction. A very large share of this deficit is in school districts that accommodate pupils living in rural areas.

A TIME FOR ACTION

Obviously what has been said is intended to stimulate the understanding of the task of rural education and an acceptance of the responsibility to do something about it.

The American people had better lose no time in perfecting the practice of their ideal of equality of educational opportunity. We are too small a part of the world and in too great a struggle against the enemies of our way of life to fritter away any of our human resources. We have no manpower to sacrifice to ignorance, physical underdevelopment, poor health, undernourishment, and civic incompetence. Education is the bulwark of our free republic and our democratic conception of human dignity and relationships.

American educators are in no petty business. The quality of their performance may well determine the Nation's destiny. In the decade ahead may our performances more nearly equal our professions!

FORCES CONFRONTING RURAL EDUCATION IN BUILDING A BETTER WORLD

JOHN H. DAVIS

Director, Moffett Program in Agriculture and Business

Harvard University

I am happy to be here on this occasion, both because of my deep interest in the welfare of rural people and because as a young man I spent several interesting years as an "Ag. teacher" and a superintendent of schools.

Even though I have continued to be interested in rural education, I do not come before you as a rural educator—nor would I feel qualified to do so. Instead, my role more nearly resembles that of a reconnaissance officer pointing out to you some of the general characteristics of the "terrain of the future" before you embark on the examination of specific problems relating to rural education.

As one scans the agricultural future he sees a host of problems. There is the whole complex of issues relating to farm price support programs; the squeeze between farm cost and income; the dilemma of the small family farmer who lacks sufficient resources to make a respectable living; the shift in population from farm to city; the competition for markets on the international front; the impact of synthetic fibers in competition with wool and cotton; the wasteful use of our land and water resources; and many others.

However, as one observes the future of agriculture more closely, he notes that it really is not static but changing. It is more like a huge molten mass than solid matter. In it are various areas of turmoil, some of them moving parallel to one another and others in counter or oblique directions.

The most outstanding fact about the future of agriculture is this element of change, which is being powered by the continuing discoveries of science and the applications of technology. In no single important phase of agriculture has the ultimate of progress been achieved or even approached. The developments of the past are but stepping stones to further change. The unexplored horizons of technology look more vast today than they did twenty-five, ten or even five years ago. This is true whether one considers plant and animal breeding, cultural practices, land and water conservation, equipment design, disease control, plant nutrition and fertilization, communication and transportation, the various phases of marketing and market development or the field of agricultural economics and farm management. In all probability the future of agriculture will be even more characterized by change than has the past.

Of course, this element of change will in no way be limited to agriculture. It will characterize our whole economy. Basically, this is necessary if America is to continue to be strong, if our economy is resilient and dynamic, and if we are to create new jobs for our growing population and at the same time continue gradually to improve our over-all standard of living.

Nor is this climate of change unique just to the United States. It encompasses the world. The potential for change often is even greater in a country whose people are yet uneducated and whose resources are undeveloped. The existence of both developed and underdeveloped areas in the same world is itself a further force tending to accelerate the rate of change in the future.

Now, what kind of a rural society do we really want? Do we want to continue the general trends which are now in motion? I shall state categorically some general propositions for you to consider—propositions with which you may or may not agree.

1. On the national front, we want an agriculture which is a part of a dynamic, growing economy—one that is capable not only of providing employment for our increasing population, but also of engendering a continually improving standard of living for our people.
2. We want an agriculture which is in step with the tempo of such a total economy—one which provides opportunity for farm people to earn and enjoy a standard of living consistent with that of other segments of the economy. We do not want our farmers to become substandard citizens in comparison with the rest of the country.
3. This means that the process of developing farm policies and programs must be geared to change—it must be an evolutionary process which is consistent with the progress of the Nation as a whole.
4. We want to find ways of utilizing our agricultural productive capacity in the implementation of better health and living standards for our

people—relying upon production controls only to the minimum extent necessary, if at all.

5. We want incentives for the use of land and water resources in such manner as will meet current needs without destroying the basic value of such resources for posterity.
6. We want gradually to shift more of the responsibility for basic economic stability in agriculture from government to farmers, processors, and the distribution trade. To do so will require the development of a more adequate marketing system, commodity by commodity—one which has inherent within itself the essentials for orderly marketing and basic price stability. This shift of reliance from government to private interests should be gradual, taking place as warranted by improvements in the marketing system.
7. We want to encourage that ratio between rural and urban population which is in the best interest of our national society. In all probability this means a continuing gradual migration from farm to city. This places upon rural education a responsibility not only to prepare young persons who want to farm to be good farmers, but also to train for urban employment those boys and girls who desire to leave the farm.
8. We want to preserve within our rural society the wholesome moral, social, cultural, and political attributes which have characterized the family type farm in the past. This can best be done by concentrating on the retention of these attributes as a part of our rural society as the family farm adjusts to inevitable change.
9. When an important adjustment is desirable or inevitable with respect to population, production pattern, farm methods, or the like, it is better that it take place promptly and orderly rather than that it be blocked. Therefore, all government programs or aids for agriculture should be designed, in terms of incentives, towards the implementation of such adjustments. This should apply to efforts such as research, extension education, conservation, and credit as well as to price support programs.
10. To maintain a dynamic and growing economy at home, it is essential that we be a part of a world economy of the same type. In a sense, the situation might be likened to the weather. The developed regions are high-pressure areas in terms of know-how, productivity, wealth, and living standards. In general, they also tend to be relatively calm weather areas economically, socially, and politically. In contrast, the underdeveloped areas tend to be low-pressure regions in terms of know-how, productivity, wealth, and living standards. Also, they tend to be areas of unrest, instability, and even revolution.

The history of the last fifty years would seem to indicate that high-pressure areas, in terms of technological development, cannot be isolated from the low-pressure areas, which are underdeveloped. The mighty forces which have been developed by science and technology know no national boundaries. Nor does

any nationality or race have a monopoly on the ability to comprehend and use science and technology. Underdeveloped countries have a desire to share in the progress which science and technology have made possible. This desire is increasing along with the accelerated communication and transportation which characterizes our era.

Now a word as to how progress can best be made with respect to general farm policy. *Today our rural society is so complicated and intricate that no one person or organization can possess the competence to deal with all phases of it.* Almost no problem in agriculture today is so simple that it is exclusively the interest and concern of one rural institution or organization. This being true, *the only way to obtain the competence needed to solve a problem is to bring together selected individuals whose composite know-how covers all essential phases of rural life.* Working together, such persons can find satisfactory answers to complicated rural issues, including the problems of rural education.

With respect to many of the problems in agriculture, the best solution often is obscure—it must be searched for and developed. To a large extent this obscurity, itself, is a by-product of the rate of change in our rural society. Under such conditions the search for truth has to be a continuing process. Education has a responsibility—a great responsibility—to search for the truth and to disseminate it when it is known.

In many situations today not only is the truth obscure, but also rural people must choose between alternative courses which are open to them. This means that there is a judgment to be exercised—a decision to be made. With respect to basic farm policy, education should develop true facts and disseminate them—leaving the task of choosing a solution to the farm leaders, government officials, legislators, and the electorate. In no event should education become deeply involved in partisan politics over farm issues. To do so would reduce the ability of education to play its vital role of developing and disseminating truth, without color or bias.

The task confronting education is not just one of trying to meet the educational needs which exist today. Rather, it is one of developing an educational program which itself is geared to change—one which not only will meet the needs of today, but also of tomorrow, next year and ten, twenty, and even fifty years from now.

Education, along with the home, church, and other institutions must assume a heavy responsibility with respect to the use to which new discoveries and techniques will be put. While research and technology are powerful tools in the hands of men, of themselves they possess no sense of moral direction. They contain no inherent qualities to assure us that the changes they initiate will result in the evolution of a better world. A new discovery or machine may as readily be used to promote the ends of Communism, Nazism, or Fascism as to further the cause of Democracy. They may be used as readily for war as peace. They can be used to subject masses of people to enforced slavery as well as to raise their standard of living. Man, himself, must supply the social, moral, and spiritual values which determine the way in which the fruits of technology will be used.

The responsibilities of education are further increased by the fact that improvements in the educational system must take place "on the march." There is no such thing as stopping the motors of rural society until alterations can be made. Changes must take place while society is in motion. Also, the fact that we are forced to adapt our educational programs to a future which is different from the past means that we can never fully rely upon past experience as our guide. We constantly must be projecting our plans to make them fit a future which not only will be different, but, in many respects will be unpredictable.

In a constantly changing world rural people must continue the learning process throughout their lives. This means that we cannot think of rural education as just something for young people while they are attending school. Today's student must not only be prepared to meet today's problems, but also the more complex problems of tomorrow. This requires a continuation of his education while he is on the job. It requires education for adults as well as youth.

We must think of rural education as encompassing not only that learning which takes place in schools and colleges, but also as including the whole learning process in the rural community. A careful look at rural institutions will reveal that all of them perform educational functions of one type or another. Certainly the home and the church are important centers of learning. Actually, the same is true of the other institutions in varying degree. The boy or girl who takes a summer job in a local business firm may learn facts which no school would ever teach them; the farm organization informs its members by means of its hoase organ, circulars, meetings, youth programs, etc.; the theater adds its bit to the total stock of knowledge of the individual it serves, and so on.

The educational function of these other institutions encroaches in no serious way upon the role of formal education. The total field of learning is so vast in comparison with existing educational facilities that our concern should be over what is being left undone rather than over who should do it. Where harmony exists, the educational activities of the other groups actually increases the job to be done by the schools by whetting people's appetite for knowledge. In addition, where proper teamwork exists, the other organizations engaged in education will place increased responsibility on the schools by requesting help in research and in the planning of their programs. The rural school should be the center not only of formal instruction, but also of educational services for the whole community.

Institutional education must not be viewed as an isolated phase of our rural society—but as an integral part thereof. Its role is a complementary one to that of farm organizations, businesses, churches, youth groups, government, etc. Together they all function to serve the needs of rural people. All such institutions must move forward together, each in its own way.

I am not suggesting that education should be united with or formally integrated with the other institutions of the community. Nor am I implying that education should be dominated or controlled by them. In general, it is best that each retain its identity and autonomy. However, it is essential that each institution recognize that it is only a phase of the total rural community and that it

must work with the others if sound progress is to be made. By working together rural institutions can produce a total result which is greater than the sum of the work each was performing before.

Those who have planned this National Conference have evidenced a recognition of the need for teamwork by inviting farm leaders, church leaders, and others to meet with you. I commend you for this. Such teamwork needs to be expanded not only on the national level, but also at the local levels for the purpose of discussing general objectives, the role each is equipped to play in their attainment, and how all groups can work in harmony toward a common end. The development of the actual method by which each participant will perform its role should be left to the respective organizations to decide for themselves. In this way we avoid the conflict which would arise if educators tried to tell farm organizations how to run their business or vice versa.

Now, let us, briefly, examine the task of schools and colleges. Since we cannot anticipate the specific conditions under which the young people of today will live five, ten, or twenty years from now, we cannot prepare them for a known environment. Instead, we must develop within them the qualities of character, the skills, and the resiliency to change which will fit them for whatever conditions may confront them.

Most important of all, we will need rural leaders—men and women who can take their places in rural society—outstanding farmers, school executives, college teachers, businessmen, farm organization heads, and government officials.

This in turn calls for more adequate rural education. It calls for more educational facilities, bigger budgets, better administration, and expanded curricula. Most of all it calls for better teachers—teachers who themselves are equipped to live in a world of change, who can see positive opportunities in new situations, and who can inspire capable young men and women to dedicate their lives to the building of a better world.

The role of rural educators should be one of leadership, first in informing others of your problems and then asking responsible representatives of interested groups to join with you in working out a sound program and carrying it into effect. You must approach the task by sitting down together as equals around the conference table to work out a program. Certainly, educators should not attempt to work out their own answer and then call the other interested parties in and try to sell it to them. If you do, my prediction is that you will fail.

Rural education is a vital phase of our whole society. It affects every person and every group. Educators, approaching the problem from one viewpoint, cannot see all aspects of the total picture. The same thing is true with respect to other interests—they, too, see the problem from a restricted viewpoint. Therefore, if any single interest tries to map out a program alone, it is apt to be inadequate.

On the other hand, if all interests come together around the conference table to work out a common solution which is in the best interest of everybody, the end product should be not only better, but more salable. In fact, important groups will already believe in it because they helped formulate it.

THE NATION'S STAKE IN SOLVING THE
TEACHER SHORTAGE CRISIS

VERNON L. HEATH

Vice President, Illinois Chamber of Commerce

It is a privilege and a pleasure for me to discuss with you the Nation's most critical educational problem—an adequate supply of competent teachers. As a layman who has devoted a great deal of thought and energy to the problem of recruiting capable young people for a career of teaching, I am convinced that the ultimate solution will depend largely on how sympathetically and how effectively both lay and professional people can join in a partnership to save and preserve the most cherished institution of our democracy—our schools.

The crisis facing the rural schools of the Nation is of special significance and importance and will require more than an Herculean effort to solve. Approximately one-half of the children of school age, or nearly 15 million, live in the open country or in centers of less than 2,500 population. Of that number more than 7.7 million live on farms.

More than one-half of the Nation's teachers are in rural schools. To meet the demand in the years ahead, it is estimated that as many as 125,000 additional elementary teachers must be recruited, not to mention the many thousands more who will be needed if we are to bring about a 30 to 1 pupil-teacher ratio in the rural classrooms of the Nation. While exact statistical information on the teacher shortage has not been completed, indications are that approximately 80 percent of the Nation's total teacher shortage is in the schools serving rural people.

The "Little Red Schoolhouse" makes a pretty picture in rhyme and prose, but how many of us realize that this little symbol of rural life in many instances is much the same today as it was 50 years ago. Fresh air, light, heat, water, and sanitation facilities are about the most inexpensive items on the face of the earth, but many schools in rural areas still use obsolete wood burning stoves with poor outside ventilation, the center incandescent light fixture, outside sanitation facilities, and desks and equipment that no longer meet the needs of the modern educational world. Under the circumstances, how can we hope that today's young graduate just out of college will choose this rather unattractive and unprogressive surrounding to launch a career of rural teaching?

We frequently hear citizens in both rural and urban areas defend the inadequacies of their educational system by saying that what was good enough for them is good enough for their children. By and large this is not the actual case with these individuals, nor does it represent their true feeling on the matter. Take a look at the farms and the homes surrounding many of our rural schools. The old horse-drawn plow practically has disappeared. In the "good old days" it required as many as 35 man-hours to produce and harvest an acre of corn. Today on many mechanized farms, with modern tractors, corn pickers, and other labor-saving devices, it is accomplished with fewer than 11 man-hours. In

addition, we find that the shift from animal power to machine power has released about 72 million acres of crop land from producing feed for horses and mules to producing food for the Nation's tables. In the last 50 years or so, while this country's population was growing from 75 million to more than 160 million, a great change has taken place in agriculture. Today 8,000,000 fewer persons on America's farms are producing food for 85,000,000 more Americans.

An educated people played a vital role in this story of rural progress and industrial achievement. Unfortunately, education in many rural sections of the Nation has not kept pace with this phenomenal advancement. Weak nations of the world are weak from a social and economic point of view because of a lack of emphasis placed on education. They are also weak because they have not developed through education the ingenuity and the scientific skill that have made our own Nation so great and so resourceful. We show more concern over the dangers of soil erosion than we do over the human erosion that threatens us in many areas through the neglect of the education of our rural youth.

Our pleasures and our happiness in acquiring the modern conveniences on the farm and in the home for the most part are purely personal, and it is not easy for some to show much concern for needed improvements that do not affect them directly or that do not involve their own everyday employment. Many individuals are perfectly satisfied with the rural school in the community, no matter how inadequate it may be, because it embodies a certain amount of atmosphere and tradition carried over from the distant past. The horse-drawn plow also has a certain amount of atmosphere but in this case we are glad to sacrifice tradition for comfort and convenience. Our desire for better schools and better working conditions for our teachers must be something more pronounced than mere lip service. It must be so strong that we will be more than willing to pay the cost that a good system of public education demands. Many citizens want a high-priced system of education but they want to purchase it at bargain-counter rates.

Figures on our national income reveal rather convincingly that we pay more for liquor and tobacco in this country than we do for education. The reason that we do not show more concern about this situation is that we as individuals pay for liquor and cigarettes by the pint and by the pack and this pay-as-you-go principle is less exacting and far less painful. On the other hand, our bill for education usually comes to us from the tax collector once a year. I am sure that if we were billed for these other two items on the same basis at the end of the year there would be far greater concern over the high cost of living and our tax bill for education would look small indeed in comparison in a large number of households across the land.

With school enrollments at an all time high and continuing to rise at a rate of more than a million children each year, the Nation's schools have now reached flood-stage. Time will tell whether the dams and levees that we have erected during the past half century will withstand the torrential waves of children that are descending on our educational fortress. I am sorry to say that there are hundreds of thousands of people in the lowlands who do not sense

impending danger, and it will take a catastrophe of gigantic proportions to move them to action. At this stage we can use many Paul Reveres who will stand ready and willing to ride up and down the countryside to shout warnings and to call all good citizens to the aid of their schools.

At a time when the problem of the teacher shortage, both in the rural and urban areas, requires the cooperative action and thinking of all citizens for its solution, I am quite concerned by the many unwarranted attacks that are being made on our schools and on education in general. Many writers in national publications, in an effort to point out the weaknesses of our educational system, invariably single out a few disgruntled citizens in every community to make the indictments and to pass sentence on the schools. Seldom do they go to any of the many thousands of well-satisfied citizens who are happy with and proud of their schools to obtain the true story of the real progress that has been made in American education. Our schools need more praise and less criticism. We never will be able to solve any of the major problems of education until communities and individuals are willing to remove the pressures that they are exerting on the schools and lend a helping hand to the cause of better education.

Good public relations by both teachers and administrators are imperative if we are to maintain good school programs and adequate financial support. Unfortunately, educators have not been able successfully to tell us laymen in realistic terms what damage results to a child's mind when there is poor instruction in the school or when an incompetent teacher is in the classroom, or for that matter, what penalties we must pay if these problems are not solved. The critical period in the child's life, I am told, is in the first, fourth, and seventh grades. Poor instruction at these stages of mental development can warp many young minds and often results in hostility in the child's mind to the whole process of learning. Until the consequences of the critical shortage of teachers can be explained to the public in this fashion, I am afraid that our citizens will not be impressed entirely by a mere statement of facts or the threat of a few closed classrooms.

I believe wholeheartedly that it is the public's responsibility to see that our schools are staffed by an adequate number of competent teachers—that this is a major problem the schools alone cannot solve. This is the philosophy we adopted in Illinois when the State Chamber of Commerce six years ago enlisted the services of more than 90 businessmen throughout the state to tackle the problem of the teacher shortage. In our program we have created a good feeling in Illinois toward education, even though it required several months to convince our school people and others that our businessmen actually were interested. I am sure that if we have done nothing else we have given new hope and encouragement to those who are struggling with this immense problem.

In Illinois we have directed our attention to the general problem without concentrating our efforts in any given field. The rural teacher shortage may not be as acute in our own state due to the fact that through a program of reorganization and consolidation our school districts have been reduced from a total of 12,000 in 1947 to less than 2,800 as of today. However, this program of reorganization of school districts in most states has not decreased the demand for rural teachers,

nor has it altered the need for specifically trained or fully qualified rural teachers.

I wish to discuss briefly the major activities that we have carried on in Illinois as laymen to recruit high school and college students for the teaching profession in the hope that these measures may suggest a basis for any program you might wish to develop in your own states to recruit young people specifically for rural teaching.

There are ten steps that should be undertaken to insure a successful program of teacher recruitment, with any emphasis you feel is necessary to solve the shortage in rural areas.

1. *First, obtain the cooperation of the State Department of Education by requesting the appointment of an assistant superintendent or commissioner as co-ordinator to head up the recruitment program.* If the task is beyond the capacity of one individual, ask for the appointment of an assistant to head up recruiting teachers for rural areas. In Illinois this individual has done an excellent job in working with the high schools and colleges and in enlisting the help of both lay and professional groups.
2. *Try to identify as clearly as possible the students in each high school who are, or might be, interested in a teaching career, and designate especially those who are interested in the field of rural education.* In Illinois we obtained the names and addresses of every high school senior in the state and each year for the past three years we have mailed to the homes of these students a total of 140,000 brochures, entitled "Facts You Should Know If You Want To Be A Teacher."

We asked all students who were interested in teacher education to return to us a reply card indicating their interest and designating the college in which they planned to enroll. We received an average of 3,000 cards per year from these students. These cards were turned over to the various colleges, suggesting that the colleges follow up the contact and make the arrangements for the student to enter school.

3. *Publicize as widely as possible the need for new teachers and the opportunities open to high school students in teaching.* Direct a large share of this publicity to the need for more rural teachers. Use a positive approach, pointing out the many satisfactions and advantages that come from experiences in the teaching field. In Illinois, in a two-year period, our State Chamber distributed more than 40,000 posters which were placed on high school and college bulletin boards. Do not overlook the potential advertising value of the thousands of school buses which travel the country roads each day picking up children in rural areas. These buses are rather unattractive and colorless inside and posters placed in them might spark considerable interest in rural education.
4. *Enlist the services of all PTA business and lay groups as well as all farm and rural organizations to help with the problem.* Impress upon the public mind the critical nature of the teacher shortage and the danger of lowering our educational standards if a proper solution is not found. In Illinois we distributed more than 15,000 folders to lay groups, entitled "Facts About Teacher Shortage," urging every community to study its own problems to see if community action could be inaugurated to correct conditions that are not conducive to good teaching.

5. *Urge the legislature, the farm bureau, the grange, the agricultural associations, women's clubs, service clubs, PTA's home bureau units, and other lay and professional groups to provide scholarships in teacher education.* The Illinois Congress of PTA's is awarding several district scholarships each year to deserving students who plan to enroll in teacher education, involving a total outlay in nine years of \$286,000.

In my home community, a small town of 6,400 population, we have sent 11 students to teacher colleges in the last few years on scholarships provided by the local Chamber of Commerce and Moose Lodge. We feel that the greatest reservoir of future teachers is not to be found in the 28 percent of the high school students who go to college, but in the 72 percent who have to remain at home because they can't attend for financial reasons. I am sure many scholarships could be obtained from rural and farm organizations if a special appeal were directed to these groups.

6. *Call a state-wide conference on teacher recruitment, inviting to the meeting representatives of all professional and lay organizations, and representatives of the various farm and home bureau units.* Through panel discussions on effective methods of recruiting future teachers and other action programs, try to encourage local groups to work with the high school and elementary schools in setting up a program at the community level. In Illinois, last December, the State Chamber sponsored a similar meeting at the state capital, which was addressed by the governor and which was attended by 240 businessmen and school administrators. Follow your state-wide conference with several regional conferences, with one or two meetings devoted entirely to rural education.
7. *Publicize the need for better salaries within your state and call the public's attention to the low salaries that exist in many communities, especially those in communities of less than 2,500 population.* Recently our State Chamber completed a salary survey of 208 Illinois cities as well as selected cities from 42 other states. We published an attractive brochure showing the salary schedules that prevail, by population areas, in various communities. This gave every community an opportunity to compare its teacher salaries with those of other cities of similar size. We hope the distribution of 16,000 of these brochures to business men and other groups will spur every community to greater effort in raising teacher salaries to proper levels.
8. *Encourage the organization of citizens' advisory committees, or education committees, in every community and in every rural area of your state.* The usefulness of these organizations is many-fold and the opportunities for accomplishment are unlimited. These citizens' committees should see that suitable living quarters are found for teachers, that the good work individual teachers are doing within the community is properly recognized, and that school buildings and facilities are up-to-date and adequate to meet the needs of the community in a time of greatly expanded enrollments. All farm and rural organizations, both state-wide and nation-wide in scope, should set up education departments within their own organizations to give whatever assistance they can to solving the teacher shortage problem.
9. *Encourage your school administrators, the AAUW and the professional education fraternities to sponsor Future Teachers of America clubs in*

each high school. Ask these organizations to work with and encourage the students who have shown an interest in a teaching career. Urge the formation of a cadet training program in the high school. We believe the most effective way to retain the interest of students in teaching is to assign them to special classroom and playground work in the elementary schools.

10. *Finally, there can be no effective recruitment program at any level unless the teaching profession joins in the program and willingly stands up to be counted in the great crusade that is before us. Every individual teacher in America must be willing to recommend his profession to his own students, otherwise the work of lay groups and local citizen groups will be to no avail. The failure of many schools to assume leadership and initiative in this crisis is the most serious problem that faces us in our attempts to recruit capable young people for the profession.*

That briefly is our program of action in Illinois and I believe the same principles can be adopted in every state. What have been the results of this effort? In 1949 approximately 950 elementary teachers were graduated from the teacher training institutions, in 1950 the figure increased to 1,200, in 1951 it was 1,500, in 1952 there was 1,900 graduates in elementary education and about the same number were graduated last year. In the fall of 1952, the 46 colleges in our state, both state-supported and private, reported an increase of 21.7 percent in the number of freshmen enrolled in teacher education. In 1953 the same institutions reported an increase of 17.1 percent in freshmen enrollments. This fall several of these institutions have reported as high as a 50 percent increase in the number of freshmen enrolled.

The number of graduates in both secondary and elementary education last June totaled approximately 4,500, about sixty percent of whom accepted or were available for teaching jobs this fall. We believe the program, by publicizing the shortage and by encouraging young people to consider teaching, possibly accounts for only a seven percent turnover in the profession in our state. We feel that many of the older and experienced teachers are staying on to teach in the line of public duty rather than retire at a time when their services are needed so badly.

May I suggest a few basic problems that are facing us at a local level and then raise a few questions as to how best we are going to solve them? Many rural school districts do not have a salary schedule for teachers. Most of the small districts still employ teachers on a bargaining basis, from year to year, with no guarantee of continuity of employment no matter how competent and faithful their services may be.

About half of all the high school teachers are receiving higher salaries than grade school teachers with equal training and experience. This condition wherever it prevails will have to be corrected or there never will be enough teachers in the elementary schools now, or at any future time. The single salary schedule where possible appears to be the only solution.

The surveys made by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce also show there is a rather wide variation of salaries in the rural and city schools of the Nation.

Beginning salaries in rural areas and in towns of 2,500 population or less in many instances are six hundred dollars per year under those paid beginning teachers in schools of 2,500 population and above. The spread is even more noticeable in the maximum salaries paid rural and city teachers. This is one of the factors in the exodus of many rural teachers to better paying jobs in urban areas.

In several states that have a teacher tenure law, I understand rural school teachers are not covered by its provisions. This means that city school teachers are assured continuous employment after having served the necessary period of probation. On the other hand rural teachers can count on employment only on a year to year basis subject to whatever whim or handicap they may encounter in a small local situation. This problem will have to be solved before we can expect any upturn in the number of teachers who will agree to accept employment in our rural schools.

Then, too, we have numerous cases where school boards of small school systems are hiring regular teachers as substitutes, knowing full well that these teachers will be working full-time in regular positions. This practice is followed not only for the specific purpose of keeping teachers off tenure or continuing contract, but also to prevent teachers from being placed on the regular schedule that has been adopted in the district and that is provided for by legislative action.

I believe that equal educational opportunities for our teachers are just as essential as they are for the great masses of the Nation's school children. The shortage of teachers in rural areas will continue critical as long as school boards and superintendents in small localities show an unwillingness to afford their teachers equally as good treatment as city school teachers enjoy. Many of the practices that I have mentioned are not in line with trends in the best business and industrial organizations in the country or with the best state and federal civil service regulations.

All of us recognize that there are problems in the rural areas which certainly warrant a differentiation in the professional preparation of our rural teachers. To appreciate and to understand the problems of a social, cultural, and economic background and to apply this knowledge to the needs of the rural community should require a professional education and work experiences directed toward this end. I understand that only a few teacher training institutions recognize rural education as a distinctive field. The problem seems to involve satisfactory procedures that we should follow in encouraging state departments, college administrators, and deans of education to recognize the importance and the place of rural education in the total educational picture.

While our interests in this conference are of rural nature, I am sure all of us are quite concerned by the whole educational outlook especially as it applies to obtaining an adequate number of competent teachers for both rural and urban schools.

Last year more than 60,000 teachers left the profession for one reason or another, many to take higher paying jobs in other fields. I know of no other profession where this mass exodus has occurred, where people have left a field in which they are highly trained to move into other jobs where they are essen-

tially untrained. If this condition or exodus of workers prevails in any business or any industry, we would have to conclude that there must be something wrong with both management and the company, the wages were not high enough and that other conditions within the company were not too good. What are we going to do to retain the many thousands of good teachers who are leaving the ranks each year?

Among the women's professions, our surveys show that teaching is the highest paid. How can we impress our young women with this fact? Many bright and capable high school girls have heard so much about low salaries in the teaching profession that they often take jobs in a retail store or office at half the salary that is paid the teacher.

Whether we agree with the principle or not, many states are unable to pay men teachers more than women teachers. The exodus of men to higher paying jobs is a startling condition brought about mainly because the maximum salaries in teaching are not sufficient to meet the needs of men with families and are considerably out of line with those paid by business and industry. In order to keep a fair balance of men and women in the profession, how are we going to solve this problem?

There is a considerable variation of salaries throughout the Nation, resulting in stiff competition among communities and among states for teachers. As citizens we must make every effort to see that conditions are right within our own boundaries if we are to survive this great struggle for human services. No state is solving its teacher shortage by merely recruiting teachers from states that pay low salaries. Every state should see that it is preparing enough teachers to meet its individual needs. If a community needs an average of 12 new teachers each year, the community should take immediate steps to see that at least 12 of its high school graduates enter college to prepare for a teaching career. It seems unreasonable that some communities should draw so heavily from the pool of available teachers without making an all-out effort to put back into that pool the same number of teachers that it withdraws. This does not mean that these teachers must return to their home communities, but it does mean that schools should make an all-out effort to perpetuate themselves.

Education should draw heavily on the practices used in business in providing personnel directors or counselors who can solve the individual grievances of teachers within the school system. Every industry knows that a dissatisfied worker can damage the morale of a whole department. Many minor grievances and annoyances in the high school system, if left unsolved, often lead to poor work on the part of the teacher not to mention frustration and discouragement of the individual involved.

Part of the answer in the future may be found in assigning to our teachers the primary duties of teaching and to others of less skill and less experience the ordinary duties that are not a part of the daily classroom routine. Doctors and nurses have learned that others in the hospital can perform some of the tasks that do not require any special training or skill.

Another problem facing us is how can we encourage the most outstanding men in the community to serve on school boards. We do not want men and women

on school boards who have an ax to grind or who are intent on beating down school taxes for needed school improvements. There is a very great obligation on the part of every school board member to learn at an early stage the need for communicating to the citizens the most pressing needs of the schools, and also communicating clearly to the teachers the school policies and areas in which they need cooperation of the teaching personnel. Citizens will support school projects when they understand fully the problems that are involved and have the necessary confidence in the individuals at the helm.

With the critical shortage of teachers and the need for more and better school buildings, we cannot afford to take short-cuts in education or to adopt the methods of business in mass producing our product. In other words we do not want push-button education. We do not want to see our young people coming off the assembly line of education lacking the proper seasoning or unprepared for life's market. With the schools trying to educate all the children of all the people, there is a greater need today for better trained teachers than at any time in the history of our Nation. If we fail to individualize our instruction to meet the wide differences prevailing in children, if we do not insist on maintaining high standards of instruction as well as high certification standards, we face the danger of allowing our schools to deteriorate, and in the end the product of the schools will be inferior.

In our effort to recruit young people for teaching, we must find some way to change the negative thinking of many teachers to that of positive thinking. I believe that too many teachers are too critical of their profession. Many high school and college boys and girls have been discouraged from entering the profession because of critical or disparaging remarks, often made innocently, by those in the profession. Teachers should and could be good salesmen. Businessmen do not dare to be too critical of their own product or they soon would be out of business. It takes good salesmanship in business to maintain good standards. The same applies to education. If our teachers colleges can graduate individuals with fine professional attitudes, I believe the greatest part of our problem would be solved.

The task ahead requires a true and tried leadership and a desire on the part of every individual to pitch in and do the job that needs to be done. Our own state department of education last year mailed out questionnaires to the 47 other states asking if an organized program were under way in their states to recruit teachers. More than 90 percent indicated that there was no such program in effect and that little was being done in this field. We cannot complain of inactivity at the state or local level if nothing is being done to inspire leadership or if we fail to call on citizens in every walk of life to answer the summons to duty. Business men are joining hands in mutual understanding in this great crusade for better schools and better teachers. Call on us for help! You will be surprised how well businessmen everywhere will respond.

Education is our greatest resource and our greatest defense against the common enemies of a free world. If it is worth saving and worth strengthening, it is worth fighting for. We cannot allow our system of public education to deteriorate because of a lack of determination or indifference on the part of any indi-

vidual or groups of individuals. Let us mobilize for greater effort, nation-wide, state-wide, and community-wide. As our ultimate goal, let us give to rural education the rightful place it deserves in our American way of life so that rural America, too, may have equal educational opportunities for both its children and its teachers.

TEACHERS FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES

GLENN KENDALL

President, Chico State College, Chico, California

Until the last half century the rural areas of the earth have held a majority of its people. It was generally conceded that the values and customs of the rural people were more stable than those of city folks and that the rural regions usually have had better reserves, both psychological and physical. While rural culture through the generations has had its "ups and downs," these generally have been less violent than its city counterpart.

Today, rural life does not seem to fit this traditional pattern. In the first place the rural areas have considerably less population than the cities. In the second place, the rural areas now are so impregnated by urban customs and ideas as to make the former inner coherence and consistency of rural culture lost.

With the advent of many modern conveniences—automobiles, modern roads, radio, television, etc., active community life has been made more possible, but these opportunities have brought with them new problems. Many a rural community in America today can bear witness that the new freedom of rural people, new educational concentrations, new marketing procedures, and new interests have left high and dry their chances at what Baker Brownell calls "human community life." At the same time some authorities believe this new pattern brings about a "common center of interest" for those living in an area which can support the institutions desired. They hold this type of integration inevitable as well as desirable.

Certainly the new technologies and instruments of living have renewed some communities. Many believe that large scale operation and contemporary urban culture can provide adequate substitutes for the values which they destroy. But there is still a long road to travel to where a wholesome and stable environment is provided for the ordinary human being in the ordinary community. All this sharpens up the question under discussion. Specifically, amidst the shifting and conflicting positions for the well-being of the rural community, what should the teacher education program—in the broad sense—be for those who are to teach in these communities of America? A by-product question is what influences can be fairly presented to help young people want to teach in rural communities when currently they overwhelmingly feel that their opportunities, both professional and otherwise, are best in urban communities?

Before attempting to give some points of view on these two questions it seems desirable to discuss the basic philosophy which should be before us as the

education of teachers in rural communities is considered. Schools in rural communities as well as in other communities should be concerned with the basic problem of helping people make the community a better place in which to live and a better place in which to make a living. The program which seems to best typify this educational philosophy is that which is known today as "The Community School." We like to think of this community school as a center of an educational program serving children, youth, and adults, a point of view that education is a continuous process which includes all age groups. We think of the facilities of the plant being utilized from early morning until late evening. We think of the curriculum of the school as being built upon the discovery, the development, and the use of all community resources and problems. We think of the curriculum as a growing one evolving out of the cooperative effort of all the participants as it involves resources and problems of the community and as the aspirations of the people develop. We also like to think that all who share in the program have a hand in its planning, in its execution, and in its evaluation.

We like to think of the community school in terms of:

1. A center of learning for the entire community and involving all age groups.
2. A center where facilities are utilized from early morning until late evening, fifty-two weeks per year.
3. Where the educational plant—small or large—serves as a demonstration of a well-planned and well-kept physical environment. Gardens, playgrounds, etc., give evidence of the school's interest and stimulate the community to similar improvement.
4. Where the school program is flexible and the curriculum is never static, since it reflects thoughtful attention to ways in which the community resources may be used.
5. Where the curriculum evolves out of the cooperative effort of the participants as they study their problems and ambitions.
6. Where the neighborhood serves as a living laboratory for study in various subject-matter areas.
7. Where teachers work with other community agencies to improve the program of living for all the people.
8. Where the teachers live in the community, participating in community life and the community accepts responsibility in helping provide suitable living conditions for its teachers.

For the kinds of responsibilities involved in such an undertaking in rural communities teachers need—and in generous quantities—a rich understanding of people, with emphasis upon rural folks and their aspirations; a deep respect for individuals; a vision of what can be accomplished through education; techniques for teaching and working with others; interest in and understandings of rural life; and "dedication" to the job to be done in rural communities.

Successful teachers in rural communities have an understanding of each pupil, the kind of abilities he has, including the ability to learn, his physical condition, his interests, his emotional and social development, and his home and neighbor-

hood environment. Successful teachers in rural communities have understandings and skills in developing and conserving natural resources. They know the cost of wasted lands, of absence of home gardens, of inferior livestock, of non-creative use of leisure time. They have a "feeling" of the practical problems of community living and they develop skills in ways in which the community becomes the laboratory for learning.

Successful teachers in rural communities have learned good ways of helping people work together in a spirit of harmony and cooperation. While good human relationships are the foundation of satisfying life in either rural or urban communities, this is basic in rural community life, since without them, projects fall apart, sooner or later, because of the limited number of people who may be drawn together.

Too few such teachers have been available to the rural communities of America throughout its history. It would be a happy experience for me this afternoon to give you the program which should be followed in providing such teachers. In order to get some "specifics" before us, I'm using an example—the one I know most about. It is, of course, our own college—Chico State College.

Let me say a word about its service area—the eight-county area of North-eastern California. This is roughly one-sixth the area of the entire state and lacks only a few square miles of equaling in size the combined areas of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. It is the only degree-granting college within a region of 26,936 square miles. The population is approximately 213,558. The largest community is approximately 25,000. Most of the people live in very small communities or country areas.

It follows that if the college is to serve its region well, it must concern itself with rural education problems. This, we are attempting to do. For example, one of the sociology professors was chosen especially for his training and competence in the rural field. The staff member in economics likewise has his doctorate study in rural economics. Such specialists teach not only in their appropriate fields but come into the classes in professional education to assist in the program there.

After the student has completed his General Education courses—many with emphasis upon the rural and small communities—and also his major theory courses in education—with opportunities for first-hand observation and study of conditions, some of which are especially in the rural communities—the student is given a full semester of student-teaching under the most competent teacher available and under the general supervision of a college staff member. For this experience we are extending the geographic area. Some students are sent as far away as 150 miles. They live in the community and participate fully in community life and experiences.

It should be emphasized that this experience in the local communities is sometimes a great opportunity for the citizens there to study anew the needs and opportunities of the community. The college will not send a student-teacher into the local communities until the local people have made plans for reasonable liv-

ing and social conditions. We want to be fully satisfied that the community itself realizes that they have an obligation. There are more community requests than we can service for these student-teachers.

Along with the preservice education program there is a major need to work with teachers who are on the job. Many of the schools of the region are manned by teachers who took their study programs several years ago. A major portion of these are married, live in the community, and have family responsibilities. Cooperative programs are being developed with a majority of the eight counties whereby college staff members and specialists in certain areas of work needed in the counties are being released from a part of their loads on campus to serve as consultants in county services. This is done by contractual arrangement between the county and the college. One example will suffice.

A special study last year by officials in the State Department of Education revealed certain needed services in psychological work and counseling and guidance services in a number of counties in this area. Full-time specialists in these areas are not appropriate in these counties at the present time. Four of the eight counties will have service from the college with supporting help from State Department of Education officials.

These cooperative arrangements are built on the thesis that all the agencies—local, college, and state—are involved in the educational program and that specialists should be identified and, insofar as possible, used where the need is greatest. They supplement, too, the usual workshops, extension centers, etc.

Threading through this presentation is, I hope, the idea that the people of the communities must share fully in developing better teachers for our rural communities. These people want to do something constructive. Sometimes help and encouragement need to be given to the lay group. This short example may be indicative. The counties and college cooperated in one-day work sessions for lay people to be held in each county in the area. Two national leaders in rural education problems came to the area and served as resource persons along with the college staff. The central theme of each work session was: "How Can Our Communities Get and Keep Good Teachers?" Plans are projected for a "repeat" conference periodically.

Some of the problems in coming to "grips" with how to do a better job of educating teachers for rural communities are:

1. The general pattern of education for college teachers does not usually concern itself with community service experience.
2. Working with community people in projects is exhausting and college teaching loads are heavy.
3. Many community groups do not see clearly the need for change from traditional programs in education.
4. Young people tend to seek opportunities in urban rather than rural areas.

Such problems are not impossible of solution. The potentials of education in rural communities can be realized. But now, as in the past, both the lay and professional people need to make it a higher priority than is generally done.

THE TASK AHEAD IN ACHIEVING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

FRANCIS S. CHASE

Chairman, Department of Education

University of Chicago

Over half of the school-age children in the United States are growing up on the farms and in the villages of rural America. The kind of education received by this large proportion of our citizenry is of vital importance to the Nation, especially at a time when policy for education, as it is put into effect in America and the rest of the free world, may well determine the course of world history for the next thousand years. I am not going to attempt to document that statement, but I think any orderly review of the forces and factors that are playing upon the world today will document it sufficiently.

I shall make no pretense of covering the topic assigned, but I want to talk with you about four tasks, all of which seem to me urgent, all of which seem to me possible for a considerable measure of accomplishment. Those four tasks are as follows: First, to give a fair start to the disadvantaged children of America; second, to keep an open road for the talented; third, to provide special facilities and services to enrich life; and fourth, to offer education adequate to sustain our freedoms.

A FAIR START FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

With regard to the first task, the best source I can suggest for this problem is the chapter on the disadvantaged in Butterworth and Dawson's new book on the modern rural school.* Among the disadvantaged are the low-income agricultural workers, especially the migratory workers, the rural workers in mining and manufacturing, the Negroes, the Indians, the Spanish Americans, and other foreign-language groups.

Butterworth and Dawson point out that the disadvantages consist of low income; lack of ownership of property; effective, if not legal, disfranchisement, segregation; discriminations in facilities and opportunities; and the effective operation of a caste system where none is supposed to exist. They make it clear that there are many doors closed to those who are born into families of low income, into families of meager culture, into families to whom for one reason or another many kinds of opportunities are not available.

I think we all recognize that one of the best means of opening more doors for the disadvantaged children of America is to provide a level of education which will enable them to acquire the culture that is prized in this Nation, to acquire the skills for vocational effectiveness, to acquire the ability to participate effectively in the making of public policy decisions. It is only through education that these children can hope to improve their lot in life. Providing a fair start for these children is only a matter of elementary humanity, of simple justice.

* Butterworth, Julian E., and Dawson, Howard A., with chapters by others. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952. 494 p. \$5.00.

Whatever forces need to be mobilized in state and Nation to provide this fair start for children should be mobilized without undue delay.

With regard to migratory workers, Cushman in a recent article in *The Phi Delta Kappan* has pointed out that provision for them is in some cases as serious a burden to the states and the local school units as are impacted areas for which Federal aid is available. Yet there is no help with this problem. The burden may be an impossible one for local units to carry and in many cases little attempt is made to carry it. Opportunities are simply denied to these children.

This is a concern not only to the local community; it is a concern to the United States that there should be such a denial of opportunity. The children of migratory workers enter school late. They drop behind at an alarming rate. By the second year, one-third of them are retarded. By the ninth year, three-fourths are retarded about one to five years. They drop out of school as soon as they are released by the compulsory attendance laws, and in many cases earlier because there is no attempt to enforce the laws in many of these localities.

So this the first task: To provide a decent minimum of education for the seriously disadvantaged children of low income, low social status groups. I place this task first not necessarily because it is of greater importance than the others, but because it is a matter of simple justice to help overcome the disadvantages suffered by so large a number of our citizens. Unless America provides a fair chance to these children, all of the vaunted heritage of liberty and opportunity has no meaning for them.

AN OPEN ROAD FOR THE TALENTED

Task number two is what I have called an open road for the talented. To illustrate graphically what I mean I have taken a page from yesterday's *New York Herald Tribune*. It has two articles that I think are of some concern to us. The first one tells us, on the basis of studies made by reputable institutions in this country, that Russia is rapidly overtaking and passing the United States in its manpower in the field of engineering. This year Russia is graduating 50,000 engineers, America 19,000.

Now with the initial handicap that Russia had, an achievement such as that does represent a kind of lifting by the educational bootstraps. It meant reaching into populations which were largely illiterate and in a very few years bringing this large number of people up through this technical engineering training. I know it is heresy, in Washington particularly, to suggest that Soviet Russia has been successful in anything, but if it is heresy to open our eyes and our minds to the facts, then the witchhunters must make the most of it, because this country can only be safe by facing up realistically to the task that confronts it and by doing what is necessary to become equal to that task. What is necessary is first and foremost the full development of its human resources through adequate education for all.

The second article deals with our need for science students. It tells us that in the United States there is a tremendous shortage of students in chemistry and physics and the other sciences. It tells us the reason for this is the shortage of teachers in these fields. Again when we look into the educational oppor-

tunities in rural America, what do we find? We find that in the rural areas a smaller proportion of students are enrolled in high school than in the urban areas. We find that a much smaller proportion of students go to college.

In other words, there is a waste of talented manpower in the rural areas. Many who might become teachers, scientists, or teachers of scientists, or enter other learned professions, fail to do so for lack of educational opportunities. This waste is great wherever poverty, sparsity of population, and inadequate cultural facilities place their blight upon the growing children.

The states with the highest proportion of rural population are the states with the lowest proportion of the total school enrollment in high school. This means especially the Southern states because in the Northeast only two-fifths of the population is rural; in the North Central states a little more than a third; in the West about three-tenths; but in the South the proportion is a little over one-half.

Again we find a combination of factors, all adding up to a denial of equal opportunity and adding up most importantly to the failure to develop our manpower. Particularly here I want to emphasize a failure to identify and to provide advanced training for the talented, for the upper 15-20 percent of ability who are found among all groups in the population, but who do not always become identified because of the paucity of the cultural resources and opportunities for learning that are offered to the people in these groups.

PROVIDING FOR THE ENRICHMENT OF LIFE

Task number three is that of providing special facilities and services to enrich life. Look at the situation in rural America. It has about one percent of the elementary enrollment in kindergartens. In urban communities five and six-tenths percent are in kindergartens. A reasonable standard might be ten percent in kindergartens. So as far as this is a valuable part of education, of the socialization process of children, it is denied again to those groups who are already most disadvantaged in opportunities for learning and developing their full potential.

Or look at the provisions for adult education. Three and a half million are enrolled in adult education courses in urban areas, only about one million in rural areas. Less than two percent of the rural population is enrolled while nearly three times as large a proportion of the urban population is enrolled. The proportion of high schools providing adult education is much lower in rural than in urban areas. According to one study, only fourteen percent of 390 rural high schools in Michigan have general adult education, whereas seventy-seven percent of the high schools in urban areas have general adult education.

Or look at the opportunities to develop talents in music and art. Consider the provisions for libraries; examine the preparation of teachers in rural and urban areas; observe the provisions—or lack of them—for community colleges, museums, and other community educational agencies. It is clear that here again a large segment of our population is denied the opportunity for the enrichment

of life that adds so much to the fulfillment of the individual to which our society supposedly is committed.

EDUCATION TO INSURE OUR FREEDOMS

Task number four in some ways is the most urgent. It is to offer education adequate to sustain our freedoms and to attain our aspirations. Here we move from the concept of equality to one of adequacy. Even if we were to make an equal division of the educational opportunities currently available, this would be far less than adequate for our present needs. Therefore, to the familiar idea of equality of opportunity, we must add the concept of adequacy of opportunity.

I mean adequacy along several dimensions. The first dimension is adequacy in the sense of enabling the individual to develop his full powers so that he may make, in his own way, his special contribution to our society. We are cutting ourselves off from the contributions of hundreds of thousands of our citizens because of inadequate educational opportunity.

The second dimension in regard to adequacy is that of developing the Nation's full potential manpower, its human resources. We cannot afford a continued neglect of these resources in the face of the threats to our freedoms that are posed by the rise of the totalitarian regimes in their sweep across a considerable portion of the earth's surface.

A third dimension of adequacy has to do with providing citizens who can make wise choices. The one fact that more than any other differentiates our kind of society from Communist society is precisely the wide latitude that is given for individual freedom of choice—our belief, only partially achieved, that the individual should be enabled to choose not only his own ends but to make his views count in the shaping of public policy.

If you will look at the foreign policy of the United States today and instead of blaming the current Secretary of State or the current administration, consider the kind of policy that the American Legion will support, you will understand why American foreign policy does not change much from one administration to another. A new set of slogans, perhaps, but essentially the same kind of policy emerges.

My reference to the American Legion was not intended in any sense as a slur. I might equally have said the Kiwanians, the Rotarians, or the businessmen, the farmers, or the school teachers of America, if you like. All I mean to imply is that our foreign policy and our domestic policy cannot sustain any higher level than the enlightenment of the people will permit, if indeed our policy is to be made through free choices of individuals. Public policy and the education of the people are so closely linked in the bonds of democracy that one cannot rise far, or remain long, above the level of the other. If we expect a wiser public policy for this country, we must have a better education. But we must have a wiser public policy in order to get a better public education. Unravel that one and we will get somewhere.

I think this dilemma can be dissolved only through a process in which political and educational leaders join with the whole American people in hammering

out a conscious public policy that will produce a clarification of values and goals, and a redefinition of the issues involved in attaining the goals. This requires the participation of the great body of citizens in discussion of the issues in small groups, neighborhood by neighborhood, and community by community. Let us hope that this conference and others like it, as well as the coming state and White House conferences on education may help to actualize this great public debate on the real issues of education.

If what I have said about the differentiation between our society and slave societies is true, this kind of freedom for the individual can be sustained only if somehow the resultant of these free individual choices adds up on the side of wisdom and the general welfare. A series of bad guesses today can be so quickly catastrophic that we may lose all of our liberties while we are deciding how to safeguard them. We can lose them as quickly from within as from without if we are not aware of what is involved in this process which enables the individual to make important decisions.

And so the task of providing an education adequate to sustain our freedoms is in a sense the over-all task which confronts all of us in rural and urban areas alike. It is of special concern to rural areas, because while the loss of potential human resources is great in all areas, it is greatest in the rural areas. It is greatest of all among the disadvantaged groups.

A REVOLUTION IN QUALITY IS NEEDED

So we must face up to the task and move toward providing the quality revolution in education that will take us nearer to our goals. This means that we must discard the mass production model of education that has served us well, and that when created was perhaps as good as the economy could support. But this mass production method which moves learners along through standardized learning experiences at uniform rates is not good enough to meet the needs of today.

It does not provide enough stimulation and opportunity for growth for the gifted. It is equally unfair to the slow learners who often are people with great potentialities, even though slow starters. We must have a quality production in education brought about by a stepping up in the quality of teaching and a reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio. Then, learners may be grouped on flexible bases for different kinds of experiences and so there may be sequence and continuity in the learning experiences provided for the individual learner, and not simply something called sequence and continuity existing chiefly on paper. This means that one experience for the individual must be built on other experiences so there is a sequential development for each individual.

The provisions for exceptional children must be stepped up, also remembering that all children are in some degree, or in some aspect, exceptional and deserving, therefore, of exceptional teachers. To get these good teachers in sufficient numbers we must exercise a quality of imagination we have not yet applied to the problem. We must find ways of identifying the people who are like the second teacher that Claude Reavis had and like the teacher that brought about

his great intellectual awakening in his twelfth year. We must give these teachers a better preparation than we have yet done. We must make their education more exciting, more meaningful, and we must prepare them, among other things, to be able to make full use of the rural environment as a laboratory for some of the richest learning experiences that can come to our children.

THE DISTINCTIVE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF RURAL PEOPLE

MRS. HAVEN SMITH

*Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation
Chappell, Nebraska*

I am a farm woman from the western Nebraska wheat belt and farming is my job. My remarks will be in the nature of observations from a layman's point of view.

For many years we have been told that rural America is the training ground for the Nation's leaders. Many things have changed, but I believe that this has not. This morning Dr. Brownell told us that half of our rural young people migrate to the city to earn a livelihood. In response to a recent survey made by Mark A. May, forty-one Senators out of fifty-eight, thirty-five of the present Governors, all but one of the active members of the Supreme Court, and all but three of the Presidents of the United States, were rural born. Further, it has been estimated that eighty percent of the ministry, seventy-five to eighty percent of the successful business and professional men of our cities, and eighty-five percent of those listed in *Who's Who in America* have come from rural areas.

So because you educators are training the children of rural America, you have a great responsibility, and because I am a farm woman, I, too, have a great responsibility. It is my obligation to stand by your side, to see that you are adequately paid, to see that your problems are understood and that you have the things you need to do a good job.

Better days are coming. Rural people are in the process of a great awakening. We are developing an awareness of the problems of rural education. We are using united power through our organizations in working toward their solution. And we farmers today are just as resourceful as our ancestors were more than a century ago when with their rifles by their sides they penetrated the wilderness, built homes for their children, cleared lands for their fields, and settled America. We are as willing as they to work for all the good things that America needs.

Farm organizations are making a frontal attack against the many obstacles to equality of educational opportunity in rural America. We are working for good roads, better libraries, more equitable tax systems, the school lunch program, raising standards of teachers, and school reorganization. We have promoted the school program of vocational agriculture. We urge our members to inform

themselves and take an active interest in the school and its problems. We have worked for years for a fair share of the Nation's income for farm people—not just so there would be more money in the bank or more money to jingle in the pocket, but so there would be more money for better homes, for better schools, for better health, for better living in rural America.

I heard Mrs. Raymond Sayre—and by the way, she is in our audience today—say years ago that when she tackled a problem she thought the first thing to do was to make an inventory—to see where we are, what we have, and whither we are going. And so I propose first to make a quick survey of what we have in rural America.

What do we have? While city people and country people are basically much alike, we find in rural America certain human characteristics and advantageous environments which make it a particularly rich field in which to live and in which to work. Rural people are distinguished by their stability and basic cultural traditions. They are self-reliant. Even the children are trained to shoulder responsibility. They have something, which Dr. Frank Cyr said recently is an objective of all educators, the spirit of neighborly helpfulness which is a part of the understanding and good will so sorely needed in America today.

As we travel the long trail since the days of the pioneers, we are losing many things while we are gaining other things. But if we lose our tradition of neighborly good will, we will have lost a priceless heritage.

No one will challenge my conviction that the best place to develop the elemental traits of neighborliness, courtesy, tolerance, and fair play, which are the roots of civilization, is in the rural community. It is the best place for children to get primary experience in real living so they will really know the natural world in which they grow up. The child who has never experienced the thrill of wading in the brook, of climbing a tree, of getting acquainted with "Bossy" and her calf, of feeding the chickens, or gathering eggs from the nest, has missed something very precious.

Arthur Morgan says, "I have met countless people who are active in various health, hospital, welfare, and hygiene societies but who had never seen a chicken killed or a kitten born. They have crossed the Atlantic but they cannot swim. They have slept in hotels in Cairo and Bombay but never in the woods. They have climbed to the top of Pikes Peak but they have never shinned a tree or climbed a cliff. They install automatic heating plants in their homes and air-conditioning in their offices but they could not be trusted to burn the trash in the back yard. They make ice in their kitchens but they have never skated or snowshoed. They eat all their lives and wear carnations and orchids but they have never planted a seed or raised a crop."

Again, the rural educator surely must take pride in her position in the community. Next to the minister she is the most important public worker. She is respected, honored, and revered. And how she must cherish the rich understanding between herself and her pupils. She knows that Johnnie is one of seven children and that his father is in jail for drunkenness. She knows he probably did not have enough to eat for breakfast that morning. She knows

that Paula is the spoiled child of over indulgent parents. She knows Laura has a good mind but so far she has failed to learn to use it. She knows about the domestic difficulties in Dora's home and understands her need of love and security.

If she needs to talk problems over with parents, it is so easy. They are her friends. She visits them often. She sits beside them in church. These opportunities for human understanding and service are opportunities which are particularly rural. During the summer, one of the fine teachers in my home town, a man by the way, was offered a position in a large city system at a substantial increase in salary. Everyone thought sorrowfully that of course he would take it. But he didn't. He went to the city, looked the situation over, and came back to us. He said he did not like the factory atmosphere. He did not like the red tape of the city system. He would rather work in our little town among friends where he felt he could do more good.

Now as I list these assets, I do not mean to minimize in any way the great differences between opportunity in rural and urban areas. But I just want to say that we can make rural America a laboratory for the richest learning experiences in this Nation. We have great assets. I think sometimes we become so concerned with our problems that perhaps we forget to look at the rich blessings we do have.

I have been thinking that if I should ask you educators to state the greatest thing that we, the farm people, could give you, I believe you would ask us for greater participation. You would tell us that our interest and action and understanding are needed along with your professional expertness and leadership to get the job done. You would ask us to realize that our investment in education is an investment in human resources, in happiness, freedom, and security.

Mr. Brownell told us this morning that the solution lies with the people, that the quality and amount of education we have depends upon the attitude of the people and that when we know the facts, we will work for good education. You have just heard Dr. Francis S. Chase point out that our standards will be no higher than the enlightenment of the people will permit. How true those statements are, and I want to tell you that rural America is fast becoming enlightened. Just the other day I visited with one of my neighbors. She said to me: "You know, I now realize that what goes on in that school over there is the most important thing in this world to me. Those teachers have my five children more hours of the day than I have." Then she began to talk to me about the school. She told me how the kindergarten teacher sends home a letter when her little girl has learned to write manuscript style. The teacher tells what that style is and how the parents can help.

She told me about the Band Mothers' Club and how the mothers were able to understand and appreciate what is being done through the band. She said that when Ruthy came home and said she was studying "Problems in Democracy," Dad said, "What is it?" and they got the book and read and they found out. She had been studying the reading books along with her children.

She knew about room mothers. She was becoming interested and informed, and you folks were making this possible. She had developed an awareness of

educational problems and needs and she is not alone. Many mothers in my own little community have just such an awareness as that mother has, and ten thousand mothers like that can be a mighty force. A million such mothers can be invincible.

If you folks should ask me what we the rural people most desire from your professions, I would answer "more teachers of quality and consecration." There are many wonderful teachers, but there are a few who are not so wonderful and very often they settle in rural schools. As I look back over my school years, one teacher stands out in my memory. She was my sixth grade teacher. I do not remember anything about the building or the equipment, both probably poor. I know we sat two in a seat. But I do remember the teacher—old, angular, homely in face but not in spirit. She left her imprint on the life of every child with whom she came in contact. There was no fooling, no coddling, but she was an inspiration. She made us want to do our best. She instilled in us the principles of neighborliness, honesty, thrift, and fair play. None of us will ever forget Miss Blakley. We need more teachers like her.

How are we to get these quality teachers? Of course, it involves salaries that will attract the most able people. It might also involve making teaching a career that need not end in marriage. I wonder if our colleges could not do a better job of giving young people a larger vision of the teacher's contribution to civilization, of her creative opportunities, of the dignity and nobility of her profession. Couldn't they do a better job of making consecrated teachers?

I think if I had a child in school today I would tell him that it was more important for him to understand and live harmoniously with the shy son of the washer woman on one side of him, the arrogant son of the plutocrat on the other, and the blustering bully up the aisle than it was for him to get high grades. I would place first things first—first his human relations, and second his scholarship. And I do not underrate scholarship.

The President of Sarah Lawrence College said, "The aim of schools and colleges should be to teach human understanding." Dr. Albert Wiggam adds, "Education that fails to teach young people how to live happily together and what keeps people apart is a failure, even a danger."

The Germans were bursting with knowledge of art, science, literature, and philosophy; yet an obscure, itinerant paper hanger who understood human relationships led them into barbarism.

I think if I were a teacher, I would ask myself: Am I turning out students who love freedom, who will not be willing to trade it for false promises of security or material gains? Am I turning out students who feel a responsibility for their government, who know about government and will not be taken in by propaganda? Am I turning out students who will do their own thinking, who will not base their conclusions on heresy, hysteria, propaganda, or on what the neighbors think? Am I turning out students who realize that prejudice is a child of ignorance? Am I turning out students who will earnestly strive to understand their fellowmen, remembering if they cannot understand the folks around them they can never hope to understand their neighbors across the sea?

Am I turning out students who place their sacred honor above all else, remembering that when the morality of a nation sinks, the hour of its doom approaches? Am I turning out students who have faith, not faith that right will prevail but faith that they can work with their fellowmen to make right prevail?

MAKING THE PROVISIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT AN ADEQUATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

FRANK W. CYR

Professor of Education

Teachers College, Columbia University

America is committed to the great ideal of universal education for its children. It is committed to an educational program which will develop the individual and improve community life. We know that the future of the Nation depends upon an intelligent well-trained citizenry. We recognize that education is the most powerful force for the perpetuation of American democracy and use to human ends of the fruits of modern technology. We know, too, that as the problems of civilization become more complex, the demand for more and better education will become greater.

The vast educational program now needed to serve the needs of each child cannot be achieved unless adequate provisions are made to carry it on effectively in each locality throughout the Nation where children live. Today we face the tremendous task of providing the corporate organization, the physical facilities, the personnel, and the financing necessary to make the needed educational program a reality.

Our public school system today serves nearly thirty-six million children. It employs approximately one million teachers, a quarter of a million non-professional employees, and over seventy thousand administrative and supervisory personnel. It is housed in a plant having an estimated capital value of 15 billion dollars and an estimated annual budget of seven billion dollars.

Our forefathers had the foresight and courage to set up a public school system to serve the educational needs of their day. They organized school districts, levied taxes, built buildings, and employed teachers to make the education they desired possible. Since that time men have struggled to change, adapt, and improve these early provisions for education as the demands for more education have increased and as modern technology has changed our ways of living and earning a living.

The rapidity of change in American life has multiplied the need for reorganizing our school systems, constructing new buildings, and refinancing our schools. A manufacturer does not hesitate to scrap an expensive manufacturing plant and build anew when it is made obsolete by a new manufacturing process. We must be equally courageous in adapting our public school system to meet new needs in education.

THREE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following three guiding principles are proposed for use in developing adequate provisions for education.

1. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*

The first principle which must guide the development of all provisions for education in rural areas is equality of educational opportunity. This does not mean absolute equality of opportunity which can never be achieved even with rigid centralized control. It does mean elimination of the gross inequalities which now exist among local school districts and among states—inequalities which penalize the children of economically poor districts and at the same time prevent wealthier districts from making maximum progress.

The principle of equality of educational opportunity is universally advocated in theory but sadly neglected in practice. One of the great objectives during this next decade must be the implementation of this principle by educational and lay leaders alike. Local, state, and national policy must be directed to this end. We can no longer ignore the gross inequalities between rural and urban education in the financing of schools, the level of teachers salaries, and the provision of physical facilities. Rural and urban leaders must recognize this problem and work out solutions together which serve the common welfare.

2. *Democratic Control*

One of the most precious assets of our smaller communities is the opportunity they naturally afford all citizens for a voice in the policy and operation of the school. One of the greatest assets of the small community is the natural opportunity it affords all citizens to participate in the work of the school, initiate improvements in the quality and scope of education, and exercise control in school affairs. Some of our large cities are recognizing the fundamental worth of this asset and making intensive efforts to develop it into their large, centralized operations. Democratic control requires intelligent, active, and constructive participation by the people within a structure which is capable of putting their desires for good education into effect. It is an asset which our small communities must guard and foster.

3. *Design Adapted To The Small Community Situation*

All schools regardless of size are basically alike. They are alike in their common purposes of providing the scope and quality of education each child needs and in improving community life. They are alike in conforming to the basic laws of learning and general principles of school administration; in their need for teachers, buildings, finance, and a corporate organization. However, a design adapted to the small school situation must be developed on the foundation of these general similarities.

Small communities cannot realize the educational program required unless these provisions for implementing the educational program are functionally designed for small school operation. They can no more function effectively by merely imitating large city school systems than automotive engineers can design

an automobile for transporting small groups by merely imitating a railroad train which is designed to transport large groups. In considering provisions for implementing the educational program in small communities, we must recognize the size of the group to be served and approach the problems with open minds and creative imagination. The factors of sparsity of population and the size of the group to be served cannot be ignored.

In the light of these principles, let us look at one of the most important changes now in progress, the reorganization of the corporate structure of our school system from local districts to state education departments.

SCHOOL REORGANIZATION

The public school system in America is supported by its corporate structure just as a skyscraper is supported by its steel framework. Like the steel framework of a skyscraper, the corporate structure of the school system is hidden from view. This corporate structure is the laws, court decisions, and official regulations which give life and direction to the school and make it a being which can carry on the work of education. This corporate structure was set up in colonial days to carry on a relatively simple educational operation designed to meet the educational needs of that time and adapted to the community pattern of that day.

Over the generations since our forefathers passed the first laws authorizing the operation of public schools, men have struggled by trial and error and in the light of democratic principles to adapt and reshape school organization to meet the demands made upon it by the increase in our national population, the desire for a fuller, richer educational program, and the changes in community life brought about by the impact of modern technology.

These pressures have brought about rapid changes in school organization since the close of World War II. The number of local school districts has been reduced nearly by one-half, the intermediate unit is being widely developed, and seven state educational departments have converted from an elective chief state school officer to appointment by a board of education. The rapidity with which change is taking place increases the need for careful study and sound principles to guide the development of a sound corporate structure of school organization, local, intermediate and state, which is capable of supporting the school system of the future.

The Local District

The greatest progress in reorganization of the administrative structure has been the reorganization of local school districts. In three-fourths of the states this has meant the development of local community school districts as the basic local unit of administration. In the remaining states, principally in the South, it has meant the development of the county as the basic local administrative unit. The process of school district reorganization is not yet completed. In the eight Midwest states which now have over half of all the school districts of the United States the process has only begun. At the same time the county unit states are faced with the problem of developing satisfactory high school and elementary attendance areas.

We are in the midst of a program of school district reorganization which will affect the pattern of school organization and the quality of education in rural areas for decades. It is vitally important that the new structure developed out of the old be based on sound principles of administration, adequate provisions for financial support, and careful surveys of the factors involved. It is important that the local people and the state education department participate together in making major decisions. Most important of all is the development of districts which (1) are capable of providing an adequate educational program, and (2) are adapted to the emerging socio-economic, community pattern.

The Intermediate Unit

One of the most vital movements in school organization since the close of World War II is the development of a new concept of the intermediate superintendency. This office is between the local district and the state education department. Typically, it functions throughout a county or similar area between the local district which is the primary unit of school operation and the state education department which has statewide responsibilities for education. Its objective is *service*, not control. Its great purpose is to assist local districts and the state education department in the provision of better educational opportunities for all the children.

Its principal functions are helping schools grow, providing consultative services, coordinating mutual activities of local districts and the state education department, participating in certain administrative procedures, and providing the cooperative shared-services which can be most effectively provided to a group of communities working together over a large area. California and New York have led in the provision of special services from the intermediate offices as desired by local districts.

We now have emerging in the development of this office the opportunity to provide the children in each school district, regardless of size, the specialized services of curriculum consultants, guidance and psychological services, special provision for education of the handicapped, health services, library services, library and audio-visual educational aids, adult education coordinators, camping education, circuit teachers, and special administrative services essential in a modern educational program. The intermediate superintendency is an essential part of the total educational structure. We face the responsibility of reorganizing the intermediate unit with adequate structure and financial support to perform its functions effectively, just as certainly as we face the problem of reorganizing local school districts.

State Education Department

The state education department is an integral part of the school system. Its responsibilities are growing as modern communication brings us all closer together and makes coordination of purpose and program within states and among states more and more essential. The state education department should be governed by the state board of education composed of outstanding lay citizens. Its major functions are: (1) Leadership and service in the development of state-

wide policy and program, (2) the distribution of state aid, and (3) the enforcement of minimum standards.

A major problem in the development of an effective organizational structure for our public school system has been that reorganization is too often carried on at one level at a time. This hampers the development of a well-organized structure in which each level, local, intermediate, and state are properly set up in relation to each other. The *federation principle* upon which our American form of government rests should be applied to the school organization. Following the federation principle, each level, local, intermediate, and state will be assigned those functions it is especially fitted to perform.

SCHOOL BUILDING FACILITIES

The need for new school buildings is one of the most urgent problems facing American education today. The lack of sufficient school building construction to keep pace with current needs during past years, the rapidly accelerated birthrate which is swelling school enrollments, the widespread reorganization of school districts, and the mass migration of population to towns and open country adjacent to large cities have created a crisis which must be faced and faced promptly. Rented quarters, barracks, makeshift quarters in school buildings, and operation of schools on two or more shifts are denying children their right to a good education.

An estimated 35 percent of our school children last year were in need of new housing. The United States Office of Education reports that thirty-eight million young Americans are enrolling in the Nation's schools and colleges this fall. This will mean an increase reaching toward a million and a half new pupils from the kindergarten through the twelfth grade and shortage of nearly three hundred seventy thousand classrooms. At an estimated \$30,000 per classroom, it will take over eleven *billion* dollars to meet this shortage.

Each locality has the responsibility for straining its financial resources to the utmost without endangering the support of the educational program itself and the financial solvency of the community. Each locality has the responsibility of setting up the type of local school organization which can best make its economic resources available for effective use.

However, localities cannot meet this financial burden alone and according to the Office of Education report of the school facilities survey in 43 states, the deficit between available resources for financing school buildings and the capital outlay needed, is greatest in the smaller school districts of the Nation. Each individual state also has a responsibility for making the utmost effort to provide state funds to finance the capital outlay needed. However, the wide variations in the economic ability of the states to support education is well known. Localities and states cannot shoulder this financial burden alone.

This gigantic problem of providing adequate housing for the school children of the American public has profound implications for the future of our Nation. Our future strength depends on the intelligence and well being of our children. We cannot perpetuate the ideals of democracy and defend our borders without an educated citizenry. And we cannot insure an educated citizenry without the

physical facilities to house an effective educational program. This is a problem of national security and must be faced as a problem of national concern. It is a national problem which we can and must solve. It can be solved by adequate Federal appropriations to supplement local and state funds. The Congress and the Administration have a responsibility and a moral obligation to provide the school building funds necessary to the educational welfare of our children.

The acute shortage of school building facilities in rural areas is due largely to population migration, reorganization of school districts, and financial problems. The movement of population is decreasing the number of pupils in some areas and increasing it in others. Technological changes in agriculture are resulting in new crops and new methods of farming which affect the need for school buildings. Many families are moving to the country and small towns to live, now that the breadwinner is commuting to work in factory, office, or research laboratory as much as forty miles from home.

The decentralization of industry into the open country and small communities is an important factor and promises to increase according to industrial leaders who recognize the values of small industry which electrical power now makes possible. The widespread reorganization of school districts has made many school buildings obsolete and created the need for new construction. The burden of financing construction with inadequate local resources has delayed essential construction and further accentuated the shortage. Any program for school-house construction will be inadequate and indefensible which does not provide the 45 percent of our school children who live in rural America with equality of school building facilities.

GUIDES TO PLANNING SCHOOL BUILDINGS FOR RURAL AREAS

In planning school buildings for small communities, it is important to consider certain characteristics which apply to the small school situation. It is impossible to achieve a well-planned functional building by merely imitating on a smaller scale a large building suitable for a city school. Some of the characteristics of a small building which should receive special attention are: (1) multiple use of space, (2) flexibility, (3) adaptation to community use, and (4) suitability to the rural environment.

Multiple Use of Space

One of the common barriers to the most efficient use of small school buildings is over-specialization in the design of rooms. If a small building is to be functional, it cannot be divided up into small specialized rooms. It must be designed so that each room will serve a variety of purposes and serve them effectively.

Room space must be available for multiple use. For example, a large generalized shop room with well-arranged space for all types of shop activities from woodworking and ceramics to general carpentry and repair of farm machinery provides a more functional learning situation for the pupils in a small high school than separate specialized rooms for each type of shop work. A general

laboratory-classroom for all the sciences taught is more functional than separate laboratories for each science with a separate lecture room adjoining.

The National Survey of Secondary Education found that the school library was used nearly twice as often by pupils when library and study hall were provided for in the same room, instead of in separate rooms. Elementary classrooms with space and equipment for activities such as supplementary reading, art work, and elementary science provide a more favorable situation for child development than when these activities are limited to specialized rooms.

Planning for multiple use of space also includes planning for the integrated use of adjacent rooms. The use of glass partitions in business education facilities and for small conference rooms have already demonstrated the functional value of space which gives small groups freedom to meet their own needs without the handicap of complete isolation from their fellows and their teacher. Folding partitions permit use of the same space for both large group and small group activities.

The same principle of multiple use applies to the school building as a community center. Lunchroom and home economics facilities can serve both pupils and community organizations. The same is true of the auditorium, gymnasium, and conference rooms. The same room, properly planned, can be used by pupils during the day and serve as a Legion Hall, Boy Scout and Girl Scout room, and a meeting place for other community organizations outside of school hours by the simple expedient of providing adequate closet space where each organization can store its own equipment when not in use.

The small school is, and should be, a closely knit, integrated whole in which the pupils and teachers of the entire school work closely together in common activities. School building design should foster this community of spirit. A building which is merely a series of isolated compartments cannot realize the full values of this unity.

Flexibility

It is essential that the rural community school building be flexible, to accommodate the adaptations in the educational program which must be made from year to year as pupil needs change. Building design must facilitate the alternation of courses, the addition of new courses, and the modification of those which are continuing. The building should be so constructed that old walls can easily be removed and new walls erected as changing educational needs require.

Adaptation to Community Use

The small community school is closely integrated with community life in a relationship not realized in large centers of population. School activities form a larger part of community life and the school building houses a wider variety of community activities. The building and grounds should be readily accessible for community participation in school activities and for use by community organizations. Just as the school in the small community has a broader responsibility for providing education and educational leadership, the school building has a broader scope of activities it should properly house.

When school building facilities are adapted to effective use by farm organizations, service clubs, women's clubs, youth organizations, dramatic clubs, and the like, it multiplies its value, replaces the need for other expensive facilities in the community, and strengthens the organizations served. The same is true when it also houses such agencies as the public library and the public health service. Provision and maintenance of satisfactory space in a wing of the school building for such services means important financial savings which can be used more profitably for other community purposes.

Attractive Design

The school should be attractive in interior decoration and exterior design. It should give more the atmosphere of a home than a factory. The use of color, decoration, and lighting should provide a healthy and favorable situation in which to live and to learn. The architectural style should be an expression of the educational life it houses and the community life it serves. Its design should not only be adapted to the climate, weather, temperature, and topography but to the nature of the rural community itself. A building architecturally appropriate to its surroundings in a densely populated city and surrounded by tall buildings usually would be entirely unsuited to the rural community environment. In the city, its need is to stand out among other buildings. In the country, its need is to give expression to the space and natural environment of the surrounding countryside.

An important characteristic of a rural community school building is its height. One-story buildings are not only more functional in serving the activities they house, but are architecturally adapted to the rural environment. Tall buildings are products of cities where land area is at a premium. The advantages of the one-story building can be enjoyed where space is one of the communities' assets.

SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

School transportation in the United States has become a big business. The schools operate a fleet of approximately 130,000 buses at a cost of over \$250,000,000 per year, transporting over seven and three-quarters million children between school and home daily. They travel each day more than three and one-half million miles with a passenger load equal to more than the total population of Chicago and St. Louis combined. The orange school bus on the highway is rapidly becoming a symbol of public education.

In an operation of this magnitude and of such recent origin, growing pains are inevitable. With the large and rapidly increasing size of the fleet now operating, the American school system can be proud of the record it has made. However, with the experience of recent years and the available knowledge through research and experience in the 48 states, a thorough review of policy and program is essential to sound, effective future development.

In determining policy and program for school transportation service, the welfare of the school children must always be the first consideration. School transportation is not provided to educate children, but to make good education available to those who cannot properly reach the school building by walking.

The transportation program as a whole, and in every aspect, must be sternly evaluated in terms of the children's welfare. This consideration must be uppermost in the minds of those responsible for all decisions, state or local which affect the proportion of the educational dollar which shall be diverted from education itself to this special service.

The board members and administrators throughout the United States who are directly responsible for school transportation form a large group. This makes it imperative that there be initial understanding of an agreement upon basic objectives toward which they can work together in developing policy and practice, if optimum results are to be achieved. Such objectives should be the product of state-wide discussion in each state.

The three basic objectives of good school transportation services are: *Safety*, *Economy*, and *Adequacy*. *Safety* is the paramount consideration. It means that the pupils are properly protected against health and accident hazards during the transportation process. *Economy* is supplementary to safety and requires that minimum costs be maintained, consistent with safety. The value received for every dollar spent on transportation must be weighed against the returns it would have brought if spent for education itself. *Adequacy* refers to the amount and quality of transportation provided, as compared with existing needs. Overcrowded buses, over-long routes, or remote children who are not transported do not meet the requirement for adequacy.

The progress made toward these objectives varies widely among the states. Annual costs per pupil vary widely for the same quality of transportation. There is similar divergence in the price paid for new vehicles. Practice with regard to employment of drivers also varies. Some districts have a policy of paying full-time wages for part-time employment.

The success with *high school pupil drivers* in the states which permit this practice, and the use of housewives should be given careful consideration. The school cannot foster either economy or safety by full-time pay for part-time employment. The national standards for school bus construction must have economy as a major goal. Only a few wealthy districts which pay teachers salaries comparable to the salaries of other professions can justify indulgence in luxury transportation. High quality teaching, not a luxurious school bus should be the symbol of a good school.

FINANCING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

There are three general types of taxation. Taxes on property, on income, and on sales. Taxes should be levied on the taxpayer according to his ability to pay. Before the closing of the frontier and the rise of American industry and commerce as we know it today, school taxes were raised by the general property tax which could be levied locally. At that time, the amount of general property a taxpayer owned was a reasonably good measure of his ability to pay taxes.

During the past fifty years, however, the proportion of wealth in general property has declined until it represents less than a third of our taxable wealth. The schools can no longer depend primarily on the local property tax as an adequate source of revenue. State and Federal governments can tax the other

sources of wealth which now represent most of the taxable wealth in the United States. State funds on an equalization basis are essential to support education and provide equality of school support.

The amount which is needed to finance education will depend upon the number of children of school age, the amount of our total national income we are willing to devote to education, and the amount of wealth which is produced that can be taxed for school purposes.

Norton estimates that the school budget of current expenditures must be increased from seven to twelve billion dollars to provide an adequate educational program. Cushman estimates that four-fifths of the present national shortage of 200,000 qualified teachers is in rural areas, which have 45 percent of the Nation's children and only 38 percent of available school funds. An estimated \$500,000,000 is necessary just to bring rural teachers' salaries up to the level of urban teachers. This equalization of salaries is essential to the provision of equality of educational opportunity in America.

The recent tendency in some states to increase the proportion of state aid distributed on a flat per pupil basis without regard to the wealth of the local district is a violation of the principle of equality of school support and penalizes rural areas. The local property tax alone cannot adequately finance schools in rural areas. We must have adequate state and Federal aid distributed on an equalization basis.

Lay and professional leaders, rural and urban, must work together for the equalization of school support, through state and Federal aid if we are to serve the common good, by providing equality of educational opportunity for all our children.

FACTORS AFFECTING SMALL SCHOOL DESIGN

The realization of an adequate educational program in rural areas will depend largely on how the provisions we have been discussing are designed.

The design of the local school district determines the quality and scope of education and exercises a powerful influence on the nature of community structure and organization. The design of the intermediate superintendency will determine whether or not a wide variety of services can be made available to rural and suburban children. The design of buildings and transportation, and of the educational program itself, will determine whether a small community school can provide sufficient breadth of educational opportunities to its pupils, or whether it is forever limited by the number of teachers employed.

It must be recognized that all schools, regardless of size, are alike in their general characteristics. It must be equally recognized that the small school in the small community must be designed to meet the needs of small groups. Size does not affect the fundamental aims of education, the basic laws of learning, the fact that a school is made up of pupils, teachers, districts, facilities and finance. However, the fact that schools and communities are small does call for design functional in that situation.

The nature of the small community and its life is largely determined by its size. The small school is an organic part of country life, related to it by a

network of informal human relationships. The small school is dependent on outside sources for certain types of services which can properly be provided within the large school system. The small school itself is a closely-integrated organism which provides greater opportunity for pupil initiative and pupil responsibility in carrying on the learning process.

The work of the traditional classroom as we have known it must be thoroughly analyzed and methods adapted to small group learning developed. Designed properly, the small school can provide just as broad a variety of educational opportunities for its children as the large school, and do it at comparable cost, just as the automobile provides transportation for small groups equal in quality to that of the railroad train which transports large groups. We must apply the same imagination and persistence to designing small schools as Henry Ford and his contemporaries applied to the invention of the automobile.

The development of adequate provisions for education in rural areas is a tremendous task. It requires the intelligent planning and effective action of lay and professional leaders throughout the United States.

RURAL EDUCATION PROBLEMS: PAST AND PRESENT

JOHN K. COX

Secretary, General Services

Illinois Agricultural Association

Those of us who worked with school reorganization especially appreciate the influence of Dr. Howard A. Dawson whose vision of what a school should be helped raise the sights of some of our leaders. He appeared on several programs at the peak of the reorganization period, and when he became physically indisposed on one trip, he spent his recuperation period assisting the County School Survey Committee in that county with its report to the people.

As a farm boy myself, later a teacher and superintendent of schools in rural communities, and still more recently associated with the largest state farm organization in America, my background and experience has been of a predominantly rural nature. I speak, therefore, from the point of view of a farm boy who spent 16 years as a school teacher and administrator and who for the past few years has been close to the policy making process of a state agricultural association.

In the 1944 to 1945 school year, Illinois had 11,955 school districts. Over 9,000 of these were one-room districts. Believing that we could provide better educational opportunities for our youngsters in fewer districts, we set about in 1945 to reorganize into larger districts. A local survey preceded action and many leaders participated in the movement, especially after it was once started. By the latter part of 1953 we had only 2,607 school districts remaining—a reduction of about 78 percent—and this number has been further reduced since then. School programs have been enriched, school housing improved,

school opportunities broadened, tax rates spread more widely to offer greater stability to school financing. Most people are happy with the change.

An additional task that Illinois had was to get the grade school and high school under the same school board and supervision and still have a large enough administrative and taxing unit to provide a good high school education at a reasonable cost per pupil.

We found that while a particular one-room school might be a good school, the average one-room school found it difficult to attract good teachers, to offer variety in the program, to afford adequate competition between students on a grade level, and, in many cases, to properly finance the school. Also, the teacher could spread her attention over one or two grades better than over six or eight. Our conclusion was that a two-room school was generally better than a one-room school, a three-room better than a two, and so on. If it became necessary because of roads, distance to another school, or lack of housing space elsewhere to leave some of the pupils in a one-room school, we recommended leaving only the lower six grades, or perhaps the lower four.

Experience with reorganization problems indicated that we should attempt to set up an administrative and taxing unit involving both grade and high school and sufficiently large for the economical and efficient operation of one high school within the district. In these larger districts we preferred to have several grade schools located nearer to the homes of the youngsters. This larger district could be organized and enjoy certain advantages of the larger district, with housing problems to be worked out later.

Some discussion at the state and local levels centered around the loss of "rural values." So many people differed about what "rural values" were that eventually the "rural values" argument was largely supplanted with a discussion of what kind of program youngsters need—urban as well as rural. This latter line of thought was based on the idea that rural and urban people must cooperate, since few rural communities can provide by themselves an acceptable program of education—particularly in the high school. It was also based on the knowledge that at least half the boys and perhaps three-fourths of the girls leave the farm and should have the benefit of some training in the sciences, manual skills (as in wood shop and metal shop courses), as well as secretarial courses, public speaking, and others. We strongly recommended that agriculture and home economics be taught.

In trying to get several small high schools, enrolling 40 to 60 pupils, to cooperate in setting up an administrative unit large enough for one good 150 to 300 pupil high school, we naturally ran into local prejudices, as well as the tendency of some people to consider business or a basketball team more important than a good educational program. While some small 50 pupil high schools lacked sufficient vision to recognize the poor job they were doing, one extremely wealthy area with 400 high school pupils voted out of a 2,800 pupil high school district. This school had maintained over the years an extraordinarily good course of study. Two years later, after calculating the cost of an equivalent program in a smaller 400 pupil high school, this area voted three to one to annex to the larger district.

Many people in small communities who stood by when the local bank closed its doors and had watched local people drive off six, ten, or twenty miles down the hard road to shop at the chain store in the larger town felt impelled when the school issue arose to do something to save the small town. Loss of the small high school as the result of a school reorganization program seemed to be another big step toward reducing the village to a ghost town. Loss of business, lower property values and the lonely feeling of being "passed by" inflamed the imagination.

On the other hand, sound reasoning indicated that the village would go down hill faster with a small inadequately staffed high school and a mediocre program. It would be a better neighborhood if the few remaining people there, or who might be attracted there, could be assured that their children could have access to a good high school a few miles down the road. Local people were urged to consider the idea that while the small neighborhood could serve well as an elementary attendance center, they look to the larger community for adequate high school training. They were reminded that they could not depend on the local neighborhood to sell them their clothes, or to furnish most of their commercial amusement, or even, in many cases, banking facilities. They were encouraged to believe that instead of a small mediocre high school helping to hold the town up, its glaring limitations added to the depressing atmosphere of the place.

Although rural children no doubt gained the most from the school reorganization program, rural people in a way also had most to lose. They lost the little school house. They had to make new ties, have community meetings further from home, see their youngsters taken aboard school buses to be transported to a new attendance center. In many cases farmers paid higher taxes in the new school district and often paid substantially more taxes per capita than the average urban taxpayer.

In view of these considerations and in order to assure the farmer that he would have his share of responsibility of "running" the new school district, the school reorganization law under which most of the reorganization took place, was written so that if the newly formed school district contained more than two townships, or 72 square miles, no more than three members of a seven-member school board could come from any one township. To further safeguard rural people from being voted into a district by urban majorities, or vice versa, the law also called for a separate vote in both rural and urban territory. The vote in each area had to receive a simple majority before the new district was declared established.

One of the main difficulties encountered in efforts to combine rural territory with the larger populated centers grows out of a weakness in our local tax structure. Everyone pays the Federal income tax, gas tax, excise taxes, often sales and other taxes. Unless a person owns real estate or personal property, he may have a substantial income but pay little to the support of the local government units including schools. Many school districts are unable to finance a good school if they must depend entirely on the local property tax.

To level out the inequalities in local taxation and guarantee the poor school districts an opportunity to provide a reasonably high standard of education to

its youngsters, financial aid from the state should be distributed to the school districts on the basis of need. The state should guarantee to each district that makes the required levy to qualify for state aid an amount per pupil approximately equivalent to the average cost of educating youngsters throughout the state.

Local taxation is often made ineffective by poor assessing. So many powerful individuals and concerns profit from a poor assessment that it is often difficult to improve local assessment machinery. However, several school districts have come up with surprising results and considerably more income locally by making a detailed study of the assessments on individual pieces of property within the school district. One school district of about 1,200 homes found 320 pieces of improved property listed as vacant lots. Another school board rejected the initial assessment of \$2,000,000 on a new automobile plant in the district and the next assessment listed it at \$7,000,000. This particular district was able by a fair assessment on all property to provide additional school housing space for its increasing enrollment and reduce taxes at the same time.

Our biggest problem at present is providing school housing in some of the rapidly developing urban centers that have exhausted their bonding power and are forced to cheapen their school program and put some of the pupils on half-day shifts. We are considering setting up a state revolving fund for needy communities that meet certain conditions. School buildings would be built with state funds and rented to the school districts until the obligation is paid off. The school building would then become the property of the district. Such school buildings would have to be built from plans that were long on utility and short on frosting.

It goes without saying that the reason for having good schools, broad curricular offerings, and good teachers is to provide our youngsters, both rural and urban, with those impressions, attitudes, and experiences that will best prepare them for facing the problems of a complex world. Our progress as a Nation, as well as many of the pleasures we enjoy as individuals, are the fruits of a competitive system which seeks opportunity, not security; a chance to prove ourselves, not a guaranteed job. Rural people have a right to expect the teacher to think more of her job to be done than of her own security on the job. The pupil's welfare, not teacher welfare, should be her chief interest. The school is for the pupil, not the teacher.

We have had so much of materialism that some teachers have lost the idealism that should be a part of every teacher's equipment in dealing with boys and girls. The teacher who ceases to be idealistic, ceases to be a good teacher.

Teen-age vandalism is largely a result of false values, taking liberties without assuming responsibilities, freedom without discipline. The school must assume part of the responsibility for the increase in juvenile crime along with the home and the church. Every pupil should be made to understand nature's law of cause and effect, that we reap what we sow, that nature is full of balances, and that liberty without responsibility is anarchy. A willingness to discipline oneself should be pictured as the attractive sign of the mature person. The words discipline and responsibility should be glorified. The teacher who merely teaches

facts and subject matter but cares little what the child thinks or what attitudes he is developing is not worthy of being a teacher.

The superintendent's job is most of all to interpret the needs of the youngsters of the community and select the course of study, the sets of experiences, and the teachers who will contribute most toward supplying those needs. The superintendent should not be artificially restricted beyond the common rules of justice in replacing poorer teachers if better ones are available and if the poorer teachers cannot be improved within the job.

No matter what improvements we make in school organization, financing, and the like, we still have problems. The new problems are simply less fundamental and less staggering and demoralizing. One of the big problems we have yet to solve is the determination of the duties, place, and powers of the county superintendent of schools in a county where school reorganization has been widespread. The duties of this county superintendent are greatly changed when his work of supervising small schools is taken over by the district superintendents.

The first question to ask is: Do we still need the county superintendent's office as the link or intermediate district between the state and the local district? If we do, and I am of the opinion we do, then our next job is to redefine the duties and powers of this office.

It has been suggested that the county—or in some cases several small counties—serve the school districts in the following capacities where the smaller school district is unable to provide the service or cannot provide it on an economical or efficient basis. It may be that the handicapped children's program, the student counseling and testing program, pupil transportation, the health program, and perhaps even vocational programs could be handled by the intermediate district. All of these programs can be costly to the small school, and we may find that the county serving as the intermediate district could provide better service in those areas and more economically.

This and other problems can be solved when people understand the issues. The degree of success of the Illinois school reorganization program on a voluntary basis and its dependence on local people making the moves after they knew and had thoroughly discussed the alternatives, is an unmistakable proof that the democratic process works. The jostling of many school leaders out of the rut and forcing them to reevaluate their program, together with the awakening of interest of parents in the schools are some of the by-products of the movement. The breaking down of traditional prejudices between small towns, of neutralizing rural and urban fears and suspicions—all of this was a result of the emphasis on pulling together.

THE SCHOOL IN THE COMMUNITY— AN EDUCATOR'S VIEWPOINT

WILLARD E. GOSLIN

Chairman, Division of School Administration and Community Leadership

George Peabody College for Teachers

In preparation for this occasion, I visited some rural schools—some of the one-room rural schools that are left and some of those promising so-called intermediate units that are being developed. I also went to some village and small-town schools. These schools were located in Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama.

In some instances I had time to sit in the classroom or prow around and see and hear and feel what was going on in the school. In most cases I went out to see some people after I had been to the school or before. I talked to some mothers and fathers and enrolled children, and I spoke with some who had been former pupils at one time or another. I went through some small towns on Saturday afternoons and then went back on Tuesday when the storekeepers were not so busy and talked to them.

I also went into some cut-over places in Minnesota and Wisconsin and looked at what is left when you take the resources away. Later I took a walk in one or two magnificent virgin forests. I walked through some magnificent cornfields in Iowa. Last week I went along with a group of children who were picking cotton on some worn-out hillsides in Alabama, and I went over into the Tennessee Valley where the Tennessee Valley Authority has been working with farmers at restoring ground coverage.

I wish to lay emphasis on three areas of relationships which I believe must be developed and exist at a high order if schools in rural America are to meet their responsibility to the children and adults of the communities and to this Nation and our world.

The first area of responsibility which I wish to discuss prompts me to say that one of our limitations is perhaps a static concept of the word "community." It would be difficult in a changing culture to put your finger on anything that is more subject to change than the American community in our time.

The first community I wish to talk about is as wide as the United States. I do not believe that there is room for a school that is a good school in America to develop a system of relationships which does not have as its first guideline an adequate system of relationship between the school, its content, its program, its policies, and its procedures—a relationship between that school and our system of freedom and democracy in this country as represented by institutions and ideals.

Perhaps no school in America is so particularly set up, so well set up to capture the genius and the romance of the background of the development of freedom in this country as the rural school in America, because America was rural in every sense of the word when we began to plan and to germinate our great concepts and institutions of freedom and democracy in this country.

The school might well serve for America's children and youth—particularly in the rural areas, but in every area—as a laboratory, as a practice center for the development of the knowledge, the information, the skill, the technique, the habit patterns, if you please, of living and acting within the framework of the best of our knowledge, experience, and tradition with freedom and democracy in this country.

The rural school ought to serve its public over and beyond the children and youth in the community in this regard, because we now live in a time when it is necessary for all of our citizens to constantly and eternally renew our understandings and our procedures and our techniques of citizenship in this country, if we are to remain abreast of the demands that are on us and if we are to cultivate and maintain the capacity to meet them.

The rural school is in a particular position to offer such learning to both children and adults, children in need of the cultivation of initial understanding and habits, adults in need of recultivation and orientation in terms of the changing needs of our concepts and institutions and freedoms in these times.

One of the major areas of relationship between the rural school and its environment ought to be the relationship of the school to the land. By the land I not only mean the soil but the moisture, the forest, the ground covering, the minerals and so forth.

There is only one procedure available to us to keep education from being academic, theoretical, and floating around in misty blue and that is to root it in the realities of the community where the education is taking place. Part of that reality is to root it in terms of the institutions and concepts of freedom and democracy; another is to root it in terms of the nature and quality and extent of the resources that not only underwrite the school but underwrite also the people around it who send their children to it.

I do not see how a rural school can come close to meeting its responsibility to America or its people that is not realistically attuned to, aware of, and a part of what is happening to the soil of the area where the school is located.

If there are trees that need to be planted, then the school ought to have a share in the planting. If there are hillsides that ought to be terraced, then the school ought to have a share in the terracing of those hillsides. It should also serve as a forum where new understandings and new techniques and procedures can be brought to the awareness of the whole community.

If new techniques and practices are needed in the processing of food, then the school ought to be a part of it. If there are new procedures needed for the marketing of products, then the school ought to have a share in this and should be influential in what is developed there.

I am aware, and Dr. Howard Dawson and others this morning made it quite clear, that only slightly more than half of the children born in rural America will remain there. Those who do not remain with the soil, after they have gone to the industrial segments of our Nation, will still be basically dependent upon the complement of raw materials of the Nation. These will be furnished to their hands in the industrial centers in order to produce what they have to eat, what

they have to wear, what they have left over to build and maintain institutions such as ours with.

The rural school is in a unique position not only to help relate its program and its activity to that part of its environment called the soil for those who are going to stay there and be a part of it, but it is in a unique position to serve the Nation by continually sending on to the industrial and trade centers of America a flow of young citizens who have had brought to them through the practices of their daily lives and the nature and content of the curriculum they studied, a realistic and lasting understanding that no people can be healthy long, no people can be well and strong long that have not retained and protected and understood and used wisely their basic resources.

The third area of relationship which I should like to identify and discuss briefly has to do with the relationship between the school and the community. One of the things that we need in education, need desperately, is the assistance of our associates and friends in sociology and elsewhere to help us understand what some of the hand-holds are on a community, how to take hold of them and work with them.

The school needs to be related to the economic flow and development and welfare of the community, and those phases of the community need to be related to the school. We not only have to give boys and girls an opportunity to learn about the tradition of the American economic system, but we have to furnish, community by community, a forum where young and old alike can discuss, examine, and debate some of the real economic issues of America, particularly as they relate to the rural sections of the country.

I am talking about such things as cooperative marketing. I am talking about such things as rural electrification. I am talking about such things as the development of better road systems, and so on. We need to view the rural school as an opportunity for young and old alike to have a better and a more mature chance to look at the developing American economic system and see where they fit into it.

It would be exceedingly useful for a young generation to learn about the labor movement as it has developed in America before it is thrust upon them in too blunt a fashion.

In the rural schools I stopped at I found just one where rural scouting had reached the point of being organized. I found several where 4-H Clubs had not yet come. In some places Future Farmer chapters were not there. I found many instances where both boys and girls and older men and women, when they began to speak about the things they would like to see in their community, talked about ways and means of doing things in terms of living relationships with their fellow men in the community.

There are a number of other phases. We have talked a good deal in American life in recent years about moral and spiritual guidance for education. It seems to me that it is an area, without doing any damage to any of our fundamental traditions about education and religion, where we who are the leaders in rural education might exercise some leadership.

If rural education is to serve rural America, to deepen the roots of stability, we need to put more flesh and blood onto the skeleton of education. We need to drive rural education deeper into that phase of rural America that I would describe as the lands. It needs to become more concerned about moisture and topsoil and trees and minerals, and their relationship not only to America but their relationship to every American whether he is rural or urban in his orientation.

I am convinced that few schools in America, rural or urban, as we look at the last decade or two, have contributed enough to the security and welfare of free men by really capturing the genius of the development and the expansion of freedom in America. I think the rural school has an opportunity to make that go far in its program and activities.

One of the needs of rural America is to recognize, from the viewpoint of the school, that there are untapped resources lying loose around every school in this country, rural school in particular, that are ready to give it an enrichment and a quality that many teachers and communities and children have not yet had an opportunity to experience.

We need particularly to lead American citizens of rural orientation to recognize more widely that the rural school is an organization, an agency, an opportunity for cooperative action on the part of rural America, not only to teach their children to read and write and cipher, but teach a generation of Americans relationship between topsoil and minerals and moisture and trees. Not only for the welfare of rural America but for the whole of America, the rural school in company with all other schools, has an opportunity to strengthen and expand the exciting concept of freedom and democracy in this country and to see it take further hold in the lives of all of us.

THE SCHOOL MUST DISCOVER THE COMMUNITY

GRISCOM MORGAN

Community Service, Inc.

Yellow Springs, Ohio

The 1954 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education of the NEA entitled, *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*, reports a very significant educational development. It describes a growing movement to take the rural school back to the social setting of the child's life and education, from which the school has been progressively withdrawn for several decades. It represents the discovery that formal education can have the advantages of modern administration and of an enriched curriculum of varied services without losing local community autonomy, initiative, and responsibility.

Instead of aiming to provide every school with every kind of service which may be needed, which is possible only with massive consolidation, the intermediate unit program would provide for each group of local school systems a

central pool of personnel and material for supplying auxiliary services as they are needed. By this means small community school systems can have advantages which otherwise would be available only to the largest systems in the region. In various parts of the country the intermediate unit has been developed to a point of demonstrating its effectiveness.

Large centralized administration or attendance units in rural education can no longer be justified. Local communities, by cooperating with others similarly situated to secure auxiliary services, may be sounder and more able to adjust to change and improvement, than either isolated small community school systems, or large, centralized organizations which destroy local autonomy.

Each of us has his own idea of what constitutes a community. Yet, for sociologists the word properly has a quite exact meaning. A ten-year study of human societies over the world from ancient times to the present by the Institute of Human Relations at Yale arrived at the conclusion that there are only two characteristics universally present in all human societies—ancient or modern. These are the family and the small, intimate community. It is doubtful whether anywhere in history we have a record of civilization long surviving the disappearance of its small community life.

The community values which all people require for wholesome living are universal values. They are not limited to rural areas, nor to any nation. They develop in a great variety of forms. Just as the great family of mammals, in order to meet varying conditions or possibilities, has evolved into such diverse types as mice, giraffes, bats, whales, and human beings—all without the sacrifice of the basic structure and function of mammals—so the intimate small communities of men—regardless of the greatly varied circumstances to which they are adjusted—all have in common very definite conditions for human survival.

One of the universal characteristics of the real human community is that of limited size. The Yale Cross-Cultural Survey, just referred to, reached the conclusion that intimate community relationships seldom could be maintained in groups of more than about twelve hundred. For many peoples, and especially for young children, the optimum group is much smaller.

With regard to the size of the larger secondary-group community: "According to studies under the direction of Carl C. Taylor comparing 114 communities in various parts of the United States, the communities having high or relatively high group consciousness or feeling of belonging on the part of the farmers have trade centers with populations ranging from 1,000 to 3,500."

Like the family, the community needs an economy of its own, including a secure function in a larger economy, a tradition of its own, distinguishing elements of culture, a locale or setting. It also needs religious, educational, political, and recreational functions if it is to be whole or enduring. But today modern technology and centralized management have made it possible to withdraw one after another of these functions from the community, and have progressively withdrawn them, until the normal life of the community is greatly restricted and impoverished. It is not uncommon for the family of a farmer or a rural worker to be very widely dispersed during the day, at work, school, recreation, or wor-

ship, while knowing few if any neighbors at home. Yet both children and adults have vital need for the community as an area of life in which the intimate group shall have mastery over its affairs.

Through the Middle West there are many localities where in days past the community school was the center of community life. With the school moved away by consolidation, or controlled without reference to the community, many or most of these have largely ceased to be communities. With the children leaving home very early and returning very late, the family also is partially disintegrating.

Today, the significance of the small community is being rediscovered, and it is being given recognition in educational planning. That process must be carried further. We must build a new and fuller understanding of the significance of the small community, of its place in a changing world, and of what is its place in the education of children. We cannot work on the assumption that just any kind and size of social group is a community without doing violence to a vital and specific requirement of human life.

To survive, the community must be cared for and loved for its own sake, as the family or the Nation is loved and cared for. It cannot survive and prosper simply as the location of largely unrelated activities and institutions, such as school, church, and business. The community must be a self-respecting, self-existing institution, managing its own local affairs in its own way, as does a mature family. The gradual destruction of the community, by taking away its natural functions of education, local administration, intimate associations, and occasions for working together for common ends, will have serious effects on national character and destiny.

Through many thousands of years of primitive community life, education of children was a natural result of living in the community. As more formal education developed, that for young children continued to be primarily a family and small community responsibility. In the modern age a great change took place at about the time of the French Revolution. The policy of the Revolution was to destroy intermediate human associations as far as possible, leaving only the individual and the over-all state. As the French school system developed after the Revolution, the child was as far as possible taken away from other associations and made a creature of the state, controlled from the center. It was highly improper for a parent to visit the school or to have any influence on it. It was the boast of the French Minister of Education that he could look at his watch at any minute of the school day and tell what every school child in France was studying. The aim was to make over the mind of the child according to the ideas of the state.

This totalitarian pattern spread over much of Europe, and from there invaded America. We do not fully realize the extent to which this scientifically mistaken and socially unwise philosophy has taken hold in the administration of American lower education, and those who promote it seldom are aware of its origin.

It has been a specific doctrine of some State Departments of Education that the state is supreme over its members and communities, that education is a function of the state, and that local communities have no rights or functions in

education except those delegated by the state. In the very practical politics of education this doctrine has been vigorously pressed with the deliberate intent of taking away power from the local communities and vesting it in State Education Departments.

The authors of the Department of Rural Education's Yearbook on the community school have not ventured a clear challenge to this totalitarian doctrine. There is a remnant of the old confusion of power with rights. Because the state has ultimate power there remains the assumption that all rights originate in the state and only by permission or allocation may be exercised by individuals or communities. For instance, in that report we read:

"Since the central responsibility rests with the state, a brief consideration of the need and basis for *allocating* functions for different state governmental activities may have pertinence—a function should be *allocated* to that unit closest to the people where it can be carried out with completeness, equity and efficiency—in other words, functions should be *allocated* from the bottom up, not from the top down."

Here we have sound intuition and practical judgment confused by the theory which has been carried over from authoritative regimes from across the ocean—the theory that power and rights are identical. The age-long experience of mankind and the inherent nature of the community reveal that the rights and functions of the community as to community affairs are indigenous in the community by its very nature. The state with its greater power is under obligation to recognize and to protect and maintain those rights. Explicit recognition of this fact would make a great and wholesome change in the atmosphere of community education.

Our problem is to determine how the underlying life of the small community is to find expression in a world of large governmental and economic affairs, and of extreme mobility and interrelatedness of people, of population centers and of economics.

The first requisites of community life are neighborliness, intimate acquaintance, mutual trust, solidarity, love, sympathy, and mutual endeavor, and responsibility. But these are not qualities that live and grow on a mass scale. Unless there is developed an enduring intimate responsible group, these relationships cannot send out their delicate roots which must precede hardy growth into the strength of confirmed personality and character. This is but one of the many functions of the small community, but it is central to all others. It is such relationships which hold society together and make life worth living.

Not only do children require the small community, but the small community requires the children. It is largely the presence of children that creates and preserves a community. The people of a community become acquainted with each other through their children more than in any other way. In acting in the interest of their children they become aware of the community. Take the children out of the community for their education, and the community usually dies.

Another service which the intimate relations of family and small community must perform is to develop that informal social order—inner character, and

self-discipline—upon which all society rests, and without which it cannot exist. No amount of police power, leadership, and discipline can keep order and harmony among people in whom those qualities are not ingrown, and they can grow into the fiber of people only through living in social groups that are at once whole enough and intimate enough to insure that this order becomes established in their lives somewhat as second nature.

It is beginning to be observed that much of mob action, isolation, delinquency, and personality disorders are characteristic effects of instability or disappearance of small community relationships. A prominent criminologist declared that the community or the lack of it was the whole story in regard to delinquency. And Judge Samuel Leibowitz, discussing sex crimes, says:

"For example, take Chinatown in the City of New York. It is still a community. Chinatown has the lowest crime rate in the entire city. Why? Because it is still a neighborhood where neighbor knows neighbor, where there is a certain inhibition against the commission of crime because of the shame that the criminal would share . . ."

The vast, and in some cases indiscriminating, programs of routine school consolidations, with the resulting destruction of small community life, never were justified. Now, with development of widespread programs of auxiliary services provided to local community schools from central pools—the so-called intermediate units—the typical arbitrary consolidation programs have no further excuse. Of course, there will always be needed a degree of reorganization and consolidation where existing schools do not and cannot serve existing communities, or where even small high schools or junior colleges are beyond community resources and enrollment.

Those who have most vigorously and routinely promoted school consolidation during the past several decades believed they had the answer to the most crucial problem in rural American education. With growing sense of power and urgency they have pressed for consolidation. The 1954 Rural Education Yearbook referred to records a nation-wide reaction against these policies: I shall quote a few statements from it to illustrate:

"Regardless of the particular services provided, the community is a basic unit for democratic processes and the achievement of social action. The school is an important agency for developing a more effective community life, and *every identifiable community should have a school!* . . . providing a school in every identifiable community means that there will be many small schools . . . The school should be an integral part of the community . . ." (p. 35)

"Community development is impossible without coordination of the main social, educational, and economic organizations which are responsible . . ." (p. 36-37)

"The elementary-school attendance units and the secondary-school attendance units should be organized around the natural sociological neighborhood and community areas." (p. 51)

"Every decision made at the intermediate level must be in keeping with the principle of local community responsibility. The leader must be aware of the

historical bases of American education and the American community to insure against implementing a program of intermediate services from the top down . . . The community school is the most important unit of school operation." (p. 207)

These expressions indicate how great is the change of attitude which is coming over the country with respect to community schools. However, the momentum of the consolidation movement is not yet spent. The process of mass depersonalizing education is still being taken by some State Departments of Education as the type to impose on rural education, with the near complete destruction of many small communities by taking their children away from them for their education.

We know it is not possible all at once to master the stubborn problems of depersonalization, increased crime and delinquency rates, and the lack of stable personal adjustment which tend to follow urban congestion and stresses. At least we can refrain from further carrying over to our small communities the habits of educational administration which derived from those urban conditions, and have contributed to depersonalization.

Education of children and adults was once an integral part of community life. As formal schooling became an increasingly specialized activity, it has tended to institutionalize education away from direct relationship with the community. For a time this did not seem to matter much, because formal schooling took a minor part of the child's life. As Dr. Lange, former head of the Department of Education at the University of California put it, since as a boy he had only three months a year of schooling, he had nine months in the year to get an education. But formal schooling, including organized extra-curricular activities, has more and more to monopolize the life and interests of boys and girls. Education has become primarily the responsibility of administrators and teachers, to a much less extent of the parents, and almost not at all of the community as such.

There is no question but that the near disappearance of many of our small communities, the great shifts of population, and the national need for higher educational standards, created a situation needing correction. The fault has lain in trying to solve that problem as though schooling was a world of its own, without long and organic relations with society as a whole. It has been assumed that because many communities could not exercise freedom wisely, none of them should have it. We have had standardized, mass-production state control. The problem cannot be solved except by seeing life as a whole, and by treating education, not as an independent interest, but as one of the interweaving threads in the whole seamless fabric of society.

The intermediate unit of educational service—or of health or welfare—can become more than just intermediate between the State Department of Education or of Health, and the local community. It can be in fact an association of smaller units, such as of local communities. Regional and state officers and services then can better assume a healthy relationship to the local communities, and the "intermediate unit" can become identified with a cooperating group of com-

munities. The principle of relatively small-scale local autonomy, with the cooperation of small groups into larger units, combined with auxiliary counsel or services from the large reorganizations, is not an abstract theory about democracy, but has worked out successfully in many relationships.

In the case of community schools there has not existed until recently any general source of auxiliary services, except in a few fields. By the provision of auxiliary services through what has been called intermediate units, the chief handicap of small community schools can be largely removed. Democracy, like any other form of social activity, can survive and flourish only by the constant exercise of creative ability to keep in adjustment with reality. It requires somewhat more creative ability to develop auxiliary services than to spend money in consolidating schools and building massive school buildings.

The developments we anticipate in rural education and in community living can be harmed by our seeking to impose them. People resent being pressed to novel action. However, given a clear example of successful action, they are eager to repeat it. Town manager government waited for a century in our country, but once given a successful demonstration in a small city, it spread like wildfire, until now several hundreds of municipalities have adopted it of their own initiative. That is the fundamental process of democratic action. Leadership should consist in creating, facilitating, and reporting progress, not in propaganda and coercion.

Participation adds interest and tends to increase competence. Such policy of participation leads to creative advance. One small school, honestly and competently and creatively administered, will be an inspiration to many others. It is possible for a group of parents and neighbors to organize and administer a small neighborhood school, as did our ancestors, putting into practice the best educational methods now available. Pacific Ackworth School in California is such an undertaking. It has high standards and a fine morale, and has been as valuable in knitting the parents together as in giving the children the best schooling to be had. Once concerned people realize what they can do with their initiative, they will go all out in building and supporting schools for their children—and for themselves. But it must be truly their own enterprise. With such enterprise there is almost no shortage of teachers, or limitation of finance, or problem of morale that cannot be overcome.

The community school and community initiative in education are not nostrums to be imposed on all areas and all communities. Perhaps only a minority of small communities are now mature enough, or care enough, to bring about a high level of community involvement in school affairs. Some may be so moribund, and so lacking in community, and even family interest that the school for the present should be administered as a trusteeship by a higher authority.

Even if the proportion of communities now capable of reaching a passable level of initiative should prove to be relatively small, the communities which do have initiative constitute a major hope. They should be encouraged to exercise freedom and autonomy. They should not be coerced into standardization and dependence, as is commonly the case today. There should be wide tolerance of variation from conventional patterns of effective operation. The danger of

excessive influence by central offices was hinted at in the Rural Education Year-book referred to. We quote: "Centralized services may tend to concentrate authority in the intermediate unit unless this philosophy (of local control) is firmly established."

It may be that the concept of auxiliary services—the intermediate unit—will have to develop at first largely through regional and state administrators. If so, these trustees should be understanding and helpful, permitting and helping the opening of paths whereby such community schools can emerge from the more dependent relationship and still have the advantage of auxiliary services. The concept of trusteeship for immature communities, during which every trace of initiative is encouraged to grow, and all capacity for local autonomy is nurtured, is a far cry from the bureaucratic dictation of school policy from above which is characteristic of some state administrations.

WE MUST BE CONCERNED

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

It is a great pleasure to again greet this rural conference of educators, as I remember so well meeting the conference in the White House ten years ago. The idea was Miss Charl Williams', and without the fact that she came to me we would never have had the conference.

I was very grateful for that conference because I have lived a great part of my life in rural areas, and I knew how valuable it was to have good schools and good teachers in rural areas. I think perhaps some of you will remember one little incident which had nothing to do with education, but which perhaps gave some of the delegates to that conference great pleasure.

One gentleman said to me: "My children would not like me to come home without having seen Falla." And so Falla, who was really, I suppose, to many children throughout the country, much more important than the President, was brought into the conference and did his tricks and went away. I have always remembered that because it was such a nice touch to the whole conference, which was a very friendly meeting.

That conference started much of the forward movement we have seen in the past ten years. I am sure that in all the speeches and all the meetings that you are attending, you are finding that there has been great improvement in rural educational conditions and in rural education. There is never, however, in a democracy a condition that can remain static. You always have to have dreams of what you want to achieve, and be working toward something better than you have at the present time.

I think there is much that we want to improve, though we can be proud of the things that we have accomplished. One of the things that I am anxious to see improved is the opportunity given to teachers to be what they should be in rural communities—leaders.

It is difficult to be a leader in a rural community unless you have more opportunities for replenishing what you give out. These opportunities are presently unavailable to all rural teachers in most cases. I have always felt that with the exception, possibly, of the profession of medicine, teachers are required to give out more in rural communities than in urban communities. If you are constantly giving out, you must have the opportunity to take in and replenish, and broaden yourself in order to understand the changing world in which we live today. It is a very difficult world to adjust to.

You are training the children of this country, and the vast majority of children at some time are in rural schools. You are training them to a new kind of citizenship, the kind of citizenship which comes to people in a nation which is the most powerful nation in the world and, therefore, the leading nation.

I have had the opportunity of going to many parts of the world in the last few years, and it has brought me a realization of how important it is to know what happens here in our own country.

We are watched all over the world. I know now that we have very excellent communications. One of the reasons why people ask you so many questions about every phase of life in the United States is that they have heard so much and they want to know what is true, what is false, what are the beliefs, standards, and values by which people really live in the United States.

Perhaps we sometimes forget that one of the great battles of Communism versus Democracy as a way of life, and of a representative form of government as against a dictatorship, is actually carried on in the way communities live throughout the United States. If we did not have such excellent communications, people would not know so much about us.

The Iron Curtain countries can make promises, and most of their world will believe the promises because they never hear anything different. There is no freedom of communication between the Iron Curtain countries and the outside world. When they make promises in areas like Asia and Africa, there is nothing else heard.

But with us, making promises is of very little value unless we give tangible proof of our sincerity because they are constantly hearing things they may not quite understand, so they want to know more about us. That is why it is so important that the rural teacher be given greater opportunity for broadening of knowledge, greater opportunity for a leadership position in every community in this country.

It does require courage, but I think it is essential that we recognize that this opportunity must be given and these leaders must be present among us. Otherwise, much that is said by the demagogues, much that is perhaps brought into our communities in ways that we are not conscious of, will be believed. Therefore, the leadership of the people who really have the opportunity to know and to learn is vastly important.

We are living in a difficult time in the world because the world is changing. All over the world we are seeing people striving for freedom. And in striving for freedom you find that nationalism is almost the first thing that emerges. Nationalism is not always the period in which you see the best coming out in the

countries. Throughout the world there is slowly coming a desire for independence, a desire for improvement in the standards of living, for greater opportunity for all people. We must recognize that that is a movement which embraces every area of life in many backward communities.

We in this country have, as far as women are concerned, achieved a measurable equality, but in many areas of the world, for the first time, women are struggling in this whole framework of the struggle for freedom to attain equality on many different levels.

It is amazing to see women accepting responsibility in areas of the world where they have never felt that they had any responsibility before. In Pakistan, which is a Moslem country, in India, which is a Hindu country, the women are now coming out and taking responsibility first of all for social situations, and this broadens into an interest in education.

It is hard for us to visualize what education in rural areas in India means. Eighty percent of the 360 million people of India live in villages. Up to the time of the new government, which is only eight years old, there was no real comprehensive effort made to give even an elementary education to all the children. I assure you that a survey of the rural schools of India would bring vast numbers of people here a certain amount of surprise. We would wonder that any one learned a great deal in those schools, and we would realize with what very limited materials the children of India are now beginning to get an elementary education. Nevertheless, the fact that it is beginning has great meaning for us.

When all is said and done, two-thirds of the people of the world are colored people. We are facing in this country at the moment a very serious question. I hope slowly and gradually we are going to resolve that question wisely. How we do it will not have any great effect upon our own country, but the effect it will have upon Communist propaganda in the areas of Asia and Africa is a very serious consideration.

We can never forget for a minute that we have a world position today. It was different when we were just a nation beginning to come into our own, just developing our own country, able to live with our primary thoughts on what we were ourselves and what we would become. Now the leadership is ours in this world, and there is a great struggle in the world. Much depends on how we show—*show, mind you, not talk, but show*—what our real beliefs are, because all over the world every single thing that happens will be watched, discussed, and evaluated.

All the time there will be subtle Communist propaganda. Already it has begun. In many areas of the world they are saying, "Oh, yes, there has been a gesture made in the United States, but it will remain a gesture. It will never be anything more."

That is one of the real problems that all of us in this country have to think about as we evaluate our own situations, and as we live this world leadership that has come to us in our own communities.

I cannot emphasize too strongly to you how what happens here spreads throughout the world. When I was in India, the Communist promises were

very simple. They were easy to understand by the masses of people who lived in villages and who had been hungry for generations. The first promise was: "Join with us. We believe all men are brothers." Among the people in India who is to know whether that is a true promise or a false one? We know it is false. We know that brotherhood in the Soviet Union means slavery, slavery under a small group in the Kremlin, slavery of the body, slavery of the mind.

We can live with different types of economy, but with the type of Soviet Communist control developed over the mind and the body of people, we can never compromise. But how is a citizen of India, living in a village, to know what goes on? Join with us, we believe all men are brothers—is a very alluring promise, and the next is equally alluring to a people who have seen a few with a great deal in their country.

The next promise is: "We cannot promise that everyone will have enough to eat, but since we believe all men are brothers, we promise you that we will share and share alike." That is a very alluring promise. We have to know about these things. We have to tell our children who are growing up to be responsible in this different kind of world where so much depends on what we show we mean by democracy and by a representative form of government in the United States. We cannot make believe. We cannot make promises. We are open to the world. On us depends what the world sees, and on us also depends how well we prepare our children to live in this new kind of world.

In every small rural community where it is possible, our children should be taught how to express the ideas, the ideals, the standards, and values that they have in life. So many of us have lived in this country without ever putting into words for our children what the beliefs and the standards are by which we live. When they find themselves, as they do today, in business, in government agencies, in the army, in many parts of the world, being expected by the way they behave to show what it means to grow up in a democracy, and to be able to explain what our values really are, sometimes our young people find it very difficult.

We need to prepare them in every rural community for this very much smaller world brought about by rapid transportation and communication. They need to know more about conditions in other countries, about other religions, about how other people have had customs and habits for centuries, long before we became a Nation. They need to have a certain respect for the things of history as well as a knowledge of economics. Those are difficult to give in the short time that the youngster is in school.

One of the important things for all of us to do is to give our young people, first, the tools with which to learn so that they know where to go to find knowledge and develop the habit of being able to learn and to study. Next, I think we want to give them great curiosity, so that they will not be complacent about what they know, but be eager to find more about what has to be done in this world to really gradually grow to be a peaceful world.

All over the world you find people longing for peace. You know that unless we have peace—now that we have learned so well how to destroy ourselves—we

need not worry very much as to what will happen because we will only have ruins. So it is vastly important that we learn to understand each other, that we know about the United Nations, that we support it, that we use it as the machinery which has been set up to help us to get to know each other and to help us work together towards a peaceful world.

All those things, really, come back to the teacher in the community. The teacher should be far more important in a rural community than it is possible for any teacher to be in a large urban community. It requires courage, it requires work and patience, but I think all those things are present in most of our teachers.

In coming to you again ten years after the meeting in the White House, I want to congratulate you on what has been achieved in the past ten years, but I would urge you not to be satisfied, not to be complacent. The world is in flux and you are the leaders that may guide the world to something better.

You have great responsibility. I congratulate you on this meeting, on its success, and I hope that you will make a program for the future that is realistic, that faces our problems of leadership, and that accepts the fact that you cannot live in the world today without taking cognizance of all of its people.

RURAL EDUCATION FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF LABOR

VICTOR G. REUTHER

Assistant to the President

Congress of Industrial Organizations

It is generally known that teachers as a group are usually overworked and underpaid. Whether in these circumstances you will welcome my appearing here to give you another assignment, in addition to those you already carry, I don't know. However, I shall take a chance on your tolerance and tell you about a job that I think you and we in the labor movement, together, have to do. That job is to help create one American community in which farm families and city families stand together as neighbors, to eliminate the misunderstandings and the suspicions which lie between us today.

The objective facts show, as they have shown for a long time, that the welfare of the farm dweller and the welfare of the city dweller are essentially the same, seen only from two different angles. However, these facts have not been brought home to our people sufficiently to dispel the distrust and misunderstanding that has separated farm people from city people in so many areas of our country.

In American history, even so great a spokesman for the common people as Thomas Jefferson found it difficult to speak well of those common men who inhabited our cities. In his great faith in people as equal creatures of God, there seemed to be this one reservation about those who lived in the cities and earned their livelihoods in city occupations. These people he feared and distrusted.

"Those who labor on the earth," he said, "are the chosen people of God if ever He had chosen people." And if ever any of America's farmers might need to find another occupation, Jefferson hoped that they would choose the sea rather than manufacturing or commerce. These latter occupations could breed only dependence, subservience, and venality.

"Let Europe keep its workers," said Jefferson. "Artificers are the instruments by which liberties are overthrown." The workers on whom America could depend were those who cultivated their own land, whose labor was under their own control. So complete was the separation in Jefferson's mind between the people of the farms and those of the cities. That the city worker could ever develop a form of democratic living adapted to his peculiar problems and his different status seems not to have occurred to Jefferson.

Whatever Jefferson may have known about the factories and mills that began growing up during the early 19th Century must have strengthened his convictions about the city and its workers. For certainly these workers, as far as their jobs were concerned, had lost control of their lives. The employer regulated the time of coming to work and the time of leaving it. He controlled and regulated every moment in between, and all his rules were aimed at extracting every possible bit of energy of which the worker, whether man, woman or child, was capable. People worked at relentless speed through as many hours of the day as the employer could command. When health was gone and life was spent, there was nothing to show for it but death itself. Workers had come under the rule of a government as despotic as anything the American revolutionaries had dreamed about, a government that the Bill of Rights could neither command nor persuade.

The Bill of Rights had given Americans the right peacefully to assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances. But the first workers who tried it with their employers were thrown into jail for what was then called criminal conspiracy. The Constitution had guaranteed Americans the right to be secure in their homes. But in our lifetime, representatives of one of our largest automobile manufacturers pressured their way into homes of the employees to see if their lives were sufficiently frugal and upright to please their employer. The penalty for refusal to allow this invasion of the home was a reduction in pay or discharge.

Looking back, today, we can see that even in Jefferson's time, a beginning was being made. The workers who struck in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston in the 1780's and 1790's were demanding a voice in their own working conditions, and, incidentally, agitating for free public education. Later while some factory workers lay in jail for exercising their basic American constitutional liberties in the workshops, others took up the demand. Eventually the courts and the employers had to give in, and the labor movement was born.

However, only within the last fifteen years did that labor movement grow to include the millions of workers in the great mass production industries of America. Only in our own time has the miracle of industrial democracy come to join the miracle of industrial productivity of which America is so proud.

And while the production miracle is the more obvious and would have undoubtedly impressed Jefferson, the engineer and craftsman, I believe that the miracle of industrial democracy might have impressed and delighted Jefferson, who believed in people, still more.

I believe that Jefferson would have been quite at home in a modern labor union. He would have enjoyed the democratic exchange of ideas of our debates that take place in our union halls as policy issues are decided. He would have been proud to see American city workers exercise self-reliance and courage in working out their unique problems just as he admired these same qualities in the farmers he loved.

Jefferson would have delighted in watching the union contract introduce due process of law, the right to representation, and equal treatment under law into the factory where these basic characteristics of American democracy had previously been denied to the landless workers of the city. I think he would have wanted farmers to understand these things about city workers. I think we would all benefit if rural America could understand them.

But perhaps these are the technical aspects of labor life in the city with which you may hesitate to burden those with whom you work in rural education. However, the application of these techniques to the problems of human beings in the city ought not to be too burdensome. Let me mention a few examples.

As Jefferson clearly saw, the work a farmer does is under his own control. Can the farmer understand the problems of a worker who has to bribe a foreman to keep his job? Can he understand why a worker wants a voice in the rules which control how fast the employer may drive the machine which in turn drives the worker?

These are some of the issues around which unions have been organized, and which unions were organized to solve. These are some of the problems which are unique for city workers. There are others which we have in common. Farmers resent seeing their product taken from them at low prices, while the sale of the product enriches those who did little to produce it. Workers feel that same resentment when they see employers enriched by what they produced for low wages. That is why workers have fought for minimum wage laws and a voice over their own wage rates. And because we understand that resentment so well, we have supported farmers' demands for price supports and other planks in the farm program intended to provide the farmer with the economic security which we ourselves cherish.

But winning economic security is different for the city worker. The city worker must contend with a kind of unemployment that few farmers ever know. As long as the farmer has his farm, he cannot be unemployed. In the normal run of the year, no one can take away his land or his tools at a moment's notice.

It is the city worker who lives in almost continual fear of the tap on the shoulder or the slip in his pay envelope that may dispossess him from his job. His job is never his job in any real sense of the word. He can be separated from it with notice or without notice from the employer. The union contract protects the worker against gross discrimination and discharge. It does not protect him against the ever-present danger of the "layoff."

In the spring of this year, layoffs spread through a great many of the industrial areas of America. Unemployment had been growing since the previous fall, while people debated whether to call what was happening a recession or a depression. By the spring of 1954, the debate was clearly fruitless. Whatever you called it, the worker was in trouble. Hundreds of thousands per month were laid off; their employers took back their tools and the ground on which the men worked. There was nothing for these workers to do.

Let me digress for a moment to make clear that we realize the direct connection between the decline in farm income which had been taking place and the unemployment of the city workers. Among the city workers who were laid off first were the agricultural implements workers. When farm incomes fall, so do purchases of farm machinery and purchases of a host of other things that city workers make. The economic difficulties of rural America soon become the economic tragedies of urban America. In turn, these feed back to become even greater tragedy on the farm. The economic oneness of city and farm become clearly demonstrated during depressions to remind those who may have forgotten this fact in times of prosperity.

But the form of tragedy is different in the city. City workers who are laid off cannot get along doing chores around the place as they may be able to do on the farm. Nor can they work a little harder than usual to produce a bigger crop as the farmer may try to do when his prices begin to slip. In the language of the city, he hears himself described as "surplus," but his children must still eat and be clothed and kept from becoming ashamed before the neighbors.

True, some of these workers went home, last spring. Some of them went back to the farms. But in most cases this simply transferred the problem or concealed it. For many thousands of the laid off workers there was no place to go. When the factory managers turn off the power and take back their tools, for most city workers, that is it.

To alleviate the hopelessness and distress which city workers face when weeks go by and there is no work and no pay check, there has grown up in the city a partial solution—we call it unemployment insurance. In some places, the rules which govern the payment of insurance disqualify many who should receive it. Typically, a worker who qualifies, receives about a third of what his earnings are when he is employed. In few states is it paid for more than 20 weeks during any so-called benefit year, no matter how long the period of unemployment may be. Over the last few months, more than 40,000 workers per week are exhausting their unemployment insurance, being thrown back on welfare or on friends and relatives.

Inadequate as it is, the city worker often finds this insurance all that stands between him and disaster. Yet even this inadequate insurance is under constant attack from those corporations who would reduce their taxes by a few dollars without regard for the cost to the unemployed worker. Let me say that frequently these corporations appeal to the rural voter for support, with statements about workers which cannot be believed where city and rural workers are really neighbors who know and understand each other. Or the attack on the city worker is based on farm analogies that cannot be accepted by farmers who know

how much alike we are in nature, but how different are the conditions under which we live.

Part of the tragedy of this misunderstanding is that the attack on the city worker is an attack on the income of the customer on whom the farmer depends; our biggest expenditures are still for the produce of your farms. The price of the failure to know each other is paid by both of us.

Let me talk briefly of another problem which affects city and farm workers alike, but which since it is aggravated in the city has led us to seek a different solution from that which the farm might have developed. I refer to the problem of the city workers who become too old to keep their jobs in the factories.

Let me say first that I do not believe that our older people—our senior citizens, as we call them—ought to be regarded as problems. Our older people ought to be as precious to society as their sons and daughters. They deserve as much from society as we who are still moving toward the age of 65. But that's not necessarily the way it is in the city.

In the city, even the worker who is 45 or 50 years old, if he is laid off, may find that his age is already making it hard for him to find a job. The 60 or 65 year old worker, even when he is still employed, may notice the boss clearly and perhaps audibly wondering if it isn't time for Joe to move out and make room for a younger, stronger man.

I understand that on the farm there may still be years of usefulness and loving care for those who have grown old. But until recently there was neither usefulness nor care for many of these people who had spent their productive years in the factories. There were only the closed factory gate, aimless idleness, and a bare existence on what small savings and social security the luckier ones might have.

Yes, there was another possibility, that of living off one's children, in homes already too small for the family, and the growing feeling that you were an ever greater burden to those you loved best.

I could tell you about the crowded, rundown boarding houses in many of our industrial centers, jammed full of lonely, old couples driven to every conceivable kind of economy to keep body and soul together.

Can rural educators, concerned with the problems of farm living, help their students to understand problems like these as they affect city workers? Can you help them to understand the solution we worked out for it? In just one union, the United Automobile Workers, CIO, more than 25,000 workers have retired from their jobs to live lives approaching dignity and comfort. They have not been kicked out of their jobs as their own sons were and as many of their neighbors still are; they have retired on factory pensions.

While these pensions do not provide luxury, these people have the respect not only of their neighbors but of themselves. As a matter of fact, they have won a new status in the eyes of the nation; even the advertisers have a new respect for them, particularly those advertisers who want to sell Gaby's clothes, toys, and similar wares. With their social security and their union-won pensions, Grandma and Grandpa are becoming our senior citizens, indeed.

In emphasizing these differences between city and rural living, I am not trying to judge between the two as a way of life. I am not sure how much it matters whether people grow up and live in the city or in a rural area.

I am conscious of the values for growth and maturity that result from living in our farm areas and small towns. Family members are frequently closer to each other in both their work and their play. Children grow better where there is no hiatus between their own lives and that of their parents. But careful planning can preserve some part of this closeness even in the city. And sometimes the greater privacy and the greater variety of experience which are possible in the city may make up for what we lose in closeness and unity.

I am very sure, however, that city and rural children should grow up as neighbors. After all, in physical terms, these are no longer the days of isolated farm houses. Daniel Boone might choose to move when he could see the smoke from his neighbor's chimney, but that privilege no longer exists even for those who might want it.

Today, within an hour's drive from his farm, the farmer may have his choice of two or three metropolitan areas, with their attractions and their problems. When we see the same TV shows, read the same newspapers, perhaps elect the same Congressmen, and send our sons off to the same wars, when our living standards rise together and the same economic declines bring catastrophe to both of us, our attitudes toward each other ought to reflect the closeness of our lives rather than create an artificial isolation.

Our families suffer equally and in the same ways from economic insecurity. I have seen surveys showing what farm families have had to give up as farm income has dropped over the last two years. Our people have had to revise plans to buy new refrigerators and new cars just as your families have had to do, and our children are dropping out of school earlier than we had hoped, just as your children are doing.

I talked before about the closeness of family units. I hope it is clear that I did not mean the kind of closeness that comes with living in a house that is too small and substandard. Bad housing is another of the problems which we share, and which injure city and farm child alike.

What can I say that hasn't already been said about the shortage of classrooms, and the disgraceful, even dangerous condition of many of the classrooms we do have? We continue to pay teachers substandard pay and as a result a large part of our teaching staff is inadequately trained and all of it suffers from serious economic injustice.

Yet, I cannot believe that this problem, and the other problems of housing, health, and economic insecurity cannot be solved if both city and rural America join to solve them. Our country has the means and the resources. Our population and our wealth continue to grow, to the amazement of skeptics both here and abroad. Let us direct our efforts to the development of the kind of understanding that neighbors ought to have of each other, so that we may work together to make our neighborhood include all of America, and make it the finest, the cleanest, the best that our hopes can picture. Let us bring to bear

on these problems a mutual appreciation of our shared devotion to the qualities of democracy, of compassion, of neighborliness. No matter how serious our problems may be, it must be our faith that together we can find an equitable and workable solution.

RURAL EDUCATION FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF BUSINESS

WALTER D. FULLER

*Chairman of the Board
Carnegie Publishing Company*

By the very nature of things, businessmen have a high regard and a highly sympathetic feeling toward rural education. In the first place, a very large percentage of them have come from the farm or from the small town. In the next place, the nature of their activities is such that they hopefully expect to attract a substantial part of their working force from the rural areas. The reasons are, of course, that these regions generate a spirit of hard work and a desire to get ahead, which are exactly what every intelligent businessman wants in his working force.

In considering the problem of rural education, it is interesting to know that according to U. S. Census Bureau figures 57.7 percent of the young people of America between 5 and 29 years of age are located in rural areas. Moreover, 47.6 percent of this group are enrolled in rural schools. Although urban young people between 5 and 29 years of age constitute 59 percent of the total population, their school attendance totals only 56 percent.

The Census statistics show a higher percentage go to schools in rural areas. It is reasonable to suppose that this also indicates a clearer alertness and ambition. It seems clear to me that the desire of the businessman to recruit workers from rural areas is a reflection of this situation.

There appears to be a greater zest and desire for education in the country than in the city. Certainly that is all to the good. We are all familiar with the old adage: "Three generations from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves." Personally, I have a feeling that there is some good influence which comes from the soil and that when the generations get too far away from the farm or small town they begin to deteriorate.

With these facts as a background, isn't it obvious that the businessman should properly look to the rural and small town regions as the great heart section of America? American business wants to continue and advance our free economy. In order to do so, it is clear there must be public understanding and support for the things that are fundamental to such accomplishment. Most businessmen feel that the intelligent and informed operation of a free market, rather than dictatorial government direction of the economy, is the road to more jobs and greater prosperity for all.

Centralized controls and, to a degree, centralized business has become an increasing part of the job of the Federal government. At present the government is operating more than 1,000 manufacturing and service enterprises. Their present value is estimated at between 25 and 50 billion dollars. Today the government is the Nation's largest single employer, the largest financier, the biggest buyer of goods and services, and the largest dispenser of welfare funds. The more government grows, the further it gets away from the local communities. Experience in other countries certainly shows that as centralized government takes more power, personal freedom diminishes. The great repository of freedom in this country, and, I think, largely the principal reason for our tremendous growth, has been the independent spirit of the local communities.

Certainly there is every prospect today that, while there may be some occasional roadblocks, our whole trend is upward towards better living and wider opportunity for everyone. With a baby being born every eight seconds in this country, the Nation's population is increasing at the rate of more than two million persons per year, thus creating new needs for goods and services. The statisticians estimate that there is a possibility, if it is handled properly, of a 60 percent increase in the standard of living for everyone over the next 20 years.

Do you know that it takes on the average approximately three and a half billion dollars of consumer expenditures to support one million employed persons?

The figures also show that for every billion dollars of disposable income, about 250,000 persons are employed, or, at present rates, a one percent change up or down in disposable income could increase or decrease employment by from 400,000 to 500,000 persons. Thus the employment figure varies up and down depending on the volume of business. These factors affect rural communities seriously because the sensitivity to change in economic conditions usually hits the country district hardest.

Now when we talk on the subject of education, I think we must look at the subject as a whole rather than piecemeal. Many of you present are in formal education, and formal education certainly is the leader in the educational effort. Nevertheless, there are other forms of education. There is travel, there are books, there are libraries, there is correspondence school education, there are newspapers, and don't forget magazines which are my branch of these activities.

For example, the October issue of the *Ladies' Home Journal* is largely devoted to schools and education, and the theme of approach is "Let's Attack the Problems . . . Not the Schools." You will be interested, I think, with the editorial box which appears on the cover. It reads: "Our school problems, financial and philosophical, must be solved by informed citizens. We offer these stories and articles, not as a cross-section or endorsed solution, but to stimulate those who must grapple with similar situations in their own communities." Five million copies of this October issue will be sold and they will be read, to greater or lesser degrees, by many millions of people. In particular I point to a personal narrative beginning on page 161 and titled "I Quit Teaching." Following this material is another narrative titled "Teaching is My Life." I am sure you will find these interesting.

All of these magazines, books, newspapers, and less direct activities are forms of education. They can be of great advantage to the teacher and they can do a job beyond the teaching job which would be almost impossible to cover otherwise. As a matter of fact, a friend of mine who is in formal education said to me very recently: "I believe that the two most powerful influences in the nation—education and the magazine press—have joined forces for constructive action on a purely voluntary basis." This statement was made at a joint conference of magazine editors and educators, held in June. He goes on to say of that meeting, "We engaged in mutual criticism of policies and techniques with the end in view of serving better the welfare of the American people through the greatest mass media of communication ever developed in human history . . . Hence there came to light a new appreciation of vital issues affecting American education today, and there developed the beginning of a properly critical approach to the process of resolving the inevitable conflicts between forces seeking to inform and instruct through schooling and publishing."

I believe that the rural schools, in common with urban schools, have very serious problems ahead of them. There are more youngsters than ever before, fewer children are dropping out of high school, and more are going to college—which is all to the good.

Education, like everything else these days, costs money. I am told that almost nine billion dollars were spent to operate our public elementary and high schools in 1953-54. But even at that, we are spending proportionately less of our income on schools today than we did in 1930. Most businessmen agree, I think, that we need to spend more.

Classes, in many cases, should be smaller, and effective teaching requires the use of modern tools and instruction, modern techniques, supplemental books, magazines, etc. It would be fine if schooling could more generally include subjects other than the three R's. I mean such matters as art, music, home economics, physical education, and so on. As a step in that direction, I understand that many rural school districts now have special mobile units which take shop and laboratory equipment from school to school for teaching agriculture, industrial arts, and homemaking. Films and books, also, are circulated by mobile units to those children who live in sparsely settled areas where enrollments are small and distance between schools is great. Then there is the whole question of an up-to-date approach to the problems of the individual—problems that need psychologists, career guidance counselors, and other types of specialists.

Schools need more teachers and more classrooms, and, of course, that means more money. The Office of Education points out that 56 percent of all classrooms surveyed in 43 states are overcrowded on the basis of minimum standards proposed by the National Council on School House Construction, and estimates that more than 340,000 new classrooms are needed this fall. The price tag on this many new classrooms would be between 10 and 12 billion dollars.

Since 1950 the annual production of teachers has dropped 25 percent, which means nearly 35,000 fewer teachers a year. We urgently need more teachers. I do not have more recent figures, but according to a *New York Times* article several years ago, over half of the teachers employed in this country were in

rural schools—some 500,000 out of close to a million teachers in all—but these totals are shrinking rather than expanding. Based on enrollments for the current year—a total of almost 32 million students—I am told that we need at least 100,000 more teachers than are available. By 1969—when it is estimated there will be several million additional students in our public schools, over and above the current enrollment—we may need 200,000 more teachers.

The problem is complicated by the fact that teachers, like everyone else, grow older. They retire, die or leave the profession. I am told that during the past four years some 300,000 teachers have left the teaching profession. I am also told that some 85,000 new elementary teachers are needed at present—about half in rural schools. Yet, only 35,000 trained graduates, qualified to teach elementary schools, came from colleges this June, and the number of graduates qualified to teach physics and chemistry amount to only 867. What are we going to do about it?

Certainly we must encourage more people to enter the teaching profession, and to make the financial rewards attractive enough for them to remain in it. That means higher salaries. I understand that the average salary being paid this year to public school teachers is \$3,600—but 29 states had average salaries below this so-called national average, and three states are paying classroom teachers an average of less than \$2,500.

The other evening I was talking with a lady who was indignantly proclaiming that a doctor charged too much when he called at her home and treated her husband who was ill. His fee was \$5. I had the temerity to point out to her that if she called a television repairman, she would pay a larger sum for a brief call to adjust her set. Yet, these figures are consistently higher than what we pay our teachers. Supply and demand is a great problem solver in our country, and in time I am sure it will solve this particular problem. The difficulty is that we are frequently very slow to realize a situation.

Businessmen have, however, an acute and growing realization of the importance of our American public school system, and that is just as true of the rural schools as it is of the city schools.

All of us must be concerned with the curriculum of rural schools, the teachers, buildings, and facilities necessary for a good educational program for young men and women. This includes those who remain on the farm and thus provide our future national agricultural leaders, and those leaving their rural communities to build their careers in the cities where they go to work in business and industrial establishments. We must be sure that these young people, when they come to the city, come with an educational background and with sufficient marketable skills so that they can adjust to the working environment of the plant and the social environment of the city with the greatest satisfaction to themselves on and off the job.

They must be prepared to compete for jobs and progress on the jobs with the young people who have been educated and trained in the urban educational institutions. They meet with keen competition, and I am referring particularly to the young people who come to the cities before they complete high school, or upon completion of high school, but without college background.

Certainly it takes money for rural communities to furnish the facilities and the educational program that I am referring to. Competent teachers with adequate salaries, salaries comparable to those in urban communities, must be provided. Industry and business must help. On the other hand urban communities should provide an educational background for those young people who may be interested in going to the rural communities for the building of their careers. Some of the best teaching and training for young people is found in rural communities. I need not tell you of the effectiveness of the agricultural and home-making courses in rural schools—training ties in day by day to the homes and family life of young people—witness the 4-H Club and FFA students with their courses in school and their projects at home and on the farm.

What is the solution for these and our other major problems today? I don't think I can do better than quote from Bernard Baruch's recent book on *A Philosophy for Our Time*: "To do better we must discard the notion that any problem is solved simply by having the government take charge of it." And then, "If democratic self-government is to survive, we must now be able to think things through for ourselves."

RURAL EDUCATION FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF AGRICULTURE

THE HONORABLE EZRA TAFT BENSON

U. S. Secretary of Agriculture

The importance of education to all the people of the Nation is part of the basic philosophy of President Eisenhower and his Administration. No nation is stronger than its people. No people can be strong without being informed. Our security and our freedom depend on an informed people.

Not only the future of agriculture, but the future of the Nation depends on how well we develop our young people. The young men and women from today's farms will be tomorrow's leaders—in the cities as well as in rural America.

To me there are no more important people anywhere in the world than those who make up our agricultural economy. They represent one of the great stable forces in America—one of the safeguards—one of the bulwarks against foreign "isms" and crackpot programs. I am grateful that my lot has been cast with such stable, substantial, sound-thinking people as those who make up farm and rural America.

Many Americans in positions of leadership today proudly point to their rural heritage. It has been estimated that four out of five of the Nation's leaders throughout its history have come from a rural environment. Most of our Presidents, even in recent decades, have come from such an environment—including President Eisenhower.

Yes, the Nation has looked to rural America for a majority of its leaders, and even more important, it has looked to rural America for the ideals which have made this Nation a land choice beyond all others.

And yet, these present-day leaders of rural heritage would be quick to point out that there are also grave disadvantages in farm and rural living. The greatest is the comparative disadvantage in educational opportunity. Many of these leaders, fortunately for themselves and for the Nation, were able to overcome the lack of rural educational opportunity by attending colleges and universities in the cities.

But who can say how much the Nation and the world have lost because many, many thousands in the rural population were unable to overcome their educational disadvantages and thus were unable to develop their God-given talents. I suspect it may be a little bit like an iceberg. Those who overcame their disadvantages are the small part of the iceberg that we see above the surface. But for everyone who was able to do this, there were many others who remained submerged.

We cannot afford to submerge the talent of our rural people—rich as we are. We cannot afford the luxury of unused abundance—and that applies to our youth as well as to our crops.

The connection between education and successful farming is crystal clear. In general, farmers who are high school graduates produce more than elementary school graduates, and elementary school graduates produce more than those with less schooling. Broadly speaking, therefore, *education adds up to income*. The average farm person has about two years less schooling than his city neighbor. In addition, rural schools are less effective, perhaps because rural teachers are not so well paid or well trained.

As we work to correct this, we must bear in mind that the farmer is carrying more than his share of the load for educating his children. Throughout a child's unproductive years, his farm parents must feed and clothe him as well as see that he is educated. Once the young man or woman has gone to college, he or she may head for the city. Thus, in many instances, the farmer who invested his time and money in bringing up his children gets no economic return in terms of production when the children are grown. That's not really so cold blooded as it sounds. It is simply a realistic appraisal of what's been happening for years.

Despite the relatively higher birth rates in rural areas, heavy migration from farm to city has caused the total farm population to decline from 32 million in 1920 to approximately 25 million in 1950. Since 1950 this trend has continued and farm population is now estimated at about 21.7 million.

More than half of the young farm men and women reaching maturity during the 1940-50 decade left the farm before their 25th birthday. Without attempting to make an accurate forecast, we can safely assume that a very large proportion of farm young men and women will go from farm to city in the present decade also.

In view of this trend, it can easily be seen that the welfare of farm and rural people is closely tied to the welfare of urban people. And the security and

well-being of people in the cities depend very closely on the welfare and well-being of our rural population.

This is one of the reasons why the Department of Agriculture has always been interested in education. As a matter of fact, the Department pioneered in adult education almost one hundred years ago. From its earliest days it has been an assembly of teachers, researchers, and scientists.

Education in all phases of farming and farm living has helped American agriculture to keep pace with technology, to improve and increase the Nation's productivity, to better its home environment, to spread the goodness of its harvests across all 365 days of the year. Yes, to give America the highest standard of living on earth.

The educational challenge of tomorrow, however, is even greater than the challenge of the past. We are a growing Nation. Our people make ever greater demands upon agriculture. To meet these demands, our farmers will have to increase efficiency, improve quality, and lower costs. The American farmer is today the best informed farmer in the world—but he must be even better informed tomorrow.

It is obvious that the changes taking place in agriculture require more general knowledge and specialized skills than were needed to become a successful farm operator in the past. We have been well aware of this problem. That is largely why such stress has been placed on research and agricultural education in the past 20 months. We know how important research and education are to farmers.

One of the major problems today is to get research results translated into action. The time lag between the discovery, or the development, of research results and their application on the farms of the Nation has been, and is, too great. We must all work harder on this phase of the research-education pattern. We need a better system of two-way communication between research and farmers.

Through research our agriculture is constantly being rendered more efficient and productive, our farm houses more convenient and comfortable, our farm people more prosperous and secure. I challenge you to help speed up the flow of research from the laboratory to the farm.

Today, agriculture in the United States is an inexact science—The Lord still has something to say about the weather and the way crops grow. But thanks to the way education has spread among the farmers on every level, that science is better known to more people than in any land in the world. More farmers are college graduates than ever before. Our land-grant college system is flourishing. Rural education is making a greater contribution today than at any time in our Nation's history.

As most of you know, a large share of our attention, in the Department of Agriculture, so far has had to be given to development of a realistic price support structure. This was a pressing problem. It could not be postponed. But President Eisenhower, and we in the Department as well, realize that price supports are but a small part of the answer to parity of rural living.

Right now, for example, we are trying to learn what can be done for the under-employed and low-income farm family. The low-income farmer and his family have been the forgotten man of agriculture—and government.

I suggest that when this report is completed, you in the field of rural education read it. Agriculture was prosperous when the war ended. Since the war, we have seen amazing improvements. It probably seemed that all farmers were sharing in the progress and prosperity. They weren't. Many farmers have reached some degree of financial security. But many others are just as poorly fixed as ever. There still are plenty of farmers with only 40 acres and a mule.

I could give you statistics about production values, man-hours, and a lot of other things. But what these all boil down to is that more than a million farmers in this great land of ours make less than a thousand dollars a year.

In view of the rapidly increasing output per man-hour and the trend toward fewer people on farms, it is obvious that help for low income farm families must proceed along two lines: First, the productive resources of those low-income families who will remain in agriculture must be expanded and developed to enable them to raise their level of living. Second, opportunities must be provided for many young people now on farms to migrate into industrial and non-farm areas and jobs where they will be able to make a better living. The Department has been studying these questions and expects to have some sound recommendations before too long.

It is clear, however, that the key to the problem is educational in nature. But formal, school education isn't enough. We need more county agents. We need more home demonstration agents. We need more trained people to give their time and skill in counselling rural youth about jobs.

I call upon you today to work out cooperation among county and state and federal agencies.

Call upon your leaders in government, industry, labor, and agriculture for help in guiding the footsteps of young men and women from the farms.

You will find these problems less forbidding than you think when all of you work together to solve them for your own communities.

We must be realistic about the fact, also, that half of our farm youths are leaving agriculture for non-farm employment and living. Greater emphasis is needed in rural schools on the training of farm youths in non-farm skills. Such courses would be extremely valuable in enabling part-time farm operators, or those who operate inadequate farm units, to improve skills they might use in such jobs as operating grain elevators, farm equipment selling and servicing, operating cotton gins, etc.

In many rural areas the general level of schooling needs to be improved. I am thinking not only of more adequate buildings and equipment but of better-rounded courses and higher quality of teaching.

One way we are trying to help correct this is by cutting taxes—and by cutting the cost of government. The administration feels that you can spend your own tax dollars for better schools far more efficiently than we can spend them in Washington.

As far as the Department's education programs are concerned, we feel that they should include more information about the kind of public assistance that is available. Thus, more farm and rural people will know about these programs and be able to take advantage of them.

I want to give you this assurance: The Department of Agriculture will do all it can to help improve rural education.

Specifically, we will:

1. Work to expand education in the field of market research, in farm and home planning, in housing and health, and in developing greater opportunities for rural youth.
2. Help devise better methods of agricultural communication in order to help farmers and city people understand each other better.
3. Strive to strengthen the family-type farm.

The family farm is the backbone of our agriculture, and indeed of America. The moment we lose sight of that fact we will place the freedom and the security of our Nation in jeopardy.

The family farm is as American as ham and eggs or apple pie ala mode. We started out that way. Our people on family farms have been the bulwark and the safeguard of the American way of life. They have done more than any other group to keep our Nation young and vigorous.

This Administration is dedicated to a continuous program of progress for the family and American rural life. We regard the Agricultural Act of 1954 not as a complete solution of our agricultural problems, but merely as a step toward the ultimate goal of a truly prosperous, productive, and free agriculture.

We are setting the stage for bigger and better things. We are prepared to hear and consider your ideas on what we can do to make rural America a better place to work and live.

You and the farmer whose children you teach represent a great safeguard against those who would destroy our way of life.

In your hands . . . and on your blackboards . . . there is the freedom of tomorrow. For freedom is in the hearts of men.

Along with President Eisenhower, I am convinced that we can have peace and prosperity at the same time.

But remember this! *You can't legislate prosperity!*

The strength of what we do today will come from the sound, economic and reasonable cooperation among men.

Freedom and security go together. When you go back to your classrooms, to your lecture halls and to your homes take with you the thought that we can have both in America. One without the other is meaningless. Instill that in the hearts of your young men and women, along with a love for their country and the way of life that gives them free choice for their lifetime.

Selected Divisional Addresses

Addresses to the 15 Divisions which make distinctive contributions or are not fully utilized in the topical treatment presented in Part I, arranged alphabetically by author.



POPULATION TRENDS AND DISTRIBUTION IN RURAL AREAS

CALVIN L. BEALE

*Agricultural Marketing Service
U. S. Department of Agriculture*

Certain aspects of rural population affecting education have changed only in magnitude or degree in the intervening years since the White House Conference on Rural Education of 1944. It was pointed out in 1944 that migration from farm areas was high; that the farm population was declining in numbers; and that increasing numbers of people were living in rural non-farm residences and commuting to industrial employment. These statements are still valid. On the other hand, there was no intimation in 1944 of the sustained revival of the birth rate that the nation has experienced and of the great increases in school enrollment of which we have as yet had only a foretaste. Rather the 1944 meeting reported a stationary or declining national population in which most of the people would be descended from those rural groups whose birth rates were still ample because of geographic isolation or religious tradition.

In discussing the rural population today, mention should first be made of the fact that the census definition of "rural" was considerably pruned in 1950. Rural population as used in the census data no longer includes the suburban fringe of large cities, nor unincorporated towns such as those characteristic of mining and textile areas. The resulting definition of rural as the population living outside of places of 2,500 inhabitants and beyond the built-up fringe of large cities is a much cleaner one. It handicaps analysis of historical trends, however, since it cannot be applied to past censuses.

Under the new definition, there were 54 and one-quarter million rural people in the United States in 1950, comprising 36 percent of the total population. There is no question but that the rural proportion of the population declined somewhat between 1940 and 1950. Within the rural population there was a great difference between the growth pattern of farm and non-farm areas. Several factors combined to draw millions of people away from the farms. Military service, the great expansion of industrial activity, the extension of industrial plants into rural areas, the rapid mechanization of agriculture, and major improvements in yields for many crops each played a part in influencing nearly 9 million people to move off the farm, or at least to abandon agriculture, in the 1940's. From a 1940 level of 30 million, the rural farm population was down to 25 million by 1950, and today is but a little more than 21 and a half million—all this without a decline in agricultural production.

Concurrently, the rural non-farm population has greatly expanded. It would appear to have grown by at least 35 to 40 percent during the 1940's, and more than 10 percent since then. In general, the increase has been especially large around the periphery of the nation: the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Coast lines, the Pacific Coast and Southwest, and the lower Great Lakes area. The farm to

non-farm shift in the rural population has proceeded so rapidly that the farm population which, less than 15 years ago, comprised 55 to 60 percent of the rural population now constitutes less than 40 percent of the rural total. It is quite obvious from the nature of some of the inquiries that we receive at the Department of Agriculture that there is a considerable lag in public awareness of this dramatic change in the composition of the rural population.

In the aggregate the total rural population is growing and should continue to grow. The most rapidly growing segment of this population is children of school and preschool age. The increased birth rate that has prevailed since 1941 shows no immediate signs of falling. In each year since 1946 there have been more births than the population analysts just the year before had predicted there would be. There will be about 4,000,000 births in the United States this year as compared with an average of about 2,500,000 in the years just before the war.

Although a tremendous amount of public attention has been centered on the current shortage of teachers and school facilities, it must be recognized that the greatest increases in enrollment are yet to come. The high schools are as yet unaffected by the baby boom. The junior high schools are swelled only by children born in the early war years when the annual number of births was not above 3,000,000. Only the elementary schools have felt the impact of the revived birth rate in all grades, and even here the upper grades have not yet been crowded by the extraordinary number of children born in the postwar years.

It is, I think a fruitless job to attempt to predict rural school enrollment with real precision on a national scale. To do so, one must predict the course of the birth rate and death rate, the proportion of children at any age who will be enrolled, and the course of migration between urban and rural areas. Believing it necessary, nonetheless, to provide some estimate of the magnitude of the job ahead for rural schools, we have prepared a projection of rural enrollment at ages 6 through 17 for the years 1955, 1960, and 1965.

Table I

Projected Rural School Enrollment at Ages 6 to 17, for the United States, October 1955, 1960, and 1965, and Current Estimate October 1953

Year	Age					
	Total 6 to 17 years	6 years	7 to 9 years	10 to 13 years	14 and 15 years	16 and 17 years
1953	11,721,000	1,414,000	3,238,000	4,069,000	1,733,000	1,267,000
1955	12,621,000	1,344,000	3,959,000	4,292,000	1,741,000	1,285,000
1960	15,195,000	1,408,000	4,418,000	5,651,000	2,082,000	1,636,000
1965	16,156,000	1,323,000	4,173,000	5,860,000	2,731,000	2,069,000

We believe Table I to be reasonably conservative. Even a sizeable margin of error would not invalidate the picture they present of the large increases in enrollment to come.

For ages 6 through 17, the prospect is for a 30 percent enrollment increase by 1960 over 1953, and a 38 percent increase by 1965. The immediate problem facing the elementary schools is a very heavy increase in children from 7 to 9 years old. The number of children enrolled at these ages may be more than 20 percent greater in 1955 than it was in 1953. Total elementary enrollment should reach a peak shortly after 1960 and then slowly recede—until the children born in the 1940's begin to have children of their own. Enrollment at junior high and senior high ages will continue to increase beyond 1965. Rural enrollment at ages 14 to 17 years will probably increase 60 percent in the next 10 years. Part of the increase at high school ages stems from the fact that the proportion of rural youth who seek a high school education is growing.

While the specific problem posed by these figures places unprecedented pressure on school facilities, the generalization to be made from the history of the American birth rate since the depression is that it is very responsive to economic conditions and the social climate. For the last 15 years we have lived under conditions conducive to marriage and family formation. Should the national economy ever falter in the coming years long enough for people to lose confidence in the immediate future, the birth rate might easily be once again depressed to a low level. A cyclical pattern of birth produces many strains on the educational system, but it is a pattern that we shall probably have to live with, and accept as normal in the years to come, unless economic cycles are eliminated or minimized.

The fact that rural families are larger than urban families is a familiar story, as is the fact that this situation affects the ability of rural people to provide adequate financial support for education. It may be well here, however, to mention the relative number of school-age children to adults in the labor force. In rural America, there are 62 children from 6 to 17 years old for every 100 persons in the labor force, while in urban America there are but 43 children of school age for every 100 working adults. In other words, rural areas have an educational load per worker nearly half again as great as do urban areas. It should be noted, however, that this traditional disparity in the educational load has lessened in recent years, for the increase in the birth rate has been greatest in urban areas where the number of children per family was previously low.

The fact that the rise in the birth rate has not been evenly distributed among all classes of the population has some very important implications for education. Before the war, families were largest among people with small incomes, poor education, and unskilled occupations. High school and college graduates as a class were not bearing enough children even to replace themselves. But with the advent of the war and the return of prosperity childbearing rose principally among the middle and upper classes where it had previously been most severely curtailed. Thus, the children who are in the elementary schools today come in much higher proportion from the well-educated segments of the population than

did the elementary children of 10 years ago, or, possibly, than do the high school children of today.

Among children born from April 1942, to April 1947, there were nearly one million more born to mothers who were high school graduates than there would have been had the rise in the birth rate been distributed in a representative manner among all educational classes. Conversely, there were nearly one million fewer births to mothers having less than a high school education than might have been expected. As a result, these children probably come from homes where there is more interest in the child's education and also in the school where he receives it. The upward trend in the proportion of children who attend high school may well be accelerated when these children reach high school age. As a class, their job aspirations may develop to be high, and somewhat different, from those of preceding groups of children. The sustained level of the birth rate in recent years has also seen the lessening of differences in family size between non-farm occupational groups in the population. Farmers and farm laborers still have substantially more children than do non-farm workers. But among the non-farm group, the professional or business man's family is much more likely today to be the same size as the carpenter's or the truck driver's than it was 15 years ago.

There has been a leveling of childbearing among the various income classes that is without precedent in American history. A survey, conducted by the Bureau of the Census in 1952, showed that among non-farm families where the wife was old enough to have substantially completed childbearing before the rise in the birth rate, there was a consistently inverse association between income and size of family. In other words, the greater the income the smaller the number of children. Families where the husband's income was less than \$1,000 had averaged about 70 percent more children than had families in the highest income class measured, which was \$7,000 or more.

In marked contrast to this situation, among families where the wife was less than 45 years old, family-size differences by income class had been wiped out to a degree far exceeding the expectations of those who conducted the survey. There were virtually no differences among families of over \$1,000 income. In fact, if there were any real differences, they were in the direction of more children among the \$5,000 and over income class than among the \$1,000 to \$5,000 class. Families in which the husband earned less than \$1,000 remained the class of highest fertility, but they only constitute about 4 percent of married couples at present. One of the characteristics of the higher birth rate among middle and upper income groups has been a decided decline in the proportion of childless couples and an increase in the proportion having at least two children. Thus a greater proportion of the couples upon whom the tax burden falls most heavily now have a personal interest in the welfare of the schools, because they have one or more children of school or preschool age.

The story of the increases in the birth rate just presented is most typical of the rural non-farm population. The farm birth rate has risen only moderately since then. The trend is towards medium-sized families. There has probably been a substantial rise in births among prosperous commercial farmers whose

families had been rather small as farm families go. The large family which had been common in many farm areas is becoming less common today.

The 1950 Census indicates there is no clear connection between farm family size and economic class in the North and the West. Well-to-do farmers average almost as many children as do farmers of low income. In the South, however, there is a sharp progression of family size with declining value of farm products produced. Prosperous southern farmers average fewer children than prosperous northern and western farmers. But, small-scale southern farmers have larger families than small-scale farmers elsewhere. Thus, in the North and West, school children in farming areas are likely to come in representative proportions from the various economic classes. In the South, children from farms are more heavily weighted with those from low-income families. It will be interesting to see whether the pattern of family size among Southern farm families develops in the future as it has in the North.

Since the vocational preparations of children is a major function of the schools, it may be well to turn our attention to the question of what rural people do for a living. It is obvious from census data that the occupational distribution of the rural population is not a static thing. Some occupations have expanded, some have held their relative place, and others are diminishing in frequency. The major occupation classes, shown in Table II are ranked from top to bottom according to their general socio-economic status. This ranking, which was developed by the Bureau of the Census some years ago, is not one of income alone, but involves factors of prestige also. In the rural population, farming was still the one most common occupation in 1950, with farmers and farm laborers accounting for 35 percent of all workers. The next most frequent class was operatives and kindred workers; that is, persons engaged in manual pursuits, more than half of them in manufacturing, for which only moderate amounts of training, or dexterity, are required. The only other group containing at least 10 percent of all workers was craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers. Familiar jobs in this class are: carpenters, electricians, mechanics, painters, plumbers. Rural workers were fairly evenly distributed among the remaining major occupation groups.

The distribution of the farm and non-farm rural workers was rather different. Only 10 percent of rural non-farm workers were directly engaged in agriculture. Nearly one-fourth were operatives, largely in manufacturing, transportation (especially truck driving), and mining. About one-sixth were craftsmen, particularly carpenters and mechanics. There were also substantial numbers of managers, officials, and proprietors (especially retail trade), and of laborers, largely in durable goods manufacturing, construction, and lumbering. In the farm population about 70 percent of workers at the time of the last census were farmers or farm laborers. Of the remainder the largest single group were operatives. Like rural non-farm operatives they were principally factory operatives, truck drivers, and miners.

The following is a list of rural occupations that have rapidly expanded in recent years. All of the occupations mentioned grew by at least 50 percent in the

nation as a whole between 1940 and 1950, and it seems probable that they have grown at similar or greater rates among rural workers.

In the professional class: accountants, and auditors, college teachers, draftsmen, technical engineers of all types. Managers, officials and proprietors in construction, manufacturing, wholesale trade, and eating and drinking places. In the clerical field, and among women only: bookkeepers and cashiers, secretarial help, and telephone operators. Sales positions have grown rapidly for women but only moderately for men.

Among craftsmen: masons, carpenters, electricians, cranemen, and road machinery operators, factory foremen, public utility linemen and servicemen, automobile, office machine, radio and television mechanics, plumbers, sheet metal workers, and tool and die makers.

Among operatives: laundry and dry cleaning work, welders, and operatives engaged in saw milling, metal industries, and the manufacturing of machinery, transportation equipment, food products (except meat), paper, and chemicals. Among service workers: bartenders and waitresses, female cooks and attendants in hospitals and institutions.

The following occupations are declining in relative importance, some experiencing a net decline in the number of workers, others barely maintaining their numbers:

Lawyers, farmers and farm managers, filling station proprietors and managers, male bookkeepers and cashiers, bakers, blacksmiths and forgemen, metal molders, filling station attendants (excluding mechanics), deliverymen, mine workers, tobacco manufacturing operatives, domestic household

Table II

Percent Distribution of Rural Labor Force by Major Occupation Group, for the United States, 1950

Major occupation group	Total	Rural rural	Rural non-farm	Rural farm
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Professional, technical and kindred workers.....	5.3	7.5	2.4	
Farmers and farm managers.....	22.7	2.3	48.7	
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	6.0	9.1	1.9	
Clerical and kindred workers.....	5.2	7.5	2.4	
Sales workers.....	4.0	6.0	1.6	
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	11.4	16.6	4.9	
Operatives and kindred workers.....	17.1	23.7	8.7	
Private household workers.....	1.9	2.6	1.1	
Service workers, except private household.....	4.4	6.6	1.5	
Farm laborers and foremen.....	12.3	5.7	20.8	
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	6.9	9.5	3.7	
Occupation not reported.....	2.7	3.0	2.3	

workers, barbers, beauticians, male waiters and fountain workers, male farm laborers, and common laborers in almost all phases of manufacturing.

This is the national picture although local conditions may vary. The demand for many occupations changes, and occupational trends must be kept abreast of, if the vocational portion of the school curricula is to have meaning.

One of the pertinent trends in the labor force since depression days is the increased employment of women. Women now comprise about a fifth of all rural workers; and one-fourth of rural women between 20 and 50 years of age are in the labor force. A new pattern which revealed itself in the 1950 Census is the practice of substantial numbers of women re-entering the labor force in their late 30's and 40's when the children no longer require full-time attention. More than half of all working rural women are married women living with their husbands. Barring an economic situation that places obstacles in the way of employment of married women, their present large-scale labor force participation appears to be here to stay.

The employment trend in the farm population is worthy of special note. With the decline in the number of people living on farms, one might presuppose that the remaining farm population was a somewhat "purer" one in the sense of being the hard core of people whose economic activity is almost solely concerned with agriculture. This is not the case. Non-agricultural employment and part-time farming are on the increase. A survey recently completed by the Census Bureau and the Agricultural Marketing Service shows that between April 1950 and April 1954, the number of farm people engaged principally in agriculture dropped by one and two-thirds million while the number working primarily outside of agriculture rose over 100,000. In these four years, the proportion of farm people working primarily outside of agriculture rose from 30 percent to 38 percent. One seldom finds a characteristic of the national population changing as rapidly as this.

To persons with a rural philosophy of life, the decline in the farm population, and its increasing dependence on traditionally urban modes of employment, may be cause for lament. But there seems to be no prospect in the foreseeable future of a reversal in the current trend. Agricultural economists agree that further mechanization of farming operations, consolidation of farms, and the resulting higher capitalization of the average commercial farming enterprise, form an irresistible trend that will see many more low-income farmers and farm laborers leave agriculture before it has run its course. Somewhere there is a limit of course, especially with our growing food requirements, but it is not at all unlikely that in 10 years from now the farm population may be only one-tenth of the total population.

Presently, about half of the farm children leave the farm upon reaching maturity. Even if the size of the farm population should stabilize, the farm birth rate is sufficiently high at its current level that only about three-fourths of the farm boys would be needed to replace farmers who die or retire. The obvious conclusion is that for many farm youth, their ability to enter the labor force in a skilled and remunerative job is dependent upon the preparation they

receive in their schools for non-farm employment. This is not a novel statement, but it deserves reiteration in 1954. By the same token, it is commonplace to say that farming itself has become a much more skilled job than it used to be. In 1950 the average value of farms producing a minimum of \$2,500 worth of products was \$26,500. It requires more than the folklore of traditional agriculture for a man to manage a business of such magnitude.

In summary, I have pointed to four trends in the rural population that are major factors affecting education.

1. The balance between the rural non-farm and the rural farm population has shifted.
2. Rural schools face a very heavy increase in enrollments.
3. The resurgence of the birth rate has been centered among families of good education, skilled occupation, and adequate income.
4. The occupational structure of the rural population is increasingly oriented to the non-agricultural economy.

CULTURAL CHANGES IN AMERICAN RURAL LIFE

ALVIN L. BERTRAND

*Associate Professor of Rural Sociology
Louisiana State University*

In the discussion which follows culture will be understood to mean "the continually changing patterns of learned behavior and the products of learned behavior—including attitudes, values, knowledge, and material objects—which are shared by and transmitted among the members of a society."

In the light of this definition of John F. Cuber, culture can be said to encompass all the activities and patterns which are developed in human association. The products of culture can vary from material artifacts, such as mechanical cotton pickers, to non-material innovations, such as price support programs.

Culture becomes important to the sociologist because his primary concern is human relationships, and every human action is culturally orientated. In this connection sociologists have determined societies to be complex but complete and functioning unities, not just collections of persons and groups. In theoretical language this phenomenon is called social organization.

The importance of any particular social organization, such as rural social organization, is determined by the number of bonds or ties that bring individuals together (in an effort to satisfy their wants and desires) and by the influence the organization has in shaping their social behavior. The impact of cultural innovation has and will continue to change human relations in the rural areas of the Nation which, in turn, will necessitate further social adjustment.

In this paper the term "rural" is interpreted rather loosely. No attempt is made to differentiate between rural farm and rural non-farm, although the orientation is toward the former.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES

Within the last decade and a half significant changes in the number, distribution, and composition of the rural population have taken place. These changes have been casually related to cultural factors associated with technology, war, and economic well-being. They include:

1. An absolute as well as a total decline in the total farm population.
2. A long-term decline in the national birthrate, with the differential between rural and urban rates being reduced.
3. A slow but steady decline in the rural mortality rate, with infant mortality declining more rapidly than general mortality rates.
4. A marked reduction in the number of non-white families in rural areas.
5. Extensive out-migration of rural youth of both sexes from 15 to 35 years of age.
6. Aging of the rural population.
7. Changes in regional distribution of farm population.

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

Social institutions are generally defined as well-established patterns for meeting various human needs. The major institutions center around certain fundamental human needs such as economic, family, government, education, and religion. Important changes studied in each of these areas of human activity are listed below.

Economic Changes: The rural dwellers struggle for existence is essentially carried on within the framework of economic activity. As a consequence the economic represents one of the most important spheres of influence in rural life. Changes of this nature seem to be more closely associated with the phenomenal increase in technology in rural areas of the United States than with anything else. A short inventory of significant trends of an economic nature follows.

- I. Changes in farm organization and tenure including:
 - (1) An increase in the size of farms.
 - (2) A decrease in number of farms.
 - (3) An increase in the productivity of the farm worker.
 - (4) Increased specialization of farm workers.
 - (5) An increase in owner-operated farms.
 - (6) A decrease in the number of sharecroppers and unskilled laborers.
 - (7) Increased commercialization of farms.
 - (8) An increase in total values of farm products produced.
 - (9) Shifts in type of farming in certain regions.
 - (10) Increased use of technological innovations in farm production.
 - (11) More use of innovations increasing and improving production of livestock and plants.
 - (12) Increased dependence on non-farm personnel.
- II. Changes in capital requirements and credit institutions including:
 - (1) Increase in capital investment in farms and needed to begin farming.

- (2) Increased use of custom work.
- (3) Decrease in the supplementary non-monetary considerations accruing to farm workers.
- (4) Buying and selling in larger quantities.
- (5) Increased dependence on outside markets, credit institutions, and economic conditions.

III. Improvements in levels of living including:

- (1) Increased use of electricity, running water, and non-solid fuels.
- (2) Greater per-capita income.
- (3) Increased leisure time.
- (4) Increase in number of automobiles.
- (5) Tremendous increase in radios and telephones, with television sets becoming popular.
- (6) Increased subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals and more use of library facilities.
- (7) Improved medical and health facilities.

Changes in the Family: The rural family has long been important in America because of its role as the "seed bed of the nation." It has already been shown that it is gradually relinquishing this role. With increasing technology and urbanization it seems certain that the trend for smaller families in rural areas will continue. There are also indications that many of the rural families' economic, protective, recreational, and educational functions are being passed on to other institutional areas of the greater society. There is an increasing tendency for rural people to take advantage of such facilities and practices as mental hospitals, homes for the aged, Florida vacations and kindergartens.

Along with the above, there is indication in current research reports that important changes in family organization are taking place. For example, it has been noted that family authority is moving from a patriarchal to an equalitarian pattern and that the roles and status of wife, siblings, and husband are changing. Certainly, the family unit is not as self-contained as it was in previous years. The above demonstrates that the rural family is undergoing profound cultural changes.

Political Changes: Legal institutions are slow to change, especially in rural areas. Nevertheless there is evidence that changes of a political nature are underway. These changes, apparently, are parallel to changes in the greater society and represent efforts to consolidate, centralize, and integrate governmental activity. Some examples may be cited:

1. The ever-increasing demand for good roads, irrigation projects, drainage projects, etc., has meant that these projects have been taken from the jurisdiction of the local county administration in many places.
2. Local problems in connection with water rights, sub-surface rights, and zoning are increasingly being referred to the state and national judiciaries and legislatures for settlement.
3. Increasing technology has on occasion given rise to conflict situations and made it necessary for legal authorities to define and enforce rules of behavior, such as in the displacement of tenants.

4. Government has increasingly changed rural culture with its programs of inspection, quarantine, standardization, and grading.
5. Legislative programs of subsidy, price support, loans, and relief have changed the farmers planning and outlook greatly.

The influences of one important political change are less obvious. This has to do with the diminishing voice of rural groups in political decisions. With the proportionate number of votes coming from rural areas decreasing every year the interests of rural dwellers are suffering. For example, the Louisiana Legislature finally passed a stock law after years of opposition on the part of farm groups. Should the farm bloc lose its power in Congress many changes of this nature can be expected.

There are indications that rural local government is slowly moving from its traditional autonomous and familistic nature, with more specialized leadership being sought. It also seems that rural political campaigns are losing some of their distinctly recreational flavor. At least notices of mass picnics and barbecues are not as apparent as a few years back.

CHANGES IN RURAL EDUCATION

The major trends in American rural education in recent years seem to be toward the equalization of educational opportunities of rural and urban children. There is, of course, a wide gap yet to close. In the above connection one finds school consolidation programs underway making possible better equipment, more competent teachers, and a greater emphasis on vocational training.

There is also a very noticeable trend for rural people to make more use of informal means of education. Today 92.6 percent of rural homes are equipped with radios, and television is coming as fast as new stations make their appearance. The number of periodicals, newspapers, and books in rural homes has also increased manyfold with recent years.

CHANGES IN RURAL RELIGION

Religion has from the founding of the country been one of the major social forces in rural areas of the United States. Recent trends indicate a decline of the rural church. Not only is a decline in the number of rural churches reported, but attendance and support are down. No doubt these changes are related to the trend toward urbanization. It is possible, however, that other factors are involved. Perhaps the increased sophistication of rural dwellers has affected their religious life. It is certain that many persons have shifted their church membership to town churches in order to take advantage of better facilities and a better educated clergy.

CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY PATTERNS

Another place where cultural change in rural areas may be noted is in neighborhood and community patterns. Lowry Nelson has defined the rural community as "that form of association maintained between the people and their institutions in a local area in which they live on dispersed farmsteads and in a village which usually forms the center of their common activities." Within the

larger community areas there are smaller groupings of farm families holding together for social activities, social control, and to maintain church and school programs. These lesser entities are identified as neighborhoods.

Changes have been brought about in community and neighborhood patterns by the innovations already mentioned. The cumulative effect has been to make the rural community and neighborhood, as traditionally defined, tend to lose their identity. In this connection, it is significant that several rural sociologists have recently suggested that perhaps rural-urban differences represent a continuum rather than a dichotomy. The direction of change has been observed and studied by a great many researchers, working in many states. On the basis of their conclusions, two general areas of change may be isolated as of major importance.

The first is the increasing centralization of social institutions. Without exception social scientists studying inter-actional patterns in rural society have concluded that such institutions as the church, education, family, economics, and government are being concentrated in the larger urban centers.

The second well-documented change in rural community organization is found in the increasing multiplicity of special-interest groups. The tendency observed in this connection is for individuals to give more and more attention to specialized group associations but to decrease the intensity of participation in each group. Said another way, many more formal clubs, societies, and organizations are to be found in rural communities. These groups are recruiting their membership from persons who heretofore limited their participation to informal gatherings for the most part. Documentation for the above trends can be found in a dozen Experiment Station bulletins on the subject of rural social organization throughout the country.

CHANGES IN RURAL SOCIAL PROCESSES

Here are a few observations relative to changes in rural social processes. In the first place, the basic social process of opposition (competition and conflict) is being modified and redirected and becoming less personal. The second basic process, cooperation, is also experiencing a change in nature. For example, many small farmers are working and acting cooperatively to form machinery pools in meeting the competition of large mechanized units. Rural social differentiation and stratification is changing, with new groups being joined and formed as mentioned and new definitions of status symbols coming into play. By way of illustration the mechanization of farms is helping introduce a new type of class structure based on specialization. The demographic changes previously mentioned have certainly brought changes in the accommodative and assimilative processes in rural areas. All in all, many changes in the structure and functioning of rural society have been brought about by changes in the inter-actional patterns in rural society.

SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL CHANGES

In the final analysis social behavior is to a large extent determined by the mentality of members of a particular society or group at a given time. Character-

istics of this nature are classified as socio-psychological and involve values and attitudes as well as personality traits.

Although studies of values in rural society have been scarce, it is interesting to note that at least two conclusions are in evidence. Rural people feel: (1) That the rural environment has a great advantage as a place for healthful living, for obtaining the facilities for a good life, and for rearing children; (2) that the possibility of having a well-rounded educational and social life is limited and that opportunities for economic advancement are limited. The latter reasons are almost unanimously cited by rural youth for leaving the farm and shed light on motivation factors in urban migration.

Personality-wise, the rural dweller of today is less conservative and orthodox and less of an individualist than his forebear. Contact with more outsiders has also made him less suspicious of strangers at the same time that it has made him less outspoken and frank. In other words his personality is assuming the characteristics of his city cousin who is dependent on keeping a careful tongue if he is to survive economically and politically.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Rural organization is developing into a more and more complex pattern of groups, many of which meet only highly specialized needs. In the terminology of Durkheim, the organization of society is more along an organic than a mechanistic basis. Thus groups are held together or maintain cohesion because of a division of labor and a specialization of tasks rather than because of homogeneity of character.

In the terminology of Tonnies, the transition taking place is from *Gemeinschaft* relations (those developing unconsciously or sub-consciously) to *Gesellschaft* relations (those entered into deliberately for the achievement of recognized ends). The followers of Cooley might describe the phenomenon as changing group relationships from the primary type (that based on intimate face-to-face contact) to the secondary type (that based on special interests).

Whatever the terminology, recent cultural changes in rural areas boil down to the fact that human relationships are becoming less personal and more impersonal. The transition is more or less traumatic and this has led my fellow rural sociologist, Sam Blizzard to suggest the term *Culturalectomy* to describe the removal of old culture patterns. Whether or not the patient survives will depend a great deal on the rural educators of the Nation.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CONCEPT FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

M. L. CUSHMAN

*Dean, College of Education
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota*

Education in the United States has always been a community enterprise. This is particularly true of rural education. The term "community school" has been variously defined. In general, it is a school which utilizes local community resources, which compensates for local community deficiencies, and whose general objective is the improvement of the quality of living of the people in the community.

I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who once said, "God must have loved the common people—he made so many of them." If one might paraphrase this expression, one could also say the He must have loved small communities and small schools—He made so many of them.

In the United States there are approximately 23,700 high schools. Of this number, there are 15,975 in rural communities. Only approximately 7,700 are urban high schools. In other words, two out of every three of the high schools of the United States must be considered as rural high schools. Most of these high schools are in communities in which there is only one school system, only one twelve-grade school. There are many communities which do not have any high school. But by and large the community schools in this country are found in rural communities. The average enrollment of these 15,975 rural high schools is approximately 158 pupils. Because these small schools are found in rural communities, it does not necessarily follow that they can be called community schools within the definition usually attributed to that term. One of the reasons why there are not more community schools in rural communities is the fact that educational administrators have not seen the implications of the community school concept for educational administration in general. There are about five areas in which the community school concept has implications for educational administration.

The first area has to do with the implications for the structure of the school district. As most of you know, the school district reorganization movement in this country is taking the direction of a community school district rather than some artificial kind of district such as the township or the county. Our experience of the past half century in the school district reorganization movement indicates clearly that *community schools* can better be developed in *community school districts* than in other social or political units. However, the neighborhood, for example, can be a social unit utilized for school attendance purposes. Our experience also indicates that good schools make good communities, and good communities make good schools.

One can, with a reasonable degree of confidence, predict the quality of the school on the basis of the quality of the community itself. Many of you have had the experience of visiting a typical American rural town, and noting in some that the streets are well paved, the store fronts are modern in appearance, yards are well kept, driveways are paved, the streets are well lighted at night; there are parks and public playgrounds, there is a minimum of friction among groups in the community. When one sees these general outward appearances of a good community he can feel reasonably confident that the school in that community is a good school.

On the other hand, if one drives into a rural community and finds store fronts which are dilapidated and old, if one finds the streets poorly paved, yards unkept, little landscaping, few recreational opportunities, visitors not assimilated in the community, and friction among various groups in the community, one might reasonably conclude that he will usually find a relatively poor school in that community.

The study by Truman Pierce, "Controllable Community Characteristics Related to the Quality of Education," indicates that there is considerable research evidence to show that the quality of the school is rather directly related to the quality of the community. That is why the school district reorganization movement has taken the direction of developing community school districts. Administrators in smaller communities must recognize this fact, must delineate the boundaries of their communities, and must utilize local community resources in the development of a community school district.

The second implication for educational administration involved in the community school concept has to do with the administration of the curriculum. The staff of the community school, if it is a community school, must make community surveys. They must utilize local community resources. They must capitalize on the abilities of lay people, bringing them into the school curriculum revision process. They must discover community problems, and be sensitive to community needs.

The administrator in analyzing the present curriculum, and in revising it must relate that educational program to the needs of the community in which the school is located. It is not what we see, but what we see in things that gives them meaning. Hence, the need for objective surveys to discover resources and problems.

When I was a superintendent of schools in a rural community in Michigan, the vocational agriculture teacher raised a problem which he was encountering with reference to the demands from the farmers of the community for utilizing the resources of the school. Farmers were asking the school to test their soil, to provide analyses of their milk, to determine butterfat content, and to give demonstrations for pruning their apple trees. One morning the teacher came to me and asked what he should do about these demands. I told him to take his vocational agriculture class out to this farmer's orchard and give a demonstration to the farmer and to the boys in his class on the pruning of apple trees. But that as soon as the boys had acquired the knowledge and the skill necessary to do the job effectively and the farmer was satisfied that he, too, could perform this

operation, he was to bring them back to school. I had at that time little conception as to the meaning of the community school, but I did feel that the function of the community school was education and not production. Some community schools are engaged as much in production as they are in education. This handicaps the school in reaching a larger number of people, and in bringing to bear its resources on the solution of many other community problems. Never do for a pupil (community) what you can get him (it) to do for himself (itself). Our purpose is not to get the job done but to make the community increasingly able to do the job itself.

The third responsibility of the administrator of the community school which is unique to him because of the fact that he has a community school, has to do with the securing of personnel with unique characteristics. The administrator in the community school must of course secure well prepared teachers. They must have in their teacher preparation programs rural sociology in order that they may understand the people and their organizations and their problems. They must have a background in rural economics. Too few of our rural teachers, and administrators, have understanding of the place of farmer cooperatives in the economy of rural communities. They are quite concerned with banking, with the corporate method of business enterprise, and the individual proprietorship and fail to realize that a large proportion of rural business is carried on through the cooperative method of doing business. The local co-op is as much a common feature of the typical rural community as is main street. But very few teachers and administrators ever take their classes to visit the local cooperative, whether it is a producer's cooperative or a consumer's cooperative, in order to find out who operates the business, what its structure is, what its purposes are, how its profits (if any) are distributed, and its general influence on the economy of the community.

These teachers must also be interested in their local community. They should understand ways of studying local geography, local government, and local social structure. The administrator must assist his teachers in making arrangements for local community surveys, for taking field trips, for building museums, and for writing a local community history. Many do not even have a history of the school. The administrator must give his teachers direction, inspiration, authority and freedom to proceed in building a community school. The significance of the community school concept for securing and providing freedom for teachers to build such a community school is much greater than usually supposed.

The fourth area of implications for the community school concept in the field of educational administration has to do with the planning of facilities and equipment. Good rural community school buildings are, or ought to be, unique. The pupils are usually housed in a single twelve-grade building. This building must be uniquely planned. It should have facilities for children, youth and adults. It must have provision for equipment for rest periods for the kindergarten youngsters who are, because of the necessity of transportation, in school all day. It must have meeting places, shops, laboratories, music facilities, library facilities, available alike to children, youth and adults in the community. In fact if the rural community school building is planned around and designed to

facilitate the community school program, it will be unlike the typical urban school building as well as many present rural school buildings.

The administrator in the community school district also has unique financial problems. It is necessary, since he must depend largely upon local property tax sources for his revenue, to work with his fellow administrators in the county, and in the state, to secure a higher level of state financing of education than is usually the case. Local tax leeway is almost non-existent. However, the development of community school districts in a state makes easier the securing of state equalization aid. A number of states illustrate this fact.

The community school can also better be secured if the state provides special aid for community school buildings. Almost half of the states now provide some kind of school building aid. States which have not done so could facilitate tremendously the development of community schools by making state aid for school buildings available in order to develop community school buildings.

Finally, the most significant implication for the development of the community school concept in the area of educational administration pertains to the leadership process. There is an intimate, almost indefinable relationship between the board of education, the superintendent of schools, and the people in the typical rural community, that exists almost nowhere else. This relationship is one in which there is a strong desire on the part of the people and their board of education to keep close contact with the day-to-day management of the school. This means that the administrator of the rural community school system must secure changes in terms of a demonstrated, recognized, and proven need. The administrator and his staff will secure what they want, or feel the school may need, by persuasion, by documentary evidence, and not secure change because of position alone.

The function of such leadership, both local and intermediate, is to bring community schools into concrete reality. We are living today in one world. We have been told that our world today is a neighborhood.

Shakespeare once wrote, "All the world's a stage." Today one might raise a question as to whether this is an accurate description. Perhaps we might be more realistic and say the whole world is the theater. The United States is the stage. And the rural part of the United States is where the action on that stage is taking place at the moment. Most of the world is the audience in this theater, and they are watching the rural scene. The reason the audience is watching the rural section of this stage is that the major portion of this audience is, itself, rural, consisting of something like one and one-half billion rural people, two-thirds of the total world population. They are the ones who want to know the outcome of the action of the play. The community school occupies a large portion of this scene. The people of the world, and the rural people of the United States particularly, have had enough experience in watching and participating in this community school to realize that it might be the hope of the world. The reason for this hope is the fact that on this stage the rural people of this country are dressed as business men, cultured, democratic, enterprising, free, citizen farmers, and not clothed in the raiment of peasants as is the case in other lands. They demonstrate through the rural education they have received the difference be-

tween autocracy and freedom, between education that berates and education that enslaves. The community school which they see unfolding on this stage is the heart of the intricate plot which in fact depicts the current struggle for the mind of man. The administration of the community school, therefore, must be built upon the commonly accepted concepts of democratic administration: (1) respect for personality, (2) faith in the power of human intelligence, (3) the right of each individual affected by policy to have a part in the determination of that policy, (4) the right to act through chosen representatives, and (5) the right to equality of opportunity. Administrators who adhere to these principles are in accord with the social and economic habits of people in rural communities. Adherence to these principles of leadership will enable administrators to develop schools that can achieve the status envisioned in the community school concept.

In summary, there are a number of community school concepts significant for educational administration. The community school has implications for the structure of the districts, for the kind of educational program to be made available to children, youth and adults, for uniquely prepared personnel, for buildings, facilities and equipment, and for administrative leadership. In fact, the community school philosophy almost requires a different kind of school, in its outward appearance, in the things that happen within it, and in the results to be achieved from it. This is a school so different from the rank and file of many schools now found in America as almost to make it a new school—as indeed it probably is. It is the function of administrative leadership, then, through these five major avenues to help the community school in America to emerge, not only because rural people need and deserve it, but also because on this world's stage there are so many other people watching the unfolding of this play that its outcome could spell the difference between civilization and catastrophe.

ECONOMIC CHANGES IN AMERICAN RURAL LIFE

OTIS DURANT DUNCAN

*Head, Department of Sociology and Rural Life
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
Stillwater, Oklahoma*

An understanding of changes occurring in the economic pattern of rural life is a prime consideration in the determination of future educational policy, not alone for the people living on farms but also for those residing in towns and cities as well. The voice of agriculture is the tuning fork which fixes the pitch for the tune of the great American chorus not only in singing the National Anthem but also in sounding aloud hymns of praise to the Creator of the universe. In short, agriculture is the soul of the Republic of the United States of America.

Seeing that whatever is important to agriculture is vital to all other phases of American life, this paper employs the adjective "rural" with reference pri-

marily to farm life and secondarily to those modes of life existing in direct adjacency to and in immediate dependence upon agriculture. This is for the sake of clarity alone, and not to proliferate an academic dogma.

The thesis of the discussion is that all economic changes occurring in agriculture either are converging upon a four-point objective, or that they must do so in order to insure national survival, or indeed the preservation of rural life itself. This objective may be resolved as a system of agriculture which will:

1. Maintain the family in a state of good mental and physical health
2. Provide the youth with educational and social equipment commensurate with the needs of their time.
3. Produce a surplus above current living sufficient to care for parents in old age.
4. Pay a rent sufficiently high to maintain the farm unit in a state of unimpaired, if not improved, fertility when it passes into the care of its next occupant.

Unless such a goal animates agricultural policy in America, the prospect for both rural life in particular and national welfare in general is one of gloom. Failure to achieve this goal will mean (1) the end of the farm family as the germ of American life, (2) the end of free democratic institutions in this country, (3) actual mass hunger and want, and (4) ultimate success for Communism on American soil. The purpose of the paper is, therefore, to show that while this goal has not always been spelled out carefully, it has been the underlying objective of American agricultural policy, especially since World War I, when it first became an imperious need.

One of the gravest dangers likely to thwart the realization of the goals for agriculture is that the cultural, technological, and economic revolutions now in process may occur with such speed as to be frustrating.

Before 1800, American farmers used practically the same technologies as did the Romans in the sixth century, B. C. During the nineteenth century agricultural technology changed more than it had since the beginning of time. Between 1900 and 1930 there was more change than occurred during the 19th century, and since 1940 change has been more radical than during all the preceding years of the 20th century. Little wonder that former President Harry S. Truman stated before the National Democratic Convention of 1952 that one cannot contemplate the potentials of the future because they are too fantastic.

Now it is proposed to examine in some detail certain fundamental changes in American agriculture on a national scale in order to gain a perspective of their enormity. What they mean for the future of rural education should become apparent as they are sketched.

CHANGES IN THE SIZE OF FARM UNITS

For at least fifty years, one of the basic problems in American agriculture has been the smallness of farm units. There grew up in this country an arbitrary notion that a 160 acre farm is sufficient. The Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 gave impetus to this standard in the old Northwest Territory. It was given an even greater stimulus by the Homestead Act of 1862. Then further promulgated

by the opening of the Oklahoma-Indian Territories to white settlement in 1889-1893. Throughout the South, especially just after the Civil War, there was the legendary ideal of "40 acres and a mule." It was only in the Corn Belt that a quarter-section of land approximated an economic unit, and it did so there by a most favorable conspiracy of natural climatic, soil, and market factors. In many places it was too large a unit to be managed under the technology of the 19th century, while in other regions, the Great Plains in particular, it has always been far too small a unit to provide stable economic base upon which rural life could depend with safety. As a result, the trend in size of farms has been generally upward since 1920, although the proportion of less than ten acres has risen even more rapidly than that of farms exceeding 100 acres in size.

Table 1

Percentage Distribution of Farms of the United States by Size for Different Census Years, 1920-1950

(Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 73rd Ed., 1952, pp. 579-580.) 74th Ed. 1953, PP. 616.

Size of Farms in Acres	Percent of Farms in Census Year						
	1950	1945	1940	1935	1930	1925	1920
All Sizes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 10	9.0	10.1	8.3	8.4	5.7	5.9	4.5
10 to 49	27.5	28.2	29.2	31.1	31.8	32.0	31.2
50 to 99	19.5	19.8	21.2	21.2	21.9	22.3	22.9
100 to 499	38.4	37.8	37.0	35.5	36.8	36.5	38.1
500 to 999	3.4	3.0	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.3
1,000 and over	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.0

According to the distribution shown in Table 1, farms under 10 acres in size increased in numerical proportion from 4.5 percent in 1920 to 9.0 percent of the total farms in 1950. Farms of 10 to 49 acres decreased from 34.1 percent of the total in 1920, to 27.0 percent in 1950. That means a decline of nearly 13.0 percent from the 1920 proportion. Farms of 100 to 499 acres remained almost constant in proportion between 1920 and 1950, allowing for chance errors of enumeration. Farms of 500 acres, or over, comprised 3.3 percent of all farms in 1920, and 5.6 percent in 1950, an increase of 69.7 percent from 1920.

Farms of less than 10 acres, regardless of a large relative increase in numbers, include a practically constant proportion, only two-tenths of one percent of all land in farms. They are mostly specialty farms, such as poultry, dairy, small animal, truck farms, or part-time farms. On the other hand, farms with 500 acres or more, included 33.7 percent of all land in farms in 1920, and 50.7 percent in 1950, an increase of 50.4 percent from 1920.

Table 2

Changes in Average Acreage Per Farm of All Land in Farms, 1850 to 1950 (Source: U. S. *Census of Agriculture*, Vol II, 1945, p. 73); 1950 Vol II, p. 4.

Census Year	Average Acreage in Farms			
	United States	The North	The South	The West
1950	215.3	194.4	148.2	702.9
1945	194.8	180.3	151.1	639.3
1940	174.0	168.6	123.1	501.5
1935	154.8	156.8	109.9	414.0
1930	156.9	166.2	106.4	433.3
1925	145.1	151.1	103.5	327.7
1920	148.2	156.4	109.2	362.7
1910	138.1	143.0	114.4	296.9
1900	146.2	133.2	158.2	396.1
1890	136.5	123.7	139.7	324.1
1880	133.7	114.9	153.4	312.9
1870	153.3	117.0	214.2	336.4
1860	199.2	126.4	335.4	366.9
1850	202.6	127.1	332.1	694.9

The shift to larger farm operation units is shown again by figures on the average size of farms (Table 2). From 1850, when the average size of farms was over 200 acres in most parts of the country, there was a general decrease in size until about 1880, when the average size had shrunk from 202.6 acres to 133.7 acres for the nation as a whole. During that cycle, the South reached its minimum size of farms, 139.2 acres, in 1890. In 1900, it seemed that the trend would be reversed for most of the country, but by 1910 it again moved in a downward course until 1925. Actually, it would be logical to say that the 75-year period (1850 to 1925) was one during which farm units grew generally smaller except when their average size was temporarily heightened by the opening of new lands in Oklahoma in 1889-93, and in other western areas around the same time. Since 1925, the average size of farms has increased in the North, South and West. Except in the South, where farm units are still less than half as large as in 1850, the average size of farms in 1950 had slightly exceeded the corresponding figures for 1850. In other words, the country is only now returning to the point in the agricultural cycle which it had attained 100 years ago.

We now have over eight times as many people to feed as in 1850. Much of the land available in 1850 was in the virgin state. Since 1890, bringing new land into cultivation has required much reclamation work, and expense. In 1850

men and animals were the sources of farm power, while in the 1950's machines do the work on farms. Farming was then a pioneer occupation, but now it is a commercial and industrial undertaking. In 1850 farming was done in order that men might live, while in the 1950's it is done to make money. In 1850, farming was an occupation of young men, but in the 1950's it has become a near monopoly of old men. In 1850, the problem was "How can we build rural schools?" while 100 years later it has become "How can we get rid of the rural schools our grandfathers built for us?"

CHANGES IN LAND TENURE

Land tenure, i.e., the rights of use conveyed by a given contractual relationship with reference to land constitute one of the most important economic arrangements in agriculture. Not only does tenure status imply a social position, but it provides also a method of division of labor, fixed and operative costs, and risks, as well as of apportionment of proceeds. It imputes managerial responsibility, determines obligations, and defines rights, all of which are "vectors" of the economic pattern. Farm tenancy has been credited with more evil and less benefit to mankind than any other socio-economic arrangement, with the possible exception of prostitution, the use of alcoholic beverages, and the opium trade. Not the least fierce of the allegations against the farm tenure system has been that it is destructive to rural education. Yet, every person who uses land in any way has an inescapable tenure relation to it.

The first agricultural census which took account of farm tenure was that of 1880, but it was not until the census of 1900 that the tenure data enumerated had analytical value. The data which permit consistent comparisons are summarized for the country as a whole in Table 3.

Table 3

Number of Farms and Tenure Distribution by Census Years, United States 1900-1950

(Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 73rd. Ed. 1952, pp. 581-582).

Census	Number of Farms	Percent of Farm Operators in Tenure Class			
		Full Owner	Part Owner	Manager	Tenant
1950	5,382,162	57.4	15.3	.5	26.8
1945	5,859,169	56.3	11.3	.7	31.7
1940	6,096,799	50.6	10.1	.6	38.7
1935	6,812,350	47.1	10.1	.7	42.1
1930	6,288,648	46.3	10.4	.9	42.4
1925	6,371,640	52.0	8.7	.7	38.6
1920	6,448,343	52.2	8.7	1.0	38.1
1910	6,361,502	52.8	9.2	.9	37.1
1900	5,737,372	55.8	7.9	1.0	35.3

A larger percentage of farmers owned farms in 1950 than in any previous census year of this century. Moreover, ownership declined from 1900 to 1930, when it reached its smallest proportion, and has risen steadily through 1950. Meanwhile, part owners have increased proportionally. For practical purposes a part owner is a farmer who owns some land which he farms and farms some land which he does not own. The part owner in 1950 had gained prominence as a factor in agriculture. Whereas in 1940 and earlier, he accounted for only one farm unit out of ten or twelve, he held one farm out of each six or seven in 1950. This is one of the most obvious proofs that effort to adjust farms to economic size is of growing importance.

The farm manager, on the other hand, is statistically insignificant. Socially, he represents a connecting link between an absentee owner, an unsettled trusteeship, or a corporation of some kind and the farm. While he is often a manager of a large farm business, he is "a rare statistic," and seems to be of dwindling importance.

In 1950 farm tenancy was at its lowest point of the century. In 1900, they accounted for 35.3 percent of all operators, 42.4 percent in 1930, and only 26.8 percent in 1950. The immediate prospect seems to be for further diminution in this class of farmers, but with rigorous economic selection eliminating from that rank those without means for becoming self-sufficient. In many parts of the West, the most highly capitalistic farmers are tenants, especially cash tenants. They rent land to free their investments for current operation, or to shift the fixed costs of taxes, interest, and depreciation, as well as the high risks of climatic factors and pests, onto other shoulders. They exploit land mercilessly and carry on a highly competitive, commercial, and specialized cash farming enterprise. With their tractors, combines, six-ton-per-hour hay balers, and similar machinery, they literally put to flight the weak single-handed tenant farmer. What is more, they are a growing breed, especially in economic power, in the Southwest and the Wheat Belt.

CHANGES IN LAND USE

A division of land according to use is, at best, a crude way of forming a picture of the agriculture economy. Besides, the distribution of uses is largely a guess. Yet, in principle, this would be a sound and necessary procedure, if it were only possible to develop reliable measurements, which has not been done. Even with these limitations, the data available are significant.

The total land in the United States is fairly constant, about 1,905 million acres. The 1950 Census shows that this has been reduced slightly to 1,904 million acres, in recent years, presumably by the impounding of streams into lakes and reservoirs. Since the figure is fairly stable, one can deal in percentage almost entirely. Table 4 shows the percentages of land devoted to various uses from 1880 through 1950.

One of the most significant land-use trends in the United States has been the proportional increase in farm pasture land from 6.4 percent in 1880 to 25.5 percent in 1950. This trend has not been reversed once during that time. It

Table 4

Land Use Trends in the United States 1880-1950

(Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 74th Ed. 1953, pp. 609).

Type of Land Use	Percent of Land in Use at Census Year							
	1950	1940	1930	1920	1910	1900	1890	1880
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Farm Pasture	25.5	24.2	19.9	17.2	14.9	14.5	7.6	6.4
Cropland Idle-Failure	3.4	4.1	2.8	2.1	1.3	1.3	.8	.5
Cropland Harvested	18.1	16.9	18.8	19.0	16.9	15.5	12.2	9.3
Farmsteads, Lanes, etc.	2.4	2.3	2.4	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.2	1.9
Forests, Cut-Over	11.5	8.2	7.9	8.8	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Pastures not in Farms ¹	15.2	20.0	22.9	26.4	31.5	32.8	42.9	46.4
Other Forest Land ²	16.3	17.1	18.3	16.8	15.8	16.7	18.0	19.3
Other Land ³	7.6	7.2	7.0	6.7	6.6	6.4	6.3	6.2

¹ Includes arid woodland, brushland, and desert, about 100,000,000 acres of which are used for grazing.² Largely commercial forest land, about 110,000,000 acres of which are used to some extent for grazing.³ Estimates by the U. S. Bureau of the Census and the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Includes cities, parks, roads, railroads, ungrazed desert, and waste land.

indicates that farmers are increasingly letting livestock do the work which was once done by human labor.

The proportion of land in harvested crops rose from 9.3 percent in 1880 to 19.0 percent in 1920; since then it has shown a tendency to decline. In 1940, harvested cropland comprised 16.9 percent of the total, but in 1950 it made up 18.1 percent, having recovered some of the decline since 1920. There has been also a small but irregular decline in the proportion of all land in non-farm forests, from 19.3 percent in 1880 to 16.3 percent in 1950.

If current population estimates are accurate, the per capita acreage in harvested crops will decline shortly. In 1920, there were 3.3 acres in harvested crops per person, while in 1950, the figure had declined to only 2.3 acres per capita. Meanwhile, there were 11.0 acres in harvested crops per person on farms in 1920 as compared to 14.8 acres in 1950, although in 1920 there were 362 million acres in harvested crops compared to 345 million in 1950. More and more people are leaving the land, and the population is being agglomerated increasingly in cities. Americans are familiar with statements that great city populations, like those in New York and Chicago, would begin to perish in a matter of thirty-six hours, if cut off from their food supply lines. Hence, putting land

to its optimum use is one of the most crucial problems facing this Nation. Fortunately, we have had to wrestle with surpluses all our lives. That day may be over soon, unless some real "head-work" is done on the land question.

The consumption of commercial fertilizer is symptomatic of the increasing effort which must be expanded to make land produce. In 1880, American farmers used 1,150 tons of commercial fertilizer, 5,453 tons in 1910, 8,222 tons in 1930, 17,984 tons in 1950, and 18,666 tons in 1951. This has, to some extent, assuaged the population pressure on land. Prior to 1900, the corn yield averaged about 25 bushels per acre, wheat about 13 bushels, oats about 27 bushels, cotton about 175 pounds (lint), and Irish potatoes about 83 bushels. Since 1945, the corn yield has reached 37 bushels per acre, and a maximum of 42.5 bushels in 1948, wheat has averaged 16 bushels per acre, oats about 35 bushels, cotton about 275 pounds (lint), and Irish potatoes have averaged about 250 bushels per acre. Before 1900, the average yield of tobacco was around 750 pounds per acre, while it has not been less than 1,100 pounds per acre since 1944, and it averaged 1,307 pounds per acre in 1951. These sketches are typical of trends in farm production, but the obvious point is that by introducing the high producing hybrids, which as well as fertilizer account for increased yields, the farmers are merely taking out of the land now its potential productivity and are converting it into surpluses, for which the American consumer and taxpayer are being taxed, only to bedevil the national political administration. What is not so obvious is how much longer it can go on with endangering future national security.

MECHANIZATION OF AGRICULTURE

The number of tractors per 100 farms is the best single index to agricultural mechanization. It has been found that as mechanization increases, farm population under 25 years of age decreases, manpower on farms declines, there is a reduction in the aggregate and in the per-farm demand for hired labor, off-farm and part-time farm work decrease, non-white decreases more rapidly than white labor on farms, and wage labor is more affected (reduced) by machines than other tenure groups.

Of course, the grain combine is a complementary machine to the tractor, and it has grown in geometric proportions since 1920. In 1920, less than 5 percent of the wheat crop was harvested with combines, but in 1938 approximately 50 percent was "combined." By 1950, it was probable that 75 percent or more of the wheat crop was harvested by combines. By 1940, over 800 patents had been taken out for cotton picking machines, which are still in the development process, although they are being used on farms. Corn pickers, power irrigation, new processes of tobacco-curing, and hay balers capable of keeping four trucks busy with hauling are only some of the newer developments in farm machinery. Most of these machines also are tractor-powered.

In 1950, Kansas had about 10 percent of all combines in the United States. In the same proportion, there would have been 140 combines in 1917, 200,000 in 1928, and 250,000 in 1930. There were 373,687 in 1945 and 713,633 in 1950. The *Farm Journal*, March, 1952, pp. 89-93, shows a single-unit tractor-

combine outfit capable of harvesting five acres of wheat per hour, on which one man does the work of three nine-horse rigs run by five men each. That means one man now does the work of fifteen men and that one tractor does that of twenty-seven horses. With the 713,633 combines in use in 1950, and there are still more in 1954, 713,633 men now can do the work formerly done by 10,704,495 men, and that many combines can do the work of 19,380,091 horses.

It has been shown that the average size of farms is increasing. The use of combines varies directly with the size of farms. In 1950, only 5.6 percent of farms of 70 to 99 acres used combines, while 48.4 percent of those having 500 to 999 acres had them. For the North, the corresponding figures were 8.7 percent and 60.0 percent. The North is the part of the country where the "hired man" is an old tradition. His fate does not look too promising, in the light of what the combine does to labor. Even more precarious is the prospect of the migratory "harvest hand," whether in cotton, corn, or wheat.

These trends eloquently explain why, especially in the Great Central Plains, rural schools are on the verge of extinction while city schools must have two half-day sessions. They tell why Stockton, Missouri, for example, has consolidated 43 school districts and why many districts must run 20 or more school busses.

CHANGES IN LEVELS OF LIVING OF RURAL AMERICA

The foregoing changes in the economic pattern of the Nation's agriculture would present a frightening spectacle, if there were no way to measure their impacts upon levels of living. Happily, students have been at work on this for a number of years. The results of the chief research carried on nationally are summarized in Table 5.

Using the national average for 1945 as a base of 100, all sections of the United States have shown marked rises in levels of living since 1930, or even since 1945. While most sections of the South fall behind other parts of the country, that area, too, has shown a strong tendency toward improvement. The poorer areas of the country have shown even greater relative improvement than the wealthier areas.

Trends significantly correlated with the rising levels of living of the farm population include changes in proportions of farms with tractors, size of farms, proportion of farm income from livestock, and farms with sales of over \$1,000. Also positively correlated with the Index are commercialization of farming, proportion of farmers hiring machines and labor, percent of farm land in harvested crops, and the percent of the adult farm population with education above the eighth grade. Factors negatively correlated with the Index are percent of farmers with outside incomes greater than farm sales, ratio of expenses to farm sales, old age and child dependency ratios, and farm population per 1,000 acres in farms.

The indications are that various economic changes now proceeding rapidly in agriculture have meant improvement in levels of living of farm people everywhere. Nothing brought into the farm home since the invention of the wheel can have a more profound effect on the character of rural living than electricity, with its improved lighting, television, radio, and the scores of labor saving

devices which it makes possible. Its increased use of running water, bathrooms, and indoor toilets, if it had nothing else, would more than justify its costs.

Table 5

Average County Index of Farm-Operator Levels of Living by Geographic Divisions of the United States, 1930-1950 (US 1945 = 100)

(Source: Margaret Jarman Hagood, *Farm-Operator Levels-of-Living Indexes*. Washington: U. S. Dept. of Agr. BAE mimeo. Bull. May, 1952, p. 5).

Geographic Division	Index of Level of Living ¹			
	1950	1945	1940	1930
United States	122	100	79	75
New England	152	137	116	107
Middle Atlantic	152	139	114	100
East North Central	148	131	109	100
West North Central	147	126	100	107
South Atlantic	90	65	49	41
East South Central	74	48	35	34
West South Central	108	79	60	55
Mountain	139	115	92	84
Pacific	160	150	121	111

¹ This index is based on four weighted factors: percent of farms with electricity, percent of farm homes with telephones, percent of farms with automobiles, and the mean value in hundreds of dollars of farm products sold or traded.

CONCLUSION

To give a comprehensive review of economic trends in American rural life is a task too great for completion within a short discussion. Hence, it has been necessary to choose certain basic phases of the rural economy and to leave others to inference—to education, the size of farm units, the land tenure pattern, land use, mechanization, and levels of living are vital and fundamental. These five economic factors lay the ground sills of the economic system from which the educational machinery must derive both its human and its material support. They determine largely the need for education and the means by which it must be achieved.

From the outset, this paper maintains the position that contemporary trends in the agricultural system have been in the direction of finding and achieving an economic farm unit. The trends themselves prove this thesis. These evidences imply that the new economic pattern being molded for agriculture is not only in the direction of improving levels of living on farms but it is inherently antitheti-

cal also with the ideal of peasantry which exists in many agrarian philosophies. For agriculture apologists to expect farm families to subsist on a cow, a sow, a hen, a single-barrel shot gun, two hound dogs, a mule and a Georgia stock plow in an age of hydrogen and cobalt bombs puts reason to flight. Neither farm people themselves nor the other 85 percent of the population can live with such a gauche juxtaposition of economic machinery.

What these new trends mean in terms of education is that the "Little Red Schoolhouse" cannot survive much longer. As the ox-cart, the horse wagon, and the steam locomotive have bowed out before improved methods of transportation, more economical and more effective agents of education will close the one-room school, and maybe others with several rooms. This is more of history than of prophecy.

Larger machine-operated farm units will not produce as many children as there once were in country districts. Hence, the need for rural schools will become less urgent than formerly. Moreover, with the growing complexity of life, with augmented economic power, and with such concomitant cultural improvements as television, aviation, and rising literary levels, farmers will not be content with an outmoded educational system for their children.

Among many other economic changes, agriculture has become a specialized business. In so doing, it has waxed distinctly commercial, highly capitalistic, and intensely mercenary. This has led farmers, themselves, to eradicate most of the barriers which once differentiated the country from the city. Almost four decades ago, Dr. Charles J. Galpin pointed out that there cannot be two separate societies, rural and urban, but only one, a "rurban" society, in which each segment is a part of a complex division of labor in carrying on the total collective life. Whether one likes it or not, that time is here. This is the "rurban epoch." It is not an age in which farmers and city people have agreed merely to leave each other alone, but it is one in which each complements the other in a larger national economy in a sense never before realized.

The children of both farmer and urban businessmen will be taught in the same school and teachers will scarcely know who is the father of either. The forces which have wrought these changes are cosmic and are too gigantic to be subject to the will or wish of any individual. Teachers have no choice but to learn the ways of both country and city, for both will be housed in the same school. The old "rural-urban" dichotomy has spent its force.

For the future, the prospects are disconcerting, not for impending evil, but because they will necessitate adjustment to a new and unfamiliar way of life. Already, one-fourth of the farms produce three-fourths of the marketable farm products. This means that the processes of elimination will be at work on the three-fourths of the farms which are inefficient. They will be consolidated into larger units, and the people on them will join the industrial proletariat. Roads, schools, churches, and dwelling houses will be closed. Even cemeteries will be abandoned, as is now under way.

This does not mean the end of rural life, but only of an era under which this nation no longer can continue. It may bring some heartaches to see old homesteads demolished, little farms swallowed up by big ones, and to hear the braying

of mules supplanted by the puffing of tractors. Yet, the pain experienced at the demise of the old regime in agriculture is but the travail of a new era throbbing to be born in its stead. The reddish tint in its caboose lamps as it disappears around the curve are but reflections of the headlights of the first "golden age" which agriculture has even known, and of a prosperity the like of which the world at large has never seen.

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES

WILLIAM J. ELLENA

*Department of Rural Education
National Education Association*

Few educational responsibilities have greater far-reaching importance to the people of a state than the establishment of a sound local district structure for administering the schools. Keeping that structure adapted to changing conditions in our society by reorganization of small ineffective districts into larger administrative units more capable of providing needed educational services has for many years been a persistent problem in American education. It is also one in which much progress has been made, especially during the past 10 years when the total number of local school districts in the Nation has been reduced by more than one-third.

Results of school district reorganization may be viewed in a number of ways. Frequently it is measured in terms of the number of local districts eliminated by incorporating their territory into larger units. Results may likewise be measured by increases in the number of new districts having certain characteristics of size or other features commonly associated with adequate local administrative units. Such methods have obvious practical values in looking at the results of reorganization and assessing its progress. Their validity rests on the conviction that larger districts are more capable of providing the scope and quality of services required in a modern program of education than can be provided effectively and economically by districts of very small size.

The number of school districts in the United States steadily increased up to some time between 1920-1930. Since 1932 the number of school districts has undergone a continuous reduction. In some states, as a result of leadership and legislation, the trend has been spasmodically downward. Within the past few years the reduction in the number of school districts has occurred at such an accelerated rate that it may well be expected that the next decade will witness a further reduction of 50 per cent or more of the number of districts existing in 1950.

As a result of reorganization, the number of school districts in the United States has undergone a rather remarkable reduction: from 127,529 in 1932; to 98,312 in 1948; to 66,472 in 1953. This is a reduction of almost half

since 1932. The rate of reduction during the three year period 1947-1950 was 21.5 percent, and during the next three years almost as great, 18.6 percent. The number of school districts is really, in a sense, less than it seems. In 1952-53 only 55,335 school districts actually operated schools. There were 11,137 (one out of every six) legally constituted districts that did not operate a school. These districts either did not have any pupils or sent their pupils to school in another district, usually on some contractual or tuitional basis. Approximately 64 percent of these non-operating districts are located in five states: Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Mississippi.

These non-operating districts are remnants of a somewhat obsolete system of school organization. The reasons for the continuance of these districts vary. They are sometimes retained as tax islands to enable some persons and/or corporations to keep down or avoid the payment of local school taxes. In other instances they represent the last attempt of local people to hold on to the local school to which a loyalty out of a long past is attached. But gradually, such districts are on the way out. Their number was 2,802 fewer in 1953 than six years previously. Some states, notably Wisconsin, Illinois, and Kansas, have recently enacted legislation for abolishing non-operating districts within a specified time period.

In some states the extent of reorganization has been considerable. In the State of Illinois, for example, the number of school districts was reduced from nearly 12,000 in 1947 to about 2,500 at the present time. In Missouri, the number of school districts has been reduced by 48.3 percent in five years. Minnesota, under a statute with excellent provisions for planning by local citizens and officials of the State Department of Education, but with extremely vulnerable provisions for enabling a majority of popular votes from becoming effective has made steady advancement, having experienced a 30 percent reduction in the number of school districts in five years. In the Nation as a whole, 1,088 school district reorganization proposals were voted upon during the school year 1952-53; only 93 were defeated. Other bright spots as well as many cumbersome state statutes and procedures could be cited.

In a recent study made by the Department of Rural Education, the following facts were uncovered. Eight states—Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas and South Dakota—have 37,757 or 56.8 percent of the 66,472 school districts in the Nation. The same eight states have 9,332 or 83.8 percent of all the school districts that no longer operate schools. They have 24,822 or 61.3 percent of the school districts that operate only elementary schools, that is, school districts which are not designed for and not attempting to provide even the 12 years of schooling which are commonly accepted as desirable. They also have 26,476 or 54.3 percent of the Nation's 48,735 one-teacher schools. While the Nation as a whole has experienced a 31.3 percent reduction in the number of school districts in the last five years, the reduction in these eight states range from .7 percent to 13.7 percent.

In spite of the extent to which reorganization has taken place, most school districts continue to be relatively small. Last year about 30 percent of all

operating districts had employed nine or fewer teachers. The trend to abolish small districts, however, is reflected in the fact that in 1947 almost twice as many operating districts had employed nine or fewer teachers. Relatively large districts continue to be the exception. In 1953 only 6.5 percent of all operating school districts employed 40 or more teachers. If it could be assumed that the ratio of pupils to teachers was 30 to 1, probably a high estimate, fewer than one out of each 10 school districts in the United States had as many as 40 teachers and 1,200 pupils in 1953. We must conclude that, even today, most schools are small schools.

The number of one-teacher schools is also of persistent concern. In 1948 there were over 75,000 one-teacher schools in operation, though there were almost twice that many in 1930. By July 1953, there were only 48,735 one-teacher schools. One-teacher schools have disappeared most rapidly in the least rural states and in the states with larger school districts. Within the next decade this number will probably be reduced to approximately 25,000 to 30,000.

The process of reorganizing school districts requires a changing legal structure which results in the establishment of districts appropriate for meeting the needs of all children and communities. As we look at our experience in reorganizing districts certain trends can be identified. There is a trend toward the development of larger school districts. There is a tendency for the boundaries of these districts to conform to the natural boundaries of a sociological community. Another trend seems to be the combining of suburban areas with the urban areas while at the same time decentralizing the large urban centers. There also is some danger in the possibility that there may be a trend from permissive to mandatory legislation.

Another important but until recently neglected aspect of school district reorganization is the intermediate unit, so called because it functions between the basic school districts and the state department of education. The need for the intermediate unit arises from the fundamental fact that a great majority of school districts, especially of the community type, are not large enough to efficiently and economically afford all the services needed. Data already presented make quite clear the inadequacy of at least 95 percent of the existing school districts. They are small and most of them will continue to be small even with the fullest predictable reorganization. Under these conditions it becomes necessary to develop plans for strengthening and expanding intermediate service units.

Whether school district reorganization in each state is to effectively achieve its full potential depends upon such things as basic reorganization procedure, the recognition and desire of people for better schools, and ESPECIALLY the kind of educational leadership provided in our local communities, at the county or intermediate level, and in our State Departments of Education.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT IN SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

FRANCIS E. GRIFFIN

*Chief, Bureau of Rural Administrative Services
State Department of Education, Albany, New York*

The State Education Department can play a very important role in district reorganization. It begins with the policy of the state itself in this regard. Enabling legislation—if there is any—either opens the door or restricts the activities of the localities and results either in progress or inactivity. The State Education Department is in the most advantageous position to assess the merits of existing or proposed legislation. This is of number one importance.

In New York there appears always to have been enabling legislation to change school districts. We are fortunate that it is an accepted policy of state government that school districts may change. We would be handicapped in the extreme if we had no more flexibility than exists under laws for the changing of towns or counties. Several states lack any enabling legislation. Many states are solely handicapped by unworkable and poor legislation.

The consolidation laws in effect in New York shortly after the start of this century did not have popular support. The whole matter of consolidation was odious, especially to rural people. We might make conjectures as to why this was true. Certainly the consolidation of districts frequently multiplied the poverty of an area. The very rich districts could not be induced to join in consolidation. As a result, only the poorer, hardpressed districts considered it. Consolidation, unfortunately, brought on major financial problems, such as transportation of pupils, which invariably became necessary. Often the newly consolidated district faced the need to build a new school house.

The Commissioner of Education in New York in 1912 welcomed the new district superintendents who took office that year and, among other charges, urged them to "go home and consolidate." With some ten thousand districts available, the field was wide open. A survey of district organization in the next decade, indicates however, that very little consolidation took place. Most district superintendents undoubtedly would have committed professional suicide had they undertaken a broad program of consolidation at that time.

In America little succeeds without popular support. The consolidation laws were generally unworkable and little could be done to build effective school systems in rural areas under their provisions. *Here was a major problem for a State Education Department—securing good legislation that could receive a measure of popular support.*

Fortunately for New York State, good legislation was secured and the State Education Department played an important role in getting it. The first measure was passed in 1914 and constructively amended in 1924. This legislation took away the vested interests of individual districts so that the extraordinarily wealthy district could not by its own vote stop consolidation and thus avoid paying its

interests, unenlightened political influence, and an antagonistic press. It has striven to accept the burden of convincing—insofar as possible and on a state level—all malcontents and uninformed individuals of the merits of the law and the need for its applications. This occasions replying to thousands of letters and telegrams and meeting with delegations, large and small that descend on Albany.

Another feature of the Amendment of 1925 that has proved of great value provides for a six-six organization in all central schools. A determined effort was made to remove seventh and eighth grade children from one-teacher schools. The central school law permits the individual former districts to have a school for the first six grades if a school was maintained in that district prior to centralization. Since 1925 the central school districts have developed a junior-senior high school where adolescents are given the wider experience and advantages of that type of organization. The vast rural area of New York is almost 100 per cent under six-six organization.

New York also is currently freed from the evils of the superimposed high school district with a group of constituent but independent elementary districts. The department of education long discouraged application of this law and finally saw its repeal. Only four such districts now exist in New York.

The State Education Department also insisted that all transportation arrangements should be made to extend at least to the former school house of each of the districts included in the centralization. This was an important requirement.

The State Education Department under the Bureau of Rural Administrative Service in 1943 entered upon a somewhat different program of assistance to communities. Since district reorganization must have the support of the people and since difficult situations remained, it became more and more essential that all possible information concerning each proposal be assembled.

The Bureau of Rural Administrative Services coordinates the activities of the various bureaus and divisions of the State Education Department to assist communities in exploring an approved centralization, or other district reorganization proposal. The Bureau requires the proponents of a proposal to secure a local committee whose responsibility will be to study the matter in great detail but with the help of Education Department specialists. This finally entails two solid days of intensive work in the State Education Department in Albany. A special conference room is available for this purpose. Some 35 to 40 such studies are made annually.

Each such study consists of five sessions. The first one deals with the general provisions of the law, the Department's policies in the establishment of districts and the responsibilities of the local people in securing local support as required by the Department. In this session all kinds of questions are raised and each individual is encouraged to toss out his personal questions, no matter how elementary. Vagueness in the minds of the people about the law is cleared up. The discussion will include such matters as the securing of petitions, the preparation of brochures, amplifying the findings of the committees, representation on the new school boards, disposal of district assets, selling of abandoned school houses.

The Divisions of Secondary and Elementary Education of the State Education Department each provide a supervisor who, along with a supervisor of the Bureau of Rural Administrative Services, help the committee project educational plans six years in the future. The Department's staff have become highly skilled in shifting the responsibility for decisions to the lay people. Yet they are adept in guiding deliberations to assure adequate personnel, broad curricula, and so forth.

With the education planning completed, the School Buildings and Grounds Division provides help in determining the need for additional school building space. Discussions involve utilization of present plant, school house design, and economies of construction. The decentralization of elementary housing is usually a topic of great concern. The estimate of building costs is made on the basis of the most recent average costs of school house construction in the category and area under consideration.

Work in the field of transportation follows. Plans will be developed that define various routes and result in a determination of the new equipment called for, garages and personnel needs, and total costs, including operation.

The final phase of the study deals with the projection of financial plans. Supervisors from the Bureau of Field Financial Services will explain sound business accounting and budgetary practices. The groups are then called upon to plan budgets year by year to put into effect the educational plans worked out. They have the benefit of average state-wide costs for various-sized school systems for the numerous items of the budget. They will be told, for example, what the average school expense is for textbooks, supplies, library books, and so forth.

Decisions as to whether or not their expenses exceed or fall below the state average in the various categories of the budget are for them to make. Teacher salary schedules are discussed and the group becomes acquainted with the state's minimum salary law. They also learn about the apportionment of state aid. Equalization formulae now apply to both transportation and building aid so that the richer central district will receive less than the poorer district measured on a valuation per pupil basis.

The detailed information obtained as a result of this two-day study goes to the local superintendent of schools when completed by the State Department of Education staff. The Bureau of Rural Administrative Services stands ready to meet locally with the committee to discuss the various phases of the materials before a general dissemination of information is undertaken. The Bureau urges preparation of a brochure which will serve to acquaint the citizens with the facts of district reorganization and edits the publication for accuracy.

Last year, 614 people visited the Bureau of Rural Administrative Services for these studies. They came from all parts of the state and represented nearly all walks of life. The chief value, of course, comes in their having helped make their own plans and in their becoming fully aware that the job of school district change is a local one which will not be ordered by a bureau in Albany. This group provides a strong nucleus for the expansion of lay activities which have involved in many communities between 100 and 200 people all organized with assignments and responsibilities laid out subcommittee by subcommittee.

This technique results in strong support for district reorganization. Note for example the votes secured in 23 districts reorganization projects successfully voted in the year ending June 30, 1954. A total of 35,164 people voted—28,206 in favor and 6,958 against.

The studies, moreover, have proved to be valuable in the protection of district reorganization laws. Largely as a result of the information gathered for some 50 proposals, the state legislature was induced during the past decade to increase the equalization monies to central school districts by 12 percent—a notable achievement at a time when competition for the tax dollar is so great.

In connection with the enlarged city school law, for which the Bureau of Rural Administrative Services is responsible, the studies of the groups working with the Education Department have resulted in new legislation providing substantial increases in state support which was shown definitely to be needed when the facts were all in.

TRENDS IN FARM AND RURAL INCOMES AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION

E. W. GROVE

Agricultural Marketing Service

U. S. Department of Agriculture

Farm families, and probably also rural non-farm families, are, on the average, economically better off now than at any time before World War II. They are not as well off now as they were during a few war and early postwar years, when inflationary forces, both in this country and abroad, gave a strong boost to farm income. But except for this period, approximately 1943 through 1948, plus a brief post-Korean flurry in 1951, they are better off now than ever before.

They are better off in the sense that their real incomes are higher than they used to be. They are better off in the sense that their incomes are higher than they used to be *in relation to urban incomes*. The trends in income over the past 25 years or more have been relatively favorable to farm people and to rural people in general.

The distribution of income—the size distribution in terms of high and low incomes—the geographic distribution by states and counties—the occupational distribution in terms of farm and nonfarm occupations—the distribution of income in all three aspects remains relatively unfavorable to the rural population. It is *less* unfavorable than it used to be—but still relatively unfavorable.

INCOME OF FARM OPERATORS

The last few years have produced what is known as a "cost-price squeeze" in agriculture. Stated very simply, it means that prices of farm products have been falling at the same time that farm production costs have stayed firm or have actually increased. In terms of income, it has meant that farmer's net income has been squeezed between declining farm income, the result of falling prices, and a high and relatively inflexible cost structure.

During 1947 and 1948, net income started on its downward trend because production expenses were rising much faster than gross income. Farmers' net income also rose sharply, and reached an all-time high early in 1947. Gross income increased somewhat further during 1947 and the first half of 1948. But farm expenses rose much more rapidly than gross income in this latter phase of the postwar inflation, so that the peak in farmers' net income was reached more than a year earlier than the peak in their gross income.

When gross income began declining in 1949, its decline was not accompanied by any significant reduction in expenses, and by the first half of 1950 farmers' net income had lost all the gains it had made following the lapse of price controls.

Farmers' prices and gross income recovered rapidly in the second half of 1950, following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea—and continued upward to new record highs in 1951. With costs also rising, however, net income regained only half of its previous loss.

The squeeze was resumed in 1952, and continued in 1953 and 1954. Farmers' prices and gross income have declined, expenses have generally stayed high, and as a result net income has declined.

Farmers' net income is currently estimated at around 12½ billion dollars, or 25 percent below the all-time high of 1947. However, the present level is just about the same as it was in 1950 before the Korean outbreak—and just about the same as it was before the lapse of price controls in 1946.

But while farmers' incomes have been considerably deflated, there has not been much deflation in the rest of the economy. The cost of farm family living is currently at an all-time high. Before considering farm operators' net income any further, we need to deflate it by the index of prices paid by farmers for family living items, to determine what has happened to the purchasing power of farmers' net income.

We find that the purchasing power of net farm income has declined 35 percent over the last 7 years as compared with a drop of only 25 percent in net farm income itself.

But there is still one more adjustment to be made if we want an accurate picture of the situation. This adjustment has to do with the number of farms among which total income is divided.

During the 1920's and 1930's there were 6½ million farms in the United States. But the last 15 years have seen a decided trend toward larger and fewer farms, and their number is now not quite 5½ million. This decline of about 17 percent has taken place gradually, with much of it occurring during the recent postwar years. The decline in farm numbers, therefore, goes a little way toward offsetting the decline in total farm income.

The purchasing power of net farm income on the average farm today is down 30 percent from the peak year 1947. But it remains higher than in any year on record prior to 1942. Average net farm income per farm in 1954 has a purchasing power more than 50 percent greater than the 1939 average, and more than a third greater than the 1929 average.

TOTAL INCOME OF THE POPULATION

We have been discussing only the income of farm operators from farming operations. It is time now to expand the coverage to include the total income of the whole farm population. And to do this we must first add the income of farm-operator families from off-farm sources, and second we must add the income of farm-labor families and others who live on farms, besides farm-operator families.

Income from non-farm sources has always been of importance in the total income of farm families, and it has become increasingly important in recent years.

Recent surveys have shown that those farm families who have the lowest farm incomes are, by and large, the ones who get most of their income from non-farm sources. In 1949, for example, the average farm-operator family got 60 percent of its total money income from the farm and 40 percent from other sources. But if we divide all the farms in 1950 into two classes, high production and low production farms, according to whether they sold more or less than \$2,500 of farm products in 1949, we find that the high production farm families received on the average four-fifths of their income from the farm while the low production farm families received less than half of their income from the farms they operated.

In actual dollars, the average net farm income from high production farms in 1949 was over \$3,000, or five times as large as the average of \$600 for low production farms. In terms of total family income, the high production average was \$4,000, only 60 percent greater than the low production average of \$2,500. Thus, differences in the size of total farm family incomes are not nearly as great as differences in the size and productivity of farms might lead one to suspect.

Outside sources of income are also a stabilizing factor in the total income of farm people, since they do not fluctuate so much as farm income. The growing importance of these outside sources means the total net income of the farm population from *all* sources compares more favorably with some earlier periods than does the net income of farm operators from farming alone.

In determining average income, the number of people living on farms is a more appropriate divisor in this case than the number of farms. And the number of people living on farms has declined much more rapidly than the number of farms, partly because of a reduction in the average size of farm families, but also because the number of people living on farms in addition to farm-operator families has been reduced.

Because of this big decline in the farm population in recent years, the average per capita income from all sources remains almost as high now as it ever was. Even after adjusting the figures for increases in the cost of living, the decline from the peak year has been less than 15 percent. The purchasing power of per capita farm income is currently about 65 percent higher than in 1939.

The peak year for this particular statistical series, the purchasing power of per capita farm income, happens to have been 1944 when the last Conference on

Rural Education was being held. I can find in the published record of that Conference no recognition of the unprecedented prosperity that farm people were enjoying at the time. Of course, the prosperity was of peculiar war-time sort, compounded of high farm income, reduced farm population, and artificially low prices of industrial products which, however, could not be had at those prices. There was a general belief at that time that prosperity would not long survive the war itself. And there was a widespread fear that, for farmers at least, economic conditions would soon return to prewar levels after the war was over.

This was the atmosphere in which the last Conference was held. But it was a misapprehension. True, the artificial wartime prosperity did not last indefinitely, although it lasted many years longer than was anticipated in 1944. But there has been—and will be—no return of prewar economic conditions for farm people. The average person in the farm population nowadays is 50 percent better off than he was even in the *best* year of the 1930's. Furthermore, this improvement is relatively much greater than the corresponding increase in real income that has taken place for the average person in the non-farm population.

INCOME OF THE RURAL NON-FARM POPULATION

So much for the income trends of the farm population. By contrast with the farm population, the rural *non-farm* population is, statistically speaking, an underprivileged group. It has not been the particular business of any department of Government to be concerned about the size of rural non-farm incomes. And as a consequence, the available statistics on such incomes are meager indeed.

The only data meriting our consideration are those collected by the Census Bureau in its annual surveys of family incomes covering the years 1944 through 1952, plus the data for 1935-36 collected in the prewar Consumer Purchases Study.

The median income of rural non-farm families was \$1,200 in 1935-36, \$2,400 in 1944, and \$3,700 in 1952. There is no cost-of-living index precisely tailored to the pattern of living of rural non-farm families—as there is for both farm and urban families. Consequently, it is impossible to say for sure what has happened to the purchasing power or real income of the rural non-farm group.

If we deflate the median incomes just quoted by the index of family living costs, there would appear to have been a significant increase in real incomes of rural non-farm families between 1935-36 and 1944. Between 1944 and 1952, the increase in median income seems to have been only enough to offset the increase in living costs. This is, however, just as well as urban families fared during that period—and better than farm families whose average real income has declined a little since 1944.

Perhaps a better way to show what has happened to rural non-farm incomes is to compare them directly with urban incomes. In 1935-36, the median income of rural non-farm families was 82 percent as large as the median income of urban families. In 1944, the same ratio prevailed. But by 1952 the ratio had risen to 88 percent.

I think we may safely conclude that the trend in rural non-farm incomes over the last 15 or 20 years has, at the very least, been just as favorable as the trend in urban incomes. And the combined trend of incomes for the rural farm and rural non-farm populations has probably been considerably more favorable than the trend for the urban population.

STATE AND REGIONAL TRENDS IN INCOME

The discussion of trends in income would not be complete without some mention of how the trends in different regions and states have varied. We do not have state or regional income data specifically for the rural farm, rural non-farm, or urban populations. However, the Department of Commerce estimates of income payments per capita of the total population in each state have some bearing on our subject.

Half of the nation's farms, half of its farm population, and 40 percent of its rural non-farm population are in the South, which has less than a third of the total population. In other words, the South is still more rural in character than the rest of the country. Since it has also had historically low incomes, at least partly and perhaps mainly *because* of its rural character, it is of some interest to see how income trends in the South have compared with those in the rest of the country.

The Department of Commerce estimates of per capita income payments cover the period from 1929 through 1953. To measure trends, it seems best to compare 1953 directly with 1929.

Average income per person in the whole United States rose by 150 percent between 1929 and 1953. By contrast, per capita income in the 11 States of the Southeast rose by 240 percent over this same 25-year period. This differential change has meant that average income in the Southeast has risen from 50 percent of the national average in 1929 to almost 70 percent in 1953. Similarly, average income in the four States of the Southwest has risen from 65 to 85 percent of the national average over the same period.

A study of these state and regional income data show: that the areas which started at the lowest income levels in 1929 generally showed the largest percentage increases between 1929 and 1953. South Carolina, for example, starting at 37 percent of the national average, the lowest for any state, showed a phenomenal increase of 335 percent, the largest for any state. Florida started in 1929 at the highest per capita income level for any state in the Southeast, and its percentage increase was the smallest in that region. However, the Florida increase of 183 percent was larger than the national average increase.

These data make it clear that there has been a considerable tendency toward the equalization of the geographic distribution of income over the last 25 years. Contrary to the Biblical expression, to him that had not plenty was given, *on the average*, during this period. And this was due in no small measure to the favorable trend in farm and rural incomes that we have already noted.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

In looking through the published report of the 1944 Conference, I found that one of the subjects for group discussion was "*Paying for Rural Education.*"

In our present Conference, Division Six, which is meeting elsewhere tonight, has for its subject "*Financing the Education of Rural People*."

Perhaps I am drawing too fine a distinction. But the phrase "paying for," to me, has a slight note of desperation about it, as though there were some question as to whether payment could be raised.

It is much more dignified to discuss the "financing" of rural education, as we are doing. Financing implies that there is no question of payment at all. It is simply a question of how, or by what method, the money is going to be raised.

I hope the distinction that I have drawn is a real one. What is more important, I hope that it will prove to be justified.

As you may have inferred from the foregoing discussion of rising income trends, I think that the distinction may in some measure be justified on that ground alone—but not completely so by any means. Although rural people are generally better off than they used to be, they are still not as well off as city folks, there are still sizeable geographic pockets of depressed incomes in rural areas, and the rural population as a whole still includes a disproportionate number of low-income families.

In other words, the distribution of income is still relatively unfavorable to the rural population. This, combined with the heavy and growing educational burden which the rural population will have to bear in the next few years, means that the problem of payment is still with us in its original form.

CONCLUSION

I have given you enough figures to demonstrate that the distribution of income is still relatively unfavorable to rural people.

On a geographic basis, it would be easy to show that incomes in the South, though remarkably improved over the last 30 years or so, are still considerably lower than the national average. And low income rural areas outside the South are not particularly hard to find.

The conclusion can be restated in one sentence. Although farm and other rural incomes have improved, they remain relatively low.

A few rural farm counties have very high average incomes. Others, though not so high, compare very well with average incomes of urban families in the same state.

In most rural areas, however, average incomes remain low, and some means is still needed to offset or compensate for this disadvantage in providing for the education of the children in those areas.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT
ON CHILDREN

ANNE S. HOPPOCK

*Assistant in Elementary Education**State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey*

Two children I know illustrate the first point I want to make in discussing the impact of the rural environment on children. These two ten-year-old girls are cousins. Their families live in neighboring farm houses. The fathers rent their fields to nearby farmers and make a living as mechanics. A garden, a cow, and hens add to the family resources. Both sets of parents are high school graduates. They live fairly comfortably but with few luxuries. They spend a good bit of time together. The children walk a mile to the little school in the village.

Jane lives zestfully. She has a dog which she cares for faithfully, and with it roams the countryside. She is writing a book and consults gravely regarding her writing problems with a young teacher who lives in the neighborhood. She is intensely interested in plant and animal life and has a number of collections including several live items. She collects rocks and Indian artifacts. She is an inveterate researcher into the meanings of her out-of-door experience. In pursuing her various interests, she exhausts available printed material at home and school, asks questions of everyone who might have information, and writes to the county agricultural agency in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Jane swims, picnics, and sings in the children's choir in the church in a nearby town.

Jane's cousin Carol, also ten, is quite different in her interests and her approach to living. She is an avid comic book reader. She is interested in clothing and is beginning to experiment with cosmetics. She makes half-hearted attempts to keep up with Jane's pace, but seldom follows through on projects they start cooperatively. She evidences little curiosity. She putters around the house, spends more time indoors than out.

It is dangerous to generalize about the influence of the rural environment on child development. Jane and Carol seemingly live in the same rural environment, go to the same school, roam the same fields and woods and streams under the same sky. But even this superficial description indicates that the two children are learning different values and interests. Their lives are taking different directions. I cannot accurately account for this since I have not studied the children intensively.

This we do know, however. The appropriations a country child makes from the experiences available in his environment and how these appropriations affect his growth and development depend upon several factors. One of these is innate capacity. Another is his family—its climate and relationships, its values and attitudes, its guidance and example. Another is his physical status and condition, how much energy he has to give to the business of living.

A second reason why it is impossible to generalize regarding the influence of the rural environment on child development is because not only do individual children and their families differ but so do rural environments. The writers

of the article in a recent issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan* on "Sociological Aspects of Rural Education" describe six regions in the United States, each of which has distinctive characteristics and problems which affect the lives of rural children. How different is the life of rural children in my own state, for example, from that of children in the Ozarks or the Great Plains.

Within each of the various regions described are to be found wide differences among segments of the population in income, in mobility, and in educational, religious, racial, and national backgrounds as well as in a variety of other respects. In a rural school classroom I visited last week, I saw the small son of the manager of a large industrial farm who travels to far places with his family, goes to camp, and all year long tastes to the full the joys of rural living with almost none of its responsibilities or deprivations. Beside him sat the son of a tenant farmer whose family is often on the move, who has lived all his life in ugly, unsanitary, overcrowded quarters, who takes care of himself and bears burdens too heavy for a little boy because his mother as well as his father works in the fields.

In discussing the influence of the rural environment on child development I would like to point up two somewhat common characteristics of rural environments and raise questions regarding the potential effects, positive and negative, on children.

First, we can assume that rural children have unique opportunities for responsible participation in the enterprises of family living, and how can we assess the effects of these on development?

Usually there are several children in farm families. If the mother does not have hired help, she is likely to be an extremely busy person—even if her home has labor saving devices, which not all farm homes do. If she has to help with the work of barn, garden, and fields, it becomes essential for the children to help in homemaking and child care. Particularly on family farms there are a multitude of jobs for young hands to do. A child's responsibilities may vary from none at all, as in the case of the boy cited earlier, to care of pets and young children, domestic work, weeding the garden, carrying wood, doing chores around the barn, possibly even helping in the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of crops.

Many children of elementary school age have small business enterprises. They may own and care for a calf, a lamb, or a flock of poultry. They may gather and sell nuts or berries or trap and sell the hides of small animals. Some go with their parents to farm markets to help sell produce. Even very young children are often found puttering around with grown-ups, thinking they are helping even if their contributions are questionable. Although in many farm and non-farm country homes, children are no longer the economic asset they once were, large numbers of country children participate in some degree in the work associated with family living and making a living.

What are the effects of this participation on development? Here again the answers must be found by studying individual children. On the positive side there is the security a child gains in feeling needed in the family, the sense of pride and personal worth which comes with doing essential work, the skills

which can accrue to children from participating with others, including adults, in cooperative projects. Even though the contribution a child makes is small, he can be developing practical concepts, for example, that planning is efficient, that negligence can have tragic results, that sometimes one must give up immediate satisfactions in order to receive greater ones later.

When nature, through drought or frost, cancels out the effect of hard work, as it often does, the farm child who has some share in family councils and responsibilities learns the hard lesson of picking up the pieces and starting over. As he participates in his small way in such activities as the scientific feeding of animals, the employment of conservation measures, the use of powerful machines, he can see that man can control, as well as adjust to his environment.

But these outcomes are not necessarily realized. We have to ask about any child: Does he work too hard and too long for his physical well-being? Many rural children do. Does work deprive him of time for other experiences essential to wholesome development? Does he have a share in planning and choosing his work and can he use some ingenuity in carrying it out? Or does he do the same jobs over and over, following adult directions, until he is little better than a puppet? What is the family climate in which he works? Is it hopeful and cheerful or does he, as in a poverty-stricken home, share a family feeling of fighting a losing battle, or having no reward for effort. These are some of the factors which help to make the difference between child labor and educational work, between resentment and a sense of power and adventure, between positive and negative effects on development.

Second, what is the effect on growth and development of the country child's closeness to nature and natural phenomena?

The freedom of most rural children to range widely in the out-of-doors makes available many vigorous physical activities. The best nursery schools and kindergartens would be hard put to it to duplicate the opportunities for running and climbing, jumping and crawling and throwing, for "messing around" with natural materials such as sand, mud, water, and snow. Depending upon the locality, there are opportunities for swimming, fishing, hiking, camping, skiing, coasting, and adventurous exploring. It may be assumed that these vigorous, happy pursuits contribute to sturdy physical and emotional development.

Rural educators point out, too, that rural children's closeness to nature makes available to them vivid first-hand experiences which may contribute to emotional stability and the acquisition of spiritual values. The child in the country, unless over-protected, is face to face with reality. He observes that life comes from life and in turn produces life. He sees how the strong preys constantly on the weak, but life goes on and nature's balance is maintained unless man upsets it. The turning earth and the changing seasons have fundamental meanings to him.

In his explorations of his environment he is at best very much in tune with his universe. He may be grubby and tousled of hair but he has distance in his eyes, wings on his feet, and stardust in his hair.

Dr. Fannie Dunn, in her book on *The Child in the Rural Environment*, describes the scientific and aesthetic experiences of a young rural child in one kind

of natural setting. These excerpts show him busy absorbing with eyes and nose and ears and hands—indeed with his whole self:

"Springtime brings sheets of purple violets for a child to pick as much as his hands can hold. Golden buttercups held under his chin reveal if he likes butter and perhaps leaves a bit of yellow pollen on his skin. Catkins on the alders and aspens scatter clouds of pollen when the wind tosses them. Honeybees and bumblebees buzz from blossom to blossom with big balls of pollen on their legs. Apple, cherry, peach and plum blossoms scatter and the newly formed fruit can be seen at their base. . . .

"In the fall there are bright colored leaves, first fluttering down one by one; then in sheets and drifts to be noisily scuffled through and tossed about; later in piles to leap and burrow into; finally in crimson bonfires filling the autumn with pungent scent."

And later in her description: "He wades in clear tumbling brooks, picks his way through swampy meadows to gather wild iris, fishes for minnows along winding streams, skates or sails his homemade boats on shallow ponds, or rides in rowboats on lakes or rivers. He climbs hills and descends into valleys in search of wild flowers, berries, or nuts. He sees, according to the location of his home, water-falls, streams at flood, the incoming tide. He may see eroding land, small deltas where rills from the stream meet roadside ditches, or roadside ditches meet the creek.

"He drinks from springs, impregnated perhaps with the tang of iron and the strong taste and odor of sulphur; he watches the water bucket drawn by a windlass from the well, or manipulates the pump handle to get a drink for himself or to make a puddle for the grabbling ducks. He gathers rocks which attract him because of the sparkle of mica, the shining streaks of quartz or the red of iron. He may find a quartz crystal, or thin polished sheets of mica, or the weathered silkiness of asbestos. There may be clean white sand for his handling or some malleable clay or blue marl full of shell fossils."

How can we say what it means to the development of a child to live in the open country where there is space to roam and active, fascinating exploring of the natural world to do? It is a temptation to assume that the potential values are realized, but experience tells us that this is not necessarily so.

Look, for example, at the youngster who rises before dawn, has his breakfast very early, helps with the farm chores, walks a distance to the bus, rides another distance to school, eats cold sandwiches for lunch (perhaps six hours after his breakfast), studies how the Egyptians built the pyramids and why some nouns are in the objective case, and then when he leaves school reverses his morning marathon with, perhaps, homework added.

Lack of time is not the only reason why some country children cannot benefit from happy experiences in the out-of-doors. It is unhappily true that some country children, particularly girls, do not have the skills and the awareness to enjoy these pursuits. One has only to drive through the countryside on a Sunday afternoon to see children alone or in small groups, just "hanging around," looking bored and lonely. I live within comfortable driving distance of three state parks with outdoor cooking facilities, hiking trails and fishing, swimming,

and overnight camping privileges. It is, however, largely people from the cities and their children who fill these parks on weekends.

I know well an area where vegetables are grown in the rich, black muckland. It was formed when the glacier dammed a small river. The fossil remains of a mastodon was found in it. The fields are rimmed with high blue hills, fun to climb, where the fire-marked rocks of Indian rock shelters may be found. *Arbutus* grows there in the spring and the red berries of black alder and the orange of bittersweet light the winter landscape. This is an environment rich in aesthetic, scientific, and historical meanings, but the children's inter-actions with it were pitifully limited when I first knew them—limited by too much work in the fields, by barren homes, by lack of adult guidance which would help to lift their lives above the dull level of existence.

For whether a child sees or is blind to the marvels about him, whether he hears or is deaf to its deep meanings, whether his curiosity is deadened by frustration or remains a voice that impels him to keep looking beneath the surface of things—these depend to a great extent on the adults who influence his life.

The questions I have raised are only a few of those which might be raised regarding the influence of the environment on the young child's development. Perhaps I've said only one thing really, that is, that each child has his own unique environment. It is usually not what a casual observer would describe it to be. It is only as we can put ourselves in the place of each child and see what he is able to choose and use from the potential wealth about him that we can find clues for arranging a more growth-encouraging environment for him.

USE OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS FOR ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN INSTRUCTION

THEODORE J. JENSON

*Superintendent of Schools
Shorewood, Wisconsin*

From one point of view, everything that goes on in and about the school has some relation to instruction and all such activities have a direct relationship to the learning process. There are, however, a great many uses made of community school facilities that are not programed under what is usually considered the instructional program. These utilizations have to do with services and provisions for the school, and with community connected experiences that might be designated as co-curricular rather than curricular. While these co-curricular community activities may not be considered as strictly school connected from an instructional point of view, many of the activities may make convenient use of school facilities and equipment.

Let us take a quick look at the kind and variety of co-curricular community and civic activities that community school plants and facilities may be called upon to serve. Then, perhaps we should give some attention to the problems, sources of

friction, and areas of concern that seem to parallel the utilization of school facilities for these activities. With a better understanding of the scope of utilization for co-curricular community and civic services, and the resulting problems and concerns, we may examine some principles and policies.

Any consideration of the kind and variety of co-curricular community and civic activities that find it convenient to use school plant facilities will raise the question: "How did the schools become involved in anything other than strictly instructional services?" This concern is probably unique to American education. Educational systems elsewhere in the world seem not to be concerned about community utilization of school facilities.

The concept of the community school, in a broad definition, appears to be closely linked with two dominant and basic principles in American education: (1) local control of schools, and (2) the schools belong to the people. It seems natural then, that the people should desire to make full and efficient use of their school facilities—while always bearing in mind that the primary purpose of all school appurtenances is instructional service. In other words, citizens provide school plants and facilities primarily to facilitate learning. However, more and more communities are finding it wise, economical, and expedient to provide a broader community service utilization of school plants and facilities, while at the same time avoiding any interference with regular instructional programs.

The word "community" appears in many places in the program of this conference. We speak of the community school—the school that belongs to, and serves, the community. Perhaps it would be well for us to note, at this point, the characteristics of a good community. Sociologists say that a good community is characterized by integration, or integrity; form, or organization; a real content of culture and creative life; boundary and limitations. It has a sense of direction—it is going somewhere.

Among the important determinants of the scope and variety of utilization of school plants and facilities for other than instruction services are: (1) the basic philosophy of education existing in the community; (2) the economic development; (3) the degree of isolation or proximity of the school community to larger centers; (4) ethnological and etiological characteristics—that is, the cultural and racial backgrounds of the inhabitants and the origin of the community complex in a given situation; (5) the presence or absence of specific community services provided by other community agencies; (6) the integration and organization of the community; (7) the quality of educational leadership; and (8) the value orientation of the citizenry with respect to overall educational goals, community improvement, civic interests, and citizen participation in local affairs.

It is very understandable that the scope and variety of utilizations of school plant and facilities may be very different in a community such as Hesik, Michigan, which is located in the cut-over country, from those utilizations found in the bedroom suburbs of Washington or New York. The social needs of the inhabitants differ. Citizens in a north woods community attempting to wrest a living from the stump land in comparative isolation from urban centers and

services, will desire such utilization of school plants and facilities as will meet the specific needs of the people. These needs may be milk testing facilities, soil testing equipment, canning facilities, frozen food plants, demonstration facilities, exhibit space, test garden plots, reading rooms, health centers, and meeting rooms. Here we see the school plant and facilities owned and controlled by the people serving the community for instructional and co-curricular, non-instructional purposes.

In contrast to the Hesik community, let us look at a community school serving a mature, privileged suburban area. The calls for utilization of school plant and facilities in such communities for other than regular instruction arise from needs for space and equipment for recreational services, avocational pursuits, libraries, meeting rooms for various social and civic groups in the community, study clubs, athletic areas, playgrounds, natatoriums, baby clinics, demonstrations, exhibits, concert series, dramatic productions, and similar activities. In the community where I work, Shorewood, Wisconsin, an exclusive residential suburb of Milwaukee, the school has the only large facility in the village for serving dinners to groups. As a result, our cafeteria service handles an average of three dinner meetings weekly for community groups. Our large cafeteria serves the students at noon and is used as a meeting hall in the evening.

Our school plant and facilities are in constant use. The pool is open to adults three nights each week. The gymnasiums, shops, classrooms, home economics, and photographic laboratories, and the like are open five nights each week. The community auditorium is in constant demand. In fact, at this time, it is booked solid for the balance of the school year and well into the 1955-56 school year.

Citizens in Shorewood feel that schools exist to be used and to serve the people. Shorewood has a greater number of adults enrolled in the various co-curricular activities after school and evenings than the combined total day school enrollment in all schools.

The demands made upon our school plants and facilities for other than instructional purposes fall into the following categories:

1. Provisions for room or space with heat, light, and custodial service, free of charges, for civic interest group activities and meetings.
2. Provisions for room or space with heat, light, and custodial service, on a cost rental basis, for special interest groups in the community.
3. Special services facilities—health centers, labs, etc.
4. Recreation.
5. Avocational interests and pursuits.
6. Public meetings of general civic interest—civil defense, etc.
7. Adult education activities.
8. Library and loan service.
9. Dinner meeting service.
10. Election centers—schools used for voting places.
11. Communication center—short wave radio station.
12. Miscellaneous requests.

You may imagine the wide and extensive utilization of school plant facilities for the regular curriculum. And what I have described as co-curricular community activities poses many problems of administration, controls, supervision, maintenance, storage of equipment, key controls, fixing responsibility for misuse and damages, liability, insurance, budgeting, and coordination.

In spite of problems which will exist with maximum utilization of school plant and facilities by the many kinds of groups in the community, our experience has been very satisfying. There exists a firm belief that the schools belong to the people and that the schools should be used for all good purposes that serve the community. I am also convinced that the support of schools and education in a community is directly proportional to the services rendered, and the degree to which the people feel that the schools belong to them—that they are receiving something for their investment. Broad use of school plant and facilities for legitimate non-instructional community services is one means of helping everyone to gain a feeling of the worthwhileness of a good school plant, a good school program, and good school equipment.

Growing out of my experience with a community school which encourages the utilization of its school plant and facilities for non-instructional purposes, I suggest that administrators, teachers and people in the community deliberate on some of the unique concerns and issues related to the topic. These might include:

1. What should be the role of the school leadership in planning and executing non-instructional use of school facilities?
2. How may community leaders and citizens assist in the planning and executing of non-instructional utilization of school facilities?
3. What kind of policy structure should be written and established for wide use of school facilities, and how, and by whom should this policy be formulated?
4. What priority considerations for the use of school properties should be written into the adopted policy?
5. What kinds of services should be free of charge, and what kinds of utilization should bear at least operating costs?
6. What mechanics and safeguards should be followed in the scheduling of school facilities for non-instructional use?
7. What criteria should be used by the community in determining the nature and kind of school facilities that should be made available for use in non-instructional activities?
8. What should be the school's policy with regard to utilization of school facilities by specialized community agencies?
9. To what extent should the school serve as a community center?
10. How should the extended use of school plant and facilities be financed?

The answers and solutions to these foregoing problems will differ in various communities. There are no absolute answers to suit all conditions and all places. However, sincere efforts to find the answers by citizens in any community, will avoid many misunderstandings, and will assist in establishing a sound basis for use of school facilities for other than instructional purposes.

STANDARDS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION IN RELATION TO THE COMMUNITY TO BE SERVED

BURTON W. KREITLOW

*Associate Professor of Rural Education
University of Wisconsin*

Any consideration of educational standards in rural communities would be incomplete and narrow unless interpreted against the sociological background of the community. Educational standards must be more than theories, more than facts. They should preferably not be goals. They often become goals for certain communities because of the communities particular sociological and economic characteristics.

It has been an accepted fact in education that students, whether in kindergarten or in college, vary greatly in their various abilities and potential. The same is true of our rural communities. Because it is true a proposed standard that represents only a single point on a scale of educational opportunity or of educational efficiency can be accepted as desirable in a community that can afford to reach it or go beyond it.

In another community the same standard can become a stumbling block toward progress because it seems so far ahead of what is humanly possible to attain or looks so ridiculous to the individuals who by the nature of their sociological and cultural background tend to maintain the status quo. Their standard is one established by tradition rather than by research, contemplation or by advice of experts.

In considering the relationship of standards for school organization to the structure and nature of the rural community the following definitions will be used:

1. The rural neighborhood is that locality grouping in the community which in terms of inter-personal relationships is one step removed from the family. The relationships in the neighborhood are often personal and the people of a neighborhood know each other well. Although there may be several "cliques" in a neighborhood, the entire group is bound together either by cultural or by service ties.

- In the midwest the one-room school is often a key service that holds 15 to 30 families together. In other cases the neighborhood ties are maintained by the rural church or even by such an economic service as a crossroads store, tavern, or filling station. Though the rural neighborhood is a country phenomenon, a neighborhood as here defined can sometimes be identified as one small part of the rural village, or even possibly an area in a city.

2. The rural community is made up of the rural village center and the surrounding farm service area. By census definition this rural village center is made up of fewer than 2,500 people.

3. The city and region it serves will be classified in this discussion as the tertiary community encompassing one or more cities and the surrounding rural communities which are associated with it through economic ties. In addi-

tion they are associated by such cultural ties as radio stations, television stations, recreation centers, junior colleges, etc. This combination of people and services from the city to the rural villages, to the rural community farm service areas, make up the complete tertiary community.

In terms of standards of school administrative structure and organization and in terms of educational standards the rural community as a sociological unit may or may not be able to meet standards suggested. Their ability to meet standards depends to a great extent upon their size. The rural community with 500 people in the village center and 900 inhabitants in the farm service area would find it almost impossible to alone meet the kind of standards that most educators or thoughtful citizen groups would establish.

These suggestions actually would not become standards since they couldn't be reached. They would not be goals because local citizens lose hope before ever trying to reach them. On the other hand a rural community with a village center of 2,000 inhabitants and 3,500 in the farm service area may be able to readily come up to the standards suggested and very likely establish educational goals both in terms of organization and achievement that would be well above the standards.

One of the great difficulties with the school reorganization movement in the midwest is the necessity to place the emphasis on reorganization at the local community level when in reality over one-half of the rural communities are not large enough to meet the standards which should be established for a good educational program.

The rural neighborhood social structure has been largely associated with the very small rural elementary school. Though I have seen rural neighborhoods that have had good small elementary schools, I do not believe there are any rural neighborhoods that could ever reach the standards of school organization and program that we're talking about at this meeting today.

In the first place, these rural neighborhoods have been built on a tradition of six or eight years of schooling. Modern society, rural and urban, is now demanding a minimum of twelve grades of schooling. The two are not compatible. Thus a standard of organization other than a completely integrated kindergarten through twelfth grade school program is unrealistic and antiquated. Yet, in the state of Wisconsin alone we have more than 4,000 such administrative units, and many of the citizens living in such an administrative unit with their one and two-room schools are unable to grasp the significance of the educational standards about which we speak.

The tertiary community on the other hand is generally made up of an area which has both the financial resources and the number of students to meet and surpass these standards. Yet, the tertiary communities in our Nation that have a comprehensive school organization are rare. We have many times failed to look realistically at the changes that have been taking place sociologically as we have been reorganizing the administrative structure and the educational program of our schools. Only in recent years have we been giving serious consideration to an intermediate unit that might be organized on modern sociological lines rather than on county or township lines that were established years ago.

In many cases the tertiary community may in itself be too big in terms of area and numbers of pupils to accomplish that which we seek educationally. Yet, overcoming some of the handicaps of bigness would in my judgment be considerably less difficult than overcoming the handicaps of smallness against which we have been struggling in rural communities and rural neighborhoods.

The relationships between the rural neighborhood, the rural community, and the tertiary community are such that economically the lines that tie them together are quite clear. Socially and culturally there are vast gaps in those relationships. The rather isolated rural neighborhood, though by no means as isolated as it was fifty years ago, may not be aware of the kinds of things citizens in the city desire in their school. Nor would they accept as desirable some of those demands that urban people are making.

Those living in the village of the rural community are midway between the two in their willingness to accept modern educational standards. Yet, by no means are they fully aware of the complete educational program that could be possible if their school systems were organized in terms of the standards I have suggested. By the same token they are unable to understand how some of the people in their farm service area are so willing to disregard even the minimum standards which they themselves accept as desirable.

We must understand the nature of the people in the rural community before we can adequately see why there are these differences in acceptance of educational changes and new educational standards. I wish to briefly review the nature of farm people, and then report on a most interesting research study that has been completed in Wisconsin that helps us in our understanding of the way people in the farm areas or rural neighborhoods, the village centers, and the cities look at their schools.

Rural and urban people are by no means alike. They often dress differently, act differently, speak differently and, I believe, think differently. This is a result of the different environmental influence thrust upon them by the physical, social, and economic characteristics of the communities in which they live. You need only drive through parts of any single state to realize that these rural communities are different. You need only to stop and visit a few families in each of the various communities you pass to understand immediately that the people are different from community to community. These differences that we note are basically differences in personality both within the farm groups themselves and between farm group and village group, between farm group and city group.

The farmer is close to the physical elements—the rain, the wind, the snow, and the ice have a real and legitimate meaning to him in terms of his economic livelihood. He is a very realistic person. He is exposed to nature in the raw. He is dependent upon nature more than artificial controls in the earning of his livelihood. Though he is a business man with numerous economic ties with both the village and the city, he has developed a high degree of independence in his thinking and in his action. His reaction to educational ideas or even to new agricultural ideas that may be different from ours is not based upon a lack of knowledge or intelligence but rather upon the nature of the community in which he lives.

I would like to report on the results of the Wisconsin study that set out to determine whether or not there were real differences among farm groups living in different types of rural neighborhoods. After studying two kinds of rural communities, those which had reorganized their schools and those which had maintained the traditional school system, we had a hunch that there was something different in the way different farm groups in these communities looked at the school reorganization program.

This hunch stemmed both from this reorganization study and from some of the studies within the field of rural sociology which found that in neighborhoods that were homogeneous as to religious and ethnic background there was a greater resistance to these new ideas in education and possibly even to new ideas in agriculture than was true in neighborhoods which had mixed nationalities and a mixed religious background.

This study then actually tested the null-hypotheses. There is no difference between neighborhood groups that are homogeneous as to their ethnic and religious characteristics and neighborhood groups in their acceptance of selected educational programs and practices as represented by:

1. The school
2. Recommended farming practices.
3. Formal organizations.

In the collection of data to test this hypotheses, 38 Wisconsin neighborhoods were delineated in Southern, Southwestern, Central, and Northwestern Wisconsin. These 38 neighborhoods were matched so that a homogeneous neighborhood was matched on the basis of specified criteria with a heterogeneous neighborhood. The matching of the pairs of neighborhoods on the basis of two basic characteristics—nationality and religion—set up a dichotomous framework within which it was possible to test the hypotheses.

Comparability of the matched pairs was accomplished by selecting and matching the pairs on certain relatively stable educational, economic, and geographic criteria. In each neighborhood a random selection of ten farm operators was made. Each of the 380 individual farm families were interviewed with an instrument containing attitude and fact questions on a large number of educational, agricultural, and organizational items. The total instrument was made up of a 30-item school practice questionnaire, a 25-item farming practice index, and a formal organizational participation scale, plus individual items of a related nature.

Such questions as the following represent the kinds which were asked:

1. How important do you think activities such as art, music, and recreation are in the school work of our children today?
2. Do you think school buildings should be used without charge for meetings and activities other than those of the school?
3. What are the names of the organizations to which you belong?
4. Have you had your soil tested for lime, phosphorous, and potash during the last three years.
5. Do you use breeder lamps at farrowing time?

According to this study's findings there is a great deal of consistency in the favorability of citizens of heterogeneous neighborhoods over their matched homogeneous pair. In a previous report the following results were listed as the most significant to educators. (Burton W. Kreitlow, "Wisconsin Study Explains Rural Attitudes Towards Schools." *The Nations Schools*, Vol. 54, No. 3 September, 1954).

1. Farm people in heterogeneous neighborhoods were consistent in their greater favorability toward new ideas in schools and farming.
2. Homogeneous neighborhoods show greater acceptance of items related to local control.
3. Families in homogeneous farm neighborhoods have a high level of membership in social and religious organizations while those in heterogeneous neighborhoods have fewer memberships but are considerably more active in agricultural and school groups.
4. Higher participation scores are shown by families in heterogeneous areas (attending meetings, holding office, serving on committees.)
5. Farm families in heterogeneous neighborhoods have higher scores on a social-economic status scale.
6. The index of family strength is higher in homogeneous neighborhoods.
7. Farm people in heterogeneous neighborhoods believe in a higher level of formal education for rural citizens than do farm people in comparable homogeneous neighborhoods.

These results have some very important implications for persons in education concerned with standards of organization. The consistency with which these differences in acceptance of educational and agricultural practices favor the heterogeneous neighborhoods indicates in terms of the proposed educational standards that they would be more readily accepted by farm people living in these mixed neighborhoods than by those living in homogeneous neighborhoods. As a matter of fact, it's very possible that what might be a standard which people in an heterogeneous neighborhood would desire could be a point of real resistance by the people in a homogeneous neighborhood.

For example, a recommendation recently made in the state of Nevada says that all high schools with fewer than ten teachers should be combined with other schools so that certain educational standards can best be met. It is possible that the wisdom of that recommendation would be understood and probably accepted by certain groups of farm people, but that in other groups the recommendation would be a red flag thrown up as a warning that someone is trying to change their social system and thereby interfere with their own control of their local education program in their high school of 90 students.

We see here quite clearly a distinction between a decision based upon cultural tradition and a decision based upon educational objectives and goals. Standards which will be acceptable are related to the kind of a neighborhood and the kind of a community for which they are suggested.

Since the citizens living in heterogeneous neighborhoods are more willing to encourage a higher level of educational attainment than are those in homogeneous neighborhoods, we can again see a point of issue on any suggested educa-

tional or financial standard for a school program. Even such a proposed standard of education as attendance in school until the age of 16 causes a distinct split among groups who are ready to accept a 16-year-old attendance law and those who resist sending children to school until age 16 and who actually seek ways of circumventing such a law.

Since heterogeneous neighborhoods are more favorable than homogeneous neighborhoods toward such modern school practices as art, music, complete school lunch program, smaller number of grades per teacher, and community and adult education activities in the school, it again puts into focus the fact that these two types of neighborhoods would make different interpretations of any standard of education, curriculum, or school finance.

In the planning of a broad progressive curriculum these differences can determine how far educators can go in developing a school program. It may mean that in certain areas the standards can directly become a goal which should be met. In others it may be unwise to mention the standards which educators are seeking and to set goals considerably below the standard. This slower step by step approach for people in homogeneous neighborhoods and communities may accomplish more in less time than a single large step away from their established and traditional social and educational pattern.

Though the administrator must be consistent in presenting educational proposals to different neighborhoods or communities, he may find it effective to approach different rural neighborhoods in very different ways as he leads them toward acceptance of such proposals. Any change suggested in school organization or in curriculum patterns must be compatible with the attitudes held by the people affected.

An additional implication stems directly from the information gathered in the study related to the kinds of organizations to which people in these different neighborhoods belong. Citizens in heterogeneous neighborhoods are more likely to be participating in community or county-wide activities and in organizations that cover areas more extensive than a neighborhood. In these organizations they have opportunity to participate as an officer or as a committee member.

It is clear that setting goals for education in organization, curriculum or finance is a different matter where people have numerous community contacts than it is where their major contacts are restricted to the neighborhood with others who think as they do. We as educators might have fine standards and even some good immediate goals for areas that are homogeneous and yet be unable to reach these people because we are contacting the wrong organizations or because these people in homogeneous neighborhoods are basically members only of their neighborhoods social and religious groups.

In one neighborhood the contact with local leaders may readily be made in a community-wide or school organization to which they belong. In a nearby neighborhood it may be essential to reach them only in these local neighborhood groups or even possibly through their minister or priest. It is possible that in the latter case the educator will have to spend more time in establishing himself than he does in the establishment of the new idea.

These implications are related directly to the differences that exist between the philosophy and purpose of the people in the homogeneous neighborhood group and those in such a community agency as the school. In my judgment, results of this investigation provide us with a most significant point of view from which to look at proposed educational standards. Individual differences of neighborhoods and communities must be considered as standards are set.

We must realize that although we may set a common standard for education in finance, in curriculum, in organization, that the attainment of that standard or the reaching of sub-goals in a movement toward that standard will proceed at different paces in different communities. It means to some extent that we may be unwise to actually establish such standards in terms of number of pupils per school, in terms of essential classes and courses to be held in a high school program. I say this may be unwise, not because we shouldn't have standards or goals, but because many times the standard or goal can become a stumbling block to obtaining even initial progress in resistant areas.

Long ago we recognized the individual differences of children in their ability to achieve in school. It is imperative that we now recognize individual differences in communities in their ability to reach certain standards. Just as the eight-year-old child with an I. Q. of 80 may have difficulty reaching a standard set for passing into the fourth grade, so might a community with an acceptance score of 80 be unable to meet a standard to develop a stronger educational program in a single year. We have learned to give real consideration and guidance to the child with an I. Q. of 80 or to the one with an I. Q. of 130. We have learned to have general achievement standards for children and in addition to adjust that standard to the individual child in terms of his capacity.

Might not we also consider how important it is that we recognize communities in terms of their abilities to move ahead in an educational program and though we have certain general standards realize that it may take a longer period to reach them in one community than in another. By the same token we cannot necessarily condemn an administrator who is unable to reach the standards of organization, the standards of curriculum, or the standards of finance as rapidly in his community or in his county as could another administrator who may be situated in the kind of community that will readily move up to and beyond those standards.

These conclusions and implications emphasize the need for new kinds of studies and research in rural education that will adequately take into account the relationship between leadership, standards, and the nature of the rural community. In Wisconsin we're moving ahead with such studies. I personally hope that universities and colleges in other states will do the same.

PRESENT PROBLEMS IN FINANCING RURAL EDUCATION

E. L. LINDMAN

*Professor of Educational Administration**George Peabody College for Teachers**Nashville, Tennessee*

In discussing with you the relationship between "Present Systems of State Finance" and "Financing the Education of Rural People", I would like to review some facts and figures about rural urban population trends as reported in the 1950 census. According to the 1940 census definition of urban, there was an 18 percent increase in urban population as compared with an increase of 7.4 percent in rural population between 1940 and 1950.

After probing into the matter, I learned that when I moved from a small city with a fairly pronounced rural orientation to the suburban residential area of Nashville, I had changed my classification from urban to rural non-farm. The non-farm part of my new classification seemed quite appropriate. I do not have a green thumb; I merely turn green with envy when I compare my futile efforts at gardening with those of my neighbors. However, the rural part of my new classification seemed most inappropriate.

My sociologist colleagues on the Peabody Campus informed me that the Census Bureau was quite aware of the problem. They had developed some new classifications such as "standard metropolitan areas" and "state economic areas." Furthermore, the whole matter was quite complex and filled with booby traps for the superficial investigator.

I was impressed with the close relationship between the urban and rural parts of our country—even the Census Bureau had trouble making appropriate distinction. This suggested that my analysis of the school finance problem should be divided into two parts:

1. Those aspects of the school finance problem which are common to both urban and rural areas,
2. Those aspects which present a special problem for rural schools.

Recent trends have emphasized those aspects of the school finance problem which are common to both urban and rural communities. The assumption by state government of a more prominent role in public education has tended to place urban and rural communities on a more nearly equal basis. Educational services provided by State Departments of Education have increased sharply since 1900. This increase in services is indicated by the larger staffs employed. In 1900 there were 177 staff members in all 48 State Departments of Education combined. By 1950 the number had increased to 9,550 persons.

Since the larger metropolitan centers tend to be educationally more self-sufficient, a large part of the additional state service is directed to small towns and rural communities. While it is not possible to measure in dollars and cents the value of these services to rural boys and girls, this contribution to better education for rural America is substantial.

Along with the increase in educational services from State Departments of Education, there has been a substantial increase in public school revenues derived

from state tax sources. While the number of school-age children in the United States increased from 21 million in 1900 to 31 million in 1950, state contributions to public school support increased from 38 million dollars in 1900 to over 2 billion dollars in 1950. The percentage of public school revenues derived from state sources increased from 17 percent to 39 percent during the same period. Although much of the total gain in revenues merely offsets the declining value of the dollar, the *relative* increase in state funds contributes much to the improvement of education in rural communities.

Perhaps more important than the total amount of state funds provided are the improvements made in the methods used to apportion these funds. In 1900 most state funds were apportioned to local school systems on a school census or, at best, on a school enrollment or attendance basis. These plans of apportionment gave little consideration to the problems peculiar to rural areas.

Although progress has been spotty, today most states have some arrangement for using "teacher units" and "pupil transportation" in their state school support plans. Similarly, most states have some form of state equalization aid for schools. Although there is much room for improvement, the increased state school support and the improvement of state apportionment formulas has done much to improve the financial position of rural schools in many states. On the other hand, in some states little progress along these lines has been made.

Rural areas have shared with urban areas state financed improvements in teacher preparation programs and in state teacher retirement systems. During the present teacher shortage, however, the city school system has a distinct advantage in recruiting the better trained teachers.

Improvements in communication and transportation have removed many of the sociological barriers between urban and rural people, and they have labored shoulder to shoulder for better education for all children.

There are some aspects of the school finance problem which are peculiar to rural areas, for example, sparsity of population. Although progress has been made, many states do not provide adequate funds for financing the small isolated school. Only a few states have fully recognized the state's responsibility for adequately financing small high cost schools after it has been determined that such schools must be maintained.

This principle needs to be emphasized and supported by both urban and rural citizens. City school leaders must recognize the fact that extra state funds will be required for these small schools. On the other hand, rural leaders need to accept the fact that in many instances the one-room school, a quarter of a mile down the road, must be closed and the children sent to a larger school 10 miles away.

We have made progress in eliminating one-room schools. There were 212,000 of them in 1910. Now there are less than 60,000. However, the small school and the related problem of school district reorganization still occupy high priority positions on the agenda of rural school leaders.

Then there is the problem of pupil transportation. The rural school superintendent, trained and experienced in school affairs, suddenly finds himself managing a fleet of busses. And he is doing a remarkably good job. True, his busses

are overloaded in many instances, but he has a good record for safety and economy. In 1950, 7,000,000 children were transported to public schools daily in 116,000 vehicles at a cost of \$31 per pupil. This is a large undertaking and required 215 million dollars exclusive of the original cost of the school busses—an amount equal to the total expenditures for all public school purposes in 1900.

The financial burden of pupil transportation falls disproportionately upon small towns and rural communities. Although some state aid for pupil transportation is provided in most states, there are some that do not have such aid. In Nebraska, for example, the entire cost of pupil transportation is borne locally. In Nevada, state pupil transportation funds are available only for one and two-teacher elementary schools; no such aid is provided for the rural high school. Clearly, action is needed to provide adequate funds for pupil transportation in such states.

Some of the better arrangements for state support for pupil transportation are found in states having a comprehensive foundation program. In such states, the cost of pupil transportation is included in the foundation program and is financed from state and local funds on a partnership basis. The inclusion of adequate allowances for pupil transportation in the state aid program requires continuous emphasis.

Another aspect of school finance of special interest to rural school leaders is financial support for the "intermediate unit." In states which have relatively small local school administrative units, the county superintendents office has become a service unit intermediate between the local administrative unit and the state. Services provided by this unit are especially important to rural schools since these schools are usually not large enough to employ full-time specialized professional personnel. Arrangements for financing the intermediate unit have not been extensively investigated. The problem is usually complicated by the fact that existing boundaries are frequently not large enough to establish an adequate program of intermediate unit services.

Intermediate unit services are financed in several ways. The county property tax is the largest source of support. In some states a substantial amount of state funds is provided for the intermediate unit service program. Some of these services are financed by cooperative agreements involving contributions from several local administrative units. The organization and administration of the intermediate unit and the financing of appropriate educational services from this unit present a challenging problem for rural school leaders.

This brief review indicates that, although certain aspects of the problem are uniquely rural, the financial problem of rural education is closely related to the general school finance problem. The familiar issues of adequate state support, of improving assessment of property, and of developing a favorable attitude among citizens toward school needs certainly apply to financing rural education. Most of the problems of rural school finances are the same as those of urban school finances.

What can be done to improve local property assessing practices? Have carelessly drawn state equalization programs tended to subsidize and reward poor assessing practices? A larger number of states still allow equalization payments

to local school districts based upon a locally chosen assessor's findings concerning taxable resources of the school district. This is obviously a practice which provides state rewards for low assessing and has tended to undermine the property tax base.

Some states have succeeded in minimizing this effect by one of three methods: (1) authorizing the state tax commission to equalize assessment ratios among counties, (2) using an objective index of taxpaying ability to determine the state equalization payment, and (3) designing the equalization program so that only a few very poor school districts share in equalization aid, the others participating in a large fund flat-grant type of program.

What can be done to enlarge school taxing units so that available local taxable resources per child are more nearly equal? Many states are struggling with this problem. It is minimized in those states having the county unit system. In other states it is being attacked by designing new school districts with a minimum valuation per child. Another approach is to retain the county as a major school taxing unit while setting up smaller community administrative units.

Have we placed too much emphasis upon "minimum" in our school support programs? School leaders in Georgia are now engaged in a basic study of school finance, with extensive lay participation which is directed toward the development of an "adequate" program of education. Is this just a trivial alteration in language or does it reflect a significant effort to raise the sights of the state school support program above the minimum concept?

What can be done to simplify our state school support laws so that legislative committees can readily understand our needs? Some states still have a dozen or more different state aid funds. Others have fewer funds but have apportionment formulas which defy explanation. The so-called minimum budget approach, used in several southern states, has done much to clarify school needs to state legislatures. However, there is some indication that this approach fosters the conviction that the state program is a complete and adequate program.

Have we become too dependent upon state aid in some states so that local initiative has disappeared? Are people saying that the state provides through the foundation program an amount of funds determined by it to be adequate; our teachers receive an annual salary which the state has determined to be enough, why should we be asked to tax ourselves locally for more funds? Are these attitudes hampering our efforts? Are we losing a healthy competition in the improvement of educational quality?

Will the pressing need for school construction cut into available current operating funds? In some states the need for state aid for school construction has sharply increased the burden on the state tax structure. Will local debt service levies have a similar effect upon the local school revenue sources? Is Federal aid for school construction a feasible approach to the problem?

Have we done everything possible to get maximum returns for the school dollar? Should cooperative purchasing of some of our larger standardized items be extended? What other possibilities are there for greater economy and efficiency?

These are some of the questions that both rural and urban school leaders must answer if our shortage of teachers and shortage of school buildings is to be corrected. We can agree on some general principles equitable to child and teacher but there is no simple answer to these questions that is universally applicable to all states. We, as educators, have a responsibility to study each problem and point the way to a solution in each community and in each state.

THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT

DOUGLAS G. MACRAE

*Assistant Superintendent,
Fulton County Board of Education,
Atlanta, Georgia*

In the heart of Atlanta, across the street from the State Capitol, there is a noted church. Whether this be providential design or sheer irony, I sometimes wonder. At any rate, the church is there. It serves a section where once were impressive homes, spacious lawns, and the slow, quiet tempo of gracious living. There were other churches in the neighborhood in those days, big, beautiful churches with throngs of people on Sunday mornings.

Well, the impressive homes have long since disappeared. The spacious lawns have gone. There is no longer the quiet, unperturbed air of an upper class residential section. Noisy traffic, concentrated industry and big business have claimed the quiet shady streets where people lived and went to church on Sunday. And just beyond the buildings and the stores and the warehouses and the parking lots, there are low rent apartment projects, and just beyond these there are filthy streets and wretched houses with the paint peeling off and dirty children running in and out.

Most of the churches have long since gone—lock, stock and pew. They have folded up. They have tossed in the towel. They have followed their flocks, an undignified thing for a church to do, to the suburbs and set up shop there. They have left the downtown area because they have feared for survival.

But the church of which I speak still stands in the same spot in downtown Atlanta. Its Sunday School attendance goes constantly upward. It has absolutely no debt and its budget is \$150,000 a year.

I asked the pastor, a man of unusual vision, how come? This was his answer: "Any church that is to survive in a downtown area must meet the needs of the community in which it is located. It will draw members from all over the city, but to survive, it must minister to its immediate community."

Well, for years this church has done that. For example: Twice a week the Church opens its doors for a Baby Clinic. The Church furnishes space, medicines, nursing help and volunteer workers. From 12 to 20 of the best pediatricians in Atlanta give their services and frail, anxious-faced mothers from the poor

neighborhood about the church bring their sick babies to the clinic and the babies are healed! Last week the Clinic admitted its 20,000th baby.

That is why the church remains and moves from strength to strength in a downtown area. It serves its community.

Now I'm supposed to be talking about schools, not churches; about suburbs, not downtown areas. But the point is this: if a church can successfully combat the sweeping movement of population away from the downtown area by serving its community, what a wonderful opportunity the suburban school has to serve where the people are. Of course there are problems.

The growth of suburbs is like that of malignant cells in the body: it is disorganized and it is rapid. Millions of people looking for a place to live are running around in this country of ours and they land in masses clustered about the rim of the city, and then these masses grow.

During the 1940's the population of the United States increased 14.5 percent; that of metropolitan areas including city and suburb 21 percent, that of all other places only 5.7 percent. The rate of growth at the peripheral, or suburban areas was 35 percent, or almost three times that at the metropolitan center.

Now I use the analogy of malignant cells only to indicate the way suburbs grow. The analogy is not in point to indicate the character of the people in suburbia, for generally speaking, I think, the healthiest urban tissue, the life blood, is on the rim of the cities.

But the growth is disorganized and the many dissimilar disparate elements in the suburbs make the community school concept difficult of realization there. The administrator also finds that school services pose a problem because of the complexity of the area to be served.

Suburbs do not follow any definite pattern. Many of them are as confusing in their development as the streets of Atlanta or of Boston. Take almost any city with many suburbs; some are old, some are new; some have a fierce pride of their own, some have not yet weaned themselves from the city which gave them birth; some are industrial; some are residential; some, however, are residential and becoming industrial, some are industrial and becoming residential; some are of high socio-economic level, some of average, some of low—many of all three. One thing they have in common—they are growing.

Whatever the need of the community is, that need the schools must meet. If the suburb is one of culture and ivory tower tradition—many suburbs are—its needs must be met. Or if this element is just a part of the community, its needs must still be met. This is an articulate element and while often grossly unfair, it is an intelligent one. Sometimes we don't meet it with equal intelligence. It can be shown and it should be shown, that the fundamentals are taught more effectively now than ever before and that college bound students get better preparation than ever before.

In this connection I know of a number of suburbs that jointly sponsor an annual College Night program. On this occasion representatives of colleges all over the country are present, meet with interested seniors and lower classmen and talk with them about opportunities in the colleges they represent. Scholarships and various kinds of student services are discussed.

The joint, single meeting is a great convenience not only to the schools, but to the college as well.

The community may well be an industrial one. Industry is now sweeping into the South almost as fast as William Tecumseh Sherman did some years ago. Again the figure of speech indicates rapidity only—not the character of the industries.

The implications for the suburban areas are obvious. Trades, commercial courses, homemaking, salesmanship and other vocational sciences must be provided in expanding measure if the school program is to keep pace with industrial growth.

And by all means let us use not only the published informational resources available for the school program through businesses in the community, but their human resources as well. The most direct way for a student to learn about business and industry is to ask the businessman to come to the school to tell him about it, and then let him have opportunity to visit the industry.

Another way in which many suburban youngsters are learning about business is actually operating one of their own through the Junior Achievement program. With an advisor from a local business concern to counsel them, these young people organize, form a corporation, sell stock, manufacture a product, pay costs of operation, labor, etc., declare dividends, and sometimes go broke. But they learn by one of the cardinal principles of John Dewey—they learn by doing. And again, they are using community resources and making school and community aware of a common identity.

The co-op programs made possible by the Smith-Hughes act and under which students work part time in shop or store and go part time to school for basic subjects is another helpful service to children and another evidence of school-community partnership.

Still another evidence is the increasingly popular Business-Education Day when the businesses and stores of the community invite all the teachers to be guests. Schools close for the day and teachers go to school at the Southern Wood Preserving Co., the Hapeville Bank, or the College Park Hardware Co. She gets close to the internal organization of the business, she learns what makes it go. She stays practically all day and is entertained at lunch. The next year the schools invite the businessmen to come into the classroom and see a modern school program in operation. This plan is operable not only in big cities, but in suburbs and small towns as well.

As the fingers of suburban population thrust outward, towns 20 or 30 miles away become suburbs themselves and school services must be expanded to meet the newly created needs. We have a high school in Fulton County 30 miles from Atlanta. Twenty years ago almost all of the boys took Agriculture and the school cannery ran almost night and day. Now very few of the boys want agriculture and the cannery is idle more often than not. The students need English, Literature, Math, and Physics. They also want shopwork, typewriting, art, and music.

The people in the little towns and rural areas now want the same standards of living as those of people living in the cities, and they should have them. How-

ever, there is an inevitable lag between the desire for such standards and their realization. The school must take the initiative in reducing this lag. The school can have no finer objective than to bring higher levels of living to these new suburbs 30 and 40 miles from the city—higher levels in communication skills, fine arts, healthy living, wholesome family life, and democratic participation in the community.

Now let's move from services to the community and use of community resources to the second thing I want to say about the suburban school: it should faithfully represent its community and all of its community.

Admittedly, the community school is difficult of achievement in the suburbs because of the many and diverse elements in the suburbs. Let's bring these elements into the school and capitalize on them. Indeed we couldn't keep them out even if we wished, for the good school is not merely related to the community—it is the community, it is a center cut slice of the community, and the slice is all the way across.

For example, in suburban College Park, Georgia, the local Kiwanis Club has been presenting a series of panels on Citizenship for high school students. The Kiwanis Club out of the resources of its membership and contacts furnishes the panel members. The students for a week or so prior to the panel study up on the question and seek to stump the experts. On the evening the panels are held the school auditorium is jammed, not only with students, but with men and women, too.

That is important, but what is more important, I think, is that the school has been a means of fitting together and giving unity to the jagged pieces of the community puzzle. For all the pieces are there. One of the panels was on the American Free Enterprise System. We had a C. I. O. man on it, a business executive, a newspaper man, an industrial relations man, and others. The different interests of the community were represented there and brought together in friendly synthesis within the framework of the school program. Can the school serve a nobler purpose?

CULTURE CHANGES AND EDUCATION

WAYNE C. ROHRER

Associate Professor of Sociology

University of Maryland

This presentation brings selected sociological and anthropological materials to bear on contemporary American education. To introduce the subject, I should like to point out four general considerations. First, education constitutes a part of our culture. Changes in culture or education influence each other. In totalitarian countries education was used to influence culture. In our society changes in education have tended to follow culture changes.

Second, the process of education is carried on in groups of people—in a social environment. The individual learns from other individuals. Even Lincoln who has symbolized the self-educated person did not have educational experiences apart from other people or their products. Third, I hold, along with many others, that rural and urban people and their interests, values, and aspirations differ more in degree than in kind. A recent article points out that contemporary rural girls are, in fact, more "urbane" than their urban sisters.

Finally, my remarks will be confined to the past half century. The paper has two sections. The first is on selected culture changes. The second deals with some consequences of these changes and their implications for education. The culture changes dealt with are considered apart from one another. This is because we must abstract to analyze. In real life these changes are intertwined and interrelated one with another.

CULTURE CHANGES

The anthropological concept of culture often includes two classes of data—material and non-material. Concrete changes in material culture—increasing mechanization of farm and home tasks and the rapid development of mass media of communication and surface transportation changes—have been so well documented it is unnecessary to discuss them here. These changes have influenced society. Also material changes have contributed to lessening rural-urban differences.

Looking at non-material culture changes we have to go beyond standard statistical collections into the publications of sociologists and anthropologists. Non-material changes occurred in the less-concrete, less-observable aspects of our culture. The first aspect discussed is a combined category of specialization of work and centralization of services. You have witnessed specialization among your teaching colleagues and consolidation of schools presents an educational example of centralization of services.

We have fewer teachers each year who have responsibility for more than two areas of subject matter or whose students have a wide range in age. School consolidation involved moving people to a service in the interest of improved facilities, enlarged curricula, increased efficiencies, more adequate salaries. A cursory glance at rural social researches of the past two decades reveals that in the era of rural school consolidation, churches closed, open country service facilities moved to towns and villages, and other changes occurred in the social organization of rural areas. Over the long-run of this era out-migration of farm population occurred.

Another case of centralization and specialization concerns the increasing importance of the expanded activities of non-local government agencies. Probably rural dwellers, more than city ones, have a greater awareness of the expanded activities of government agencies since each REA plant, reclamation project, and SCS or country extension office constitutes a visible symbol of non-local government activity. Many of these also symbolize the new specialized jobs needed to serve agriculture. Educators, too, have seen more state aid and supervision in this period.

The second area of non-material culture change includes the extensive development and application of the social sciences. Particular reference should be made to sociology, social psychology, psychology, and anthropology and, of course, to the integrating fields such as human growth and development. Possibly no occupational group has more enthusiastically accepted social science findings than have educators. Further, educators have elaborated on these findings in educational theory and in application-situations. However, the important factor from the cultural change reference point is the development and application of these sciences. Our culture in the past half century constituted a climate conducive to their use.

Another culture change occurring in the past fifty years is the change from production to consumption-orientation. Leo Lowenthal reported in 1944 on his analysis of biographies appearing in *The Saturday Evening Post* and *Colliers* magazines for the years 1900, 1920, and 1940. He found the occupations of persons biographized in 1900 were more apt to be inventors, manufacturers, and financiers bent on industrial development. These were the "Empire Builders." By 1920 Lowenthal noted the appearance of a number of biographies of stars of opera and the movies. By 1940 a significant number of biographies were devoted to athletes, stage, screen, and radio stars.

Lowenthal labels the "Empire Builders" the "Captains of Production" and those whose occupational callings received more space in recent magazine biographies the "Captains of Consumption." This rather remarkable shift in culture "heroes" symbolizes an extensive reorientation of many people in our society. Probably the trend Lowenthal identified has not altered in the intervening years.

CONSEQUENCES OF CULTURE CHANGES FOR EDUCATION

The consequences of changes in material culture have been pervasive for our society. Margaret Mead provides us a means for analyzing this material in one of her comparative portrayals of American and English cultures. She observed that the Englishman regards the real world as a realm to which he adapts, while the American regards the real world as something to overcome, alter, control. In the English culture man is *a part of nature*. Margaret Mead labeled the Englishman the "Junior Partner of God" in his own conception of himself. In the American culture man is somewhat *apart from nature* and the real world constitutes fair game for manipulation. One explanation Miss Mead offers for our attitude is that it was frontier-born when resources were practically limitless.

Margaret Mead's insight allows us to set in perspective the "typical" American culture. We control climate within our buildings and synthesize many products formerly extracted directly from the land or its products. In rural living we exercise high control over crop and livestock production through hybridization and applications of insecticides and synthetic fertilizers and artificial breeding.

It appears as though the farmer—the rural person—more actively and intimately controls nature than does the urban person who lives, relatively speaking, in a man-made environment, but whose environment—because of its man-made ness—appears to him to be less influenced by the vagaries of nature. Perhaps we

can say Miss Mead's suggestion has greater relevance for rural educators than for urban educators.

Successful applications of science on a wide scale have consequences for culture, individual personalities, and practices of education. The highly rational attitude is not likely to include humility as a dominant characteristic. Rather the materialistic belief is likely to foster the notion that man can do anything by simply marshalling material and financial resources. Another likely consequence is that a man becomes falsely confident of his power and contemptuous of the real world and, in turn, of man himself.

Formal education agencies have the resources to deal with this attribute of our culture. The first step toward solving a problem lies in its identification which Margaret Mead accomplished for us in this case. Education concerns itself with developing in individuals the flexible quality of accepting new values and attitudes. Man-made machines can be changed. Attitudes and values also are man-made and can be changed.

One way teachers have applied a corrective to the attitude of man standing apart from the world occurs in their incorporation of maturation theory into teaching practices. I do not think this is a nebulous connection. Many teachers refused to abide by the attitude that all like-aged children had the same maturation experiences and the same learning abilities. Their relativistic orientation recognized individual capacities and differences and dealt with each student on his merits.

The attitude of control more nearly fit the old pedagogy wherein all students were given a set of materials on a time schedule and all were expected to conform to an established pattern and achieve a standardized goal. This attitude tended to regard the individual student almost solely as a passive consumer of the knowledge disseminated by adults. Persons holding this attitude failed to recognize that students "learn" from their colleagues and that learning occurs in other than formal classroom situations. They also equated rote learning with retained learning.

One way to regard this problem of man's relationship to the world of things lies imbedded in his relationship to other men—the way he defines his role with reference to others and his conception of other's expectancies concerning his role. Teachers who set aside time in each school day for student-administered group discussions, group work, and study activities will contribute to democratic practices. Through these activities every individual has opportunities to play roles of leadership and followership and as a consequence is likely to develop a stable personality rooted in democratic social activities. By democratically participating in a variety of roles the individual achieves the quality of adaptability, a characteristic necessary to accept change. In our society we constantly are confronted with change and the quality of adaptability seems vitally necessary to the individual's sense of security. The secure person fears neither the future nor the present.

Specialization of work into a proliferation of roles and the centralization of services proceeded from assumptions nurtured in the rational attitude. One consequence of the specialization of roles was that the family lost to other agen-

cies and groups some of its former responsibilities. For instance, with regard to personality development, Talcott Parsons observes that the greater opportunities girls have to identify themselves with an adult feminine role—the mother—(and I would add—the school teacher)—and the practice they have playing these roles is one explanation for the differences often observed in "typical" boy and "typical" girl personalities.

Parsons writes: "It seems to be a definite fact that girls are more apt to be relatively docile, to conform in general according to 'adult' expectation, to be 'good', whereas boys are more apt to be recalcitrant to discipline and defiant of adult authority and expectations." Boys not having opportunities to identify themselves with a male adult role—the father being occupied away from home—have greater problems in developing from childhood to adulthood. To a marked degree, in this sense, the farm boy reared on a family farm who will succeed to farm operatorship has an advantage over the urban reared boy.

When we closed rural schools and churches we consequently withdrew support from many additional neighborhood and community institutions. This does not constitute a romantic plea to return to the "Little Red School House"—many ought to have been closed—nor does it belabor centralization as an evil and a curse. The point is that we changed our school organization and many other aspects of our rural way of life changed due to this consolidation.

According to many anthropologists a change in one aspect of culture or social organization will ramify throughout a social system. Quite often many of these ramifications will be unexpected and contrary to intent because of incomplete understanding of the elements of society. Currently we have the job of building new social organizations in many places. Community development programs, the community school movement in education, the rash of adult education ventures expressed in discussion groups, all may be considered as filling the void left by centralization.

Something of possible use to community school advocates is brought out in recently reported research at the University of Maryland, (Wayne C. Rohrer and John F. Schmidt: *Family Type and Social Participation*). In this study it was found that the most active adults in formal organizations of the community lived in households including younger school-age children (6-11 years). Before having children or before their children reached this age-class, adults participated less with other family members and in community organizations. When later stages in the family cycle were reached—when there were only teenagers or when the children had left the parental home—participation in both family and community declined.

If this analysis applies to other places, community activities are shouldered by relatively few parents in the short run. Participation in community affairs then is not widely distributed. The relevance for the community school movement lies in its opportunity to make the community school a center for widespread community activities. If educators active in this movement see all adults—not just those who are parents of school children—as its clientele, the community school movement will contribute to community integration. The movement will be, in fact, a "community" affair.

One of the greatest consequences of the development of specialized roles is the impairment of communication. Each speciality develops a jargon and each specialist tends to orient toward specialists of his calling. The teachers in a three-teacher school could easily work among themselves and with their neighbors who filled the roles of board members. Intimate and informal relationships prevailed. Communication was simple in that decisions could be reached and policies formed in the primary group environment.

In the impersonal environment of the secondary group, relationships are formal and communicative barriers develop. Highly developed specialization in the absence of inter-communication among specialists can lead to quite different views of and attitudes toward a given situation. For instance, a particular student may be a poor athlete but an excellent student of history. If the two teachers involved jointly evaluate this student's abilities each can gain a more adequate judgment of his capacities. We must regard the student as a whole individual and not fragment him because our specialties form portions of a whole curriculum.

One of our biggest jobs is to develop communication networks between all persons concerned in a social system. In education you have to build adequate intra-education communication systems between teacher and teacher, from the local school level to the county and beyond, and between school personnel and official lay members of the social system of the school. Then you need to build an extra-education communication system as well, not just to and including parents who attend PTA, but to all members of the community. As communication develops participation in affairs and decision-making increases. With increasing participation many administrative tasks which teachers now have will be willingly accepted by lay persons. By increasing lay participation in school affairs, and considering the school an integral part of the community, the void left by centralization will be filled.

The community school should be more than just another meeting place for community affairs. The use of school facilities for adult forums and institutes constitutes a step forward, but let us think of student attendance and participation in these adult activities. Through such adult-child interactions when "adult" matters are being discussed, the young person's transition to full adulthood is gradual and he is freed from being an "apprentice" in community affairs when he reaches adulthood. The latter—adult apprenticeship—appeared to be the case in the family type study just cited.

The community school movement appears to have importance in another way. It seems to constitute a reversal of the trend of bringing people to services and appears rather to bring services to people. In urban areas this trend has developed in recent decades in the decentralization of many services. Perhaps the community school movement stands in the forefront of a significant developing rural trend.

The applications of the social sciences ramify throughout our society just as do technological changes. Also, as in technological changes, unintended consequences developed from these applications. Industry, labor, government, and business have supported studies in training, developing, and selecting leaders.

Other studies have dealt with morale, social tensions, communication, the small group, and other areas with increasing emphasis in recent decades. Educators have applied social science findings in sociometric seating arrangement, in changing the role of the teacher from that of the "merchant of ideas" to that of the "developer of learning situations," and in other ways. Some educators revised their methods in the light of researches on social climates—autocratic, democratic, "laissez-faire" environments—due to the discovered influences social environment has on social control and learning.

Probably the teacher's use of sociometric seating arrangements reflects the quality of flexibility in that it constitutes a change from traditional physical arrangements. However, one caution must be noted. Through this means we discover the membership of the congeniality group, but all persons are not chosen. In other words sociometry identifies the socially adjusted and unadjusted. What do we do with the isolate? Is he forgotten or crudely manipulated to "join the others?" Sociometry is a means to the end of setting up situations where learning can occur in a congenial atmosphere. By developing congenial situations in which students may learn from one another, perhaps the teacher will be freed to devote more attention to the isolate. The isolate may benefit from this attention to the extent that he becomes a more secure person and may become a member of a congeniality group.

At this point it would be well to discuss briefly the idea that social science applications may be used for good or ill. These applications may be used to further administrative objectives in which case we "use" people and actually treat them as means. The applications can be used in a way appropriate to democratic beliefs to contribute to the growth of an individual to the end that he fills responsible roles in a democratic society. As teachers or supervisors we must constantly assess our methods and techniques. To whom does this idea contribute? To my own or to others' objectives? Neither the "suggestion box" nor the "open door policy" mean in and of themselves that democratic beliefs are being pursued or inculcated.

Teachers can, by their attitudes toward and actions with their students, demonstrate that people in all places have resources, skills, and knowledge useful to others. Teachers who keenly observe their students, the pre-schoolers, and adults of the community will better prepare themselves for their complex job of teaching. Through their observations they will be more likely to incorporate into their inter-actions with students ideas useful to these students in adulthood.

One elaboration on this idea of the teacher as an observer of children and adults has reference to the PTA organization. It is my impression that PTA's virtually exclude children from their scheduled events. How can parent and teacher better understand the child and each other if the three do not share some inter-active experiences? In the absence of common inter-active situations unrealistic segmentalized knowledge of parent-child, teacher-child, and parent-teacher relationships is likely to develop. One virtue of the old rural practice of the teacher boarding with families had the positive characteristic that all could obtain a "whole" picture of inter-actions among child, parent, and teacher.

Probably the rising interest in matters of consumption was a consequence of the virtual disappearance of our Nation's physical frontier. A narrowing of land resources stemmed the westward, farmward migration. In its stead we have witnessed population concentration in urban areas. On the periphery of cities even land uses changed from production to consumption use, e. g., from farm land to residential sites.

Some aspects of our consumption-orientation is expressed in the increasing interest in hobbies, the number of persons taking annual vacations, the national characteristic that women spend more money than men, and the vast array of appliances whose manufacture is directed toward easing burdens of the homemaker and homeowner. Another expression of this is found in the change in subject matter interest which occurred in the last three decades of Home Economics Extension in the State of Maryland. When Home Demonstration Agent work began in the 1920's subject matter included for the most part food preservation, furniture renovation, and making clothes. Now many Maryland homemaker's interests lie in learning to make decorative objects for the home, costume jewelry, and other items of consumption.

The increasing importance of sports in every school program illustrates the point. Denis Brogan broaches the thesis that sports activities in our schools contribute to the Americanization of the children of immigrants since they could participate in these activities despite their parents' cultural backgrounds. A further point on the pervasiveness of this new attitude and, in fact, of its integrating quality, is offered by Kimball in his study of a rural-urban fringe area. This area, including residents of heterogeneous background and community disorganization, became organized as an integrated community around the recreational interests of the residents.

The orientation toward consumption may be a recognition that all our problems are not production problems. The consumption-orientation found in our culture may be incorporated into school programs by consciously-directed activities in handicrafts work and in consumer education. In the area of handicrafts, and related to this, in the pursuance of hobbies, perhaps we will find a method to bridge the gap between consumption and production-orientation.

The implications of these culture changes have relevance for education in areas of curriculum, the role of the teacher in the school and community, and in human relations. To translate these changes into action, educators should use these guide lines: School and the local society are interdependent; the individual's development as a stable personality is not segmentalized and compartmentalized but is a processual development; rural and urban life are interdependent; yesterday's curriculum, method, and content, though successful, does not necessarily meet the needs of the student of today.

PRESENT STATUS OF PERSONNEL NEEDED

T. M. STINNETT

*Executive Secretary**National Commission on**Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA*

Since to the best of my knowledge no definitive data exists regarding personnel needs of rural schools, we must draw conclusions from existing overall needs.

As a generalized statement, it may be said that the Nation has been in a continuous period of teacher shortage since the beginning of World War II. The shortage grew steadily worse during the war and ameliorated only slightly after its close. Then with the impact of a number of adverse factors—adverse in terms of getting a balance in teacher supply and demand—the situation has rapidly deteriorated since 1950.

SOME VITAL STATISTICS

The shortage during the war years was, of course, a result of the general manpower shortage. But by 1945 or 1947, the schools began to receive the first wave of children from an increased birth rate that started in 1940. Almost every year since 1940 has produced an aggregate increase in the number of births, reaching the all-time high of about 4,000,000 in 1953. Preliminary reports indicate that 1954 will show another increase. Thus, for several years now, the elementary schools have had increased enrollments of more than 1,000,000. In 1953-54, the increase reached 1,600,000. Between now and 1960, the annual increase will approximate 1.3 million in the elementary schools.

What do these increased enrollments mean in terms of teacher needs? They mean that from 40,000 to 50,000 new teaching positions are created each year. When annual replacement needs of something like 50,000 are added as well as needs to replace sub-standard teachers, to reduce overloading, and to provide additional curriculum services, there is an indicated total demand for new elementary teachers each year of not less than 125,000. Currently, we are producing about 45,000 new elementary teachers annually, and only 35,000 of these are degree graduates. At the elementary school level alone, we have for several years been piling up an annual deficit of from 50,000 to 75,000 qualified elementary teachers. The U. S. Office of Education estimates a deficit of 124,000 qualified elementary teachers for the school year 1954-55.

We are just now reaching the stage of critical shortages of teachers at the high school level, because high schools are just now beginning to experience the results of the upswing in birth rates. Between now and 1965, however, the high school teacher supply problem will be just as critical—if not more so—as the elementary teacher situation has been since 1948. High school enrollments will increase by 66 percent by 1965. In terms of numbers, high school enrollments will increase from about 7,000,000 to 12,000,000 or more. Where there are now 3 children in high school there will be 4 in 1960, and 5 in 1965. That

is to say, where there are now 3 high school classrooms and 3 high school teachers, there must be 4 in 1960 and 5 in 1965.

High school enrollments will increase on the average of about $\frac{1}{2}$ million each year through 1965. In terms of the number of new teachers needed annually, something like 25,000 will be required to man new positions which must be added because of increased enrollments, an additional 25,000 to 50,000 will be needed for replacements, to eliminate sub-standard teachers for added curriculum services, and to reduce overloading, making a total annual need for new high school teachers of from 50,000 to 75,000 on the average.

It has been estimated that the need for new high school teachers this fall was 50,000. That is almost exactly the number prepared last year but we have data which indicates that not more than 30,000 of those prepared will actually teach.

To summarize, the annual need for new teachers will be:

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. For elementary teachers through 1960 | 100,000 to 125,000 |
| 2. For high school teachers | 50,000 to 75,000 |

<i>Total annual need</i>	150,000 to 200,000
--------------------------	--------------------

Current (1953-54) production of new teachers was:

- | | |
|----------------|--------|
| 1. Elementary | 45,000 |
| 2. High School | 50,000 |

<i>Total</i>	95,000
--------------	--------

Thus, the annual production is running from 55,000 to 105,000 short of estimated needs.

To sum up the dilemma which is in prospect, total school enrollment between now and 1965 will increase from $34\frac{1}{2}$ million to 44 million. If the increased number of new teaching positions required approximate the enrollment increase, between 300,000 and 400,000 new teachers will be needed in the next 10 years to man new positions alone.

What are the basic factors involved in these alarming shortages and in the dim prospects for the future? Let's leave for later discussion the causes of instability within the teaching profession, taking a look first at some factors which, whatever might have been done, would probably indicate serious teacher shortages.

First, it must be recognized that we are in a period in which the demands for teaching services are at the highest level in our history. Second, we are in a period in which the pool from which such services must be drawn is at relatively the lowest level in our history. The first is, of course, a result of the high birth rates that began in 1940 and have continued since, resulting in enrollment increases of 6,000,000 between 1940 and 1954 and pushing up the annual demand for the teachers from perhaps 75,000 to 150,000.

The second factor is a result of the low birth rates of the 1930's, which are now reflected in relatively low college enrollments. The pool from which we get

new teachers is college graduating classes. In 1950 a total of 433,000 graduated from our colleges with first degrees. By 1954 this number had dropped to 285,000, a decline of 34.3 percent. This decline has been reflected, as would be expected, in a decline in the annual production of teachers since 1950. The production of high school teachers has dropped 41.7 percent since 1950, and in some fields, notably the sciences, the decline has been greater. At the elementary school level, the annual production since 1950 has been reduced by 26 percent. The decline last year was nearly 7 percent.

As distressing as the foregoing figures are, there is another aspect concerning which we now have data—from 13 states—for the first time which indicates that an alarming proportion of those completing preparation for teaching each year do not actually take teaching jobs. If the sampling data from those 13 states can be applied to the Nation as a whole, 35 percent of all persons completing preparation for teaching take jobs outside the teaching profession.

At the elementary level 56 percent of the men and 82 percent of the women, or 78 percent of all, actually become teachers. At the high school level, only 43 percent of the men and 66 percent of the women, 54 percent of all, actually teach. This means that of the 45,000 elementary teachers prepared last year, only 40,000 actually can be considered as supply, and of the 50,000 high school teachers, only 27,000 can be so considered. Instead of having 95,000 new teachers available for the schools this fall, only 67,000 actually accepted teaching jobs.

PERSONNEL NEEDS FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

As I said at the outset, to my best knowledge, we have no accurate data on the personnel needs of rural schools as such separate and apart from the over-all needs of all types of schools.

We shall, therefore, have to draw some conclusions from comparative data. These comparisons cannot be accurate because the population picture is changing so rapidly that what may be true in 1954 may not be true in 1955. However, I believe we can derive some rough approximations on the personnel needs of the rural schools from relative factors.

We know that the rural population approximates 40 percent of the Nation total. We know, too, that in general there are more children in the average rural family than in the average urban family. Therefore, it would appear to be a reasonable assumption that about 50 percent of our school population is rural. We could say roughly, therefore, that the personnel needs of the rural schools would be at least half of the total projections listed above, or for the elementary schools from 50,000 to 70,000 new teachers each year and for the high schools from 25,000 to 40,000. As a matter of fact, because of certain peculiar factors I shall discuss below, we know that the need will be more than this, that rural areas face a much more critical task in getting and keeping enough competent teachers than does the Nation as a whole. What are some of those factors?

FACTORS AFFECTING SUPPLY OF TEACHERS FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

1. In boom time or bust, in periods of abundant teacher supply or in periods of teacher shortages, rural schools do not get an even break in securing qualified teachers. In times of abundant supply, urban schools will not take the beginning or inexperienced teacher. They siphon off the experienced rural teachers and rural schools are compelled to take those without experience. In periods of short supply, urban schools tend to take all qualified teachers, leaving the sub-standards, the cast-offs, and the incompetent for the rural schools.

2. Studies on the subject have generally revealed that newly qualified teachers preponderantly prefer urban to rural school jobs.

3. The rural schools face special problems of their own with respect to teacher supply and demand, for there is evidence that teachers in rural schools are relatively poorly qualified.

- a. In a study of teachers in rural schools in 1951-52, the NEA Research Division pointed out:

"Fifteen years ago 62.3 percent of the teachers in one-teacher rural schools had at least two years of college training and 10.0 percent were college graduates. Today these percents are 76.5 and 23.2 respectively. . . . the above data pertain only to teachers in one-teacher schools. There are, however, certain other possible comparisons that are enlightening. In 1938-39, 38.2 percent of the elementary teachers in *city* school systems had at least four years of college training; the corresponding percent for rural elementary teachers in 1951-52 was 38.1. In other words, rural teachers have just about caught up to where city teachers were 13 years ago . . .

"In rural elementary schools only 1 teacher in every 3 has a degree, and 41.2 percent still have less than 3 years of college training." (In the Nation as a whole 67 percent have degrees.)

- b. The above figures do not reveal the full dimensions of the problem of standards in rural elementary schools. Complete data are not available but the 1954 Teacher Supply and Demand Study revealed that in some predominantly rural states where the one-room school is still common there are large numbers of teachers who have never been to college at all or who have a negligible amount of college training.

- (1) In Nebraska in 1953-54, an analysis of the preparation of *new* elementary teachers showed that about 40 percent had *less* than 30 semester hours of college credit and that an additional 24 percent had no college credit whatsoever. In other words, a total of nearly 2/3 of the new elementary teachers had been to college for less than a year or not at all.

Moreover, since about 70 percent of all new elementary teachers in Nebraska were employed in one-room schools, we may safely assume that the rural children of Nebraska are being taught, to a large extent, by teachers who have virtually no college preparation. (Among experienced Nebraska elementary teachers, nearly 40 percent have less than two years of college work.)

(2) In North Dakota, among all elementary teachers, both new and experienced, nearly 45 percent have less than two years of college preparation. This includes about 30 percent who have *less than a year* of college work. North Dakota also has many one-room schools. Among all *new* elementary teachers employed last year, more than $\frac{3}{4}$ were employed in one-room schools.

c. We must remember, of course, that many states are doing a much better job in securing teachers for their schools, both rural and urban. In Arizona, for example, 98 percent of all teachers are college graduates, and the other 2 percent have had three years of college. However, it is clear that a vast number of rural children are being cheated of their right to be taught by a well prepared teacher.

4. The typical rural teacher has always received a smaller salary than the over-all average of American teachers' salaries and a great deal less than urban teachers. In 1951-52, the average salary of rural teachers was only \$2,484 and the average salary of rural elementary teachers was only \$2,385. At that time, teachers in cities of over 500,000 were receiving an average of about \$4,500—roughly twice the pay of rural teachers. In 1951-52, the average rural teacher started the school year with a personal indebtedness of about \$800—about $\frac{1}{3}$ of his annual salary.

5. The low salaries of rural teachers have sometimes been dismissed with the statement that these teachers are typically young people, inexperienced, living at home with their parents, and having no dependents. This is a completely erroneous idea.

a. During the past 15 years, the rural teaching force has changed from a group of workers that was predominantly single to one that is predominantly married. Almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of all rural teachers are married. The average age of elementary teachers is 42 and of secondary teachers about 34. About $\frac{1}{4}$ are men, typically with two or three dependents.

b. Rural teachers typically live four or five miles from school and do not have public transportation available. They must, therefore, own and maintain an automobile.

c. Rental housing is difficult to find in many rural areas. Consequently, it is not surprising that the majority of rural teachers are living in homes that they own, or rather are trying to pay for. About a fourth of these houses do not have inside toilets or bathtubs and a third of them do not have access to a telephone.

6. Professional working conditions and teacher welfare:

a. Teachers in relatively large rural schools typically have definite salary schedules and written contracts. However, there are still many rural teachers in smaller schools who are not paid on a definite scale and who are not under written contract. It is still rather typical in rural areas to pay secondary teachers more than elementary teachers of equivalent education and experience.

- b. Paid sick-leave is now common in rural districts, but about 1/4 of all rural teachers are still without it. The average is 7 or 8 days per year.
- c. Most rural teachers can now get a few days off each year to attend professional meetings.
- d. Large rural schools tend to be relatively modern and adequate, but there are still thousands of teachers working in rural schools that are inadequate. 70 percent of teachers in one-room schools do not have access to a sink with running water; 85 percent do not have a teacher's locker; more than half have either no storage space or space which they consider definitely inadequate; 1/4 work in buildings with inadequate heat; 1/3 consider their ventilation inadequate; 15 percent have *no artificial lighting* and a full 1/3 have inadequate lighting.
- e. Research indicates that it is no longer true that the rural teacher must often contribute to the campaign funds of local politicians; that he must submit to community restrictions upon smoking, dancing, dating, etc.; that he is required to remain in the community on week ends, to teach local Sunday School classes, etc. However, substantial numbers of teachers do not feel free to discuss certain controversial issues, especially sex, criticism of prominent business or political leaders, separation of church and state, communism or socialism.

Program

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

ON

RURAL EDUCATION

Education for Rural America
—a forward look

Sponsored By

The National Education Association of the United States Through its
Department of Rural Education

With the Assistance of

The Office of Education of the United States Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare and the cooperation of other National
Organizations and Agencies and State Committees.

Washington, D. C.
October 4-6, 1954

OPENING GENERAL SESSION

MONDAY 9:30 A.M.

Presiding

MRS. LUCILLE L. KLINGE, Superintendent, Lane County Schools, Eugene, Oregon;
President, Department of Rural Education, NEA

Music

MT. VERNON HIGH SCHOOL CONCERT BAND, Mt. Vernon, Fairfax County, Virginia.
Eugene Steinbach, Director

As I See Rural Education at Midcentury

MISS WAURINE WALKER, President, National Education Association

As I View Rural Education—1954

SAMUEL M. BROWNELL, U. S. Commissioner of Education

*Presentation of Diplomatic Officials from Other Nations**A Decade of Education in Rural America*

HOWARD A. DAWSON, Executive Secretary, Department of Rural Education, NEA

Forces Confronting Rural Education in Building a Better World

JOHN H. DAVIS, Director, Moffett Program in Agriculture and Business, Harvard University

ASSEMBLY ONE

MONDAY 2:00 P.M.

THE TEACHER

To explore the situation with respect to teachers and other school personnel to serve rural people.

Presiding

Cecil E. SHUFFIELD, Supervisor, Howard County Schools, Nashville, Ark.

The Nation's Stake in the Teacher Situation

VERNON L. HEATH, Vice President, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Robinson

The Teachers We Need to Serve Rural Children and Youth

GLENN KENDALL, President, Chico State College, Chico, Calif.

*Discussion of questions presented in writing by members of the Assembly**Panel of Consultants:*

Chairman: WILLIAM MCKINLEY ROBINSON, Director, Department of Rural Life and Education, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo

Consultants:

EARL ANDERSON, Chief, Teacher Education Section, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

W. EARL ARMSTRONG, Executive Director, National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D. C.

WARD E. BARNES, Superintendent of Schools, Normandy, Missouri

FRANK H. GORMAN, Dean, College of Education, University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska

EVELYN R. HODGSON, Professor of Education, State Teachers College, Oneonta, New York

E. L. COLE, Dean, Grambling College, Grambling, La.

MRS. NEWTON P. LEONARD, President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago, Illinois

Cecil W. POSSY, Executive Secretary, Oregon Education Association, Portland

T. M. STONNETT, Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA, Washington, D. C.

ASSEMBLY TWO

MONDAY 2:00 P.M.

THE STUDENT

To explore the situation with respect to who are to be educated and the nature of their unmet needs.

Presiding

ERNEST W. BARKER, Superintendent, Pottawattamie County Schools, Council Bluffs, Iowa

The Task Ahead in Achieving Equal Educational Opportunity for All

FRANCIS S. CHASE, Chairman, Department of Education, University of Chicago, Illinois

The Distinctive Educational Needs of Rural People

MRS. HAVEN SMITH, Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chappell, Nebraska

Discussion of questions presented in writing by members of the Assembly

Panel of Consultants:

Chairman: ROBERT S. FOX, Principal, University Elementary School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Consultants:

PETER BANCROFT, District Superintendent, Vineland School, Bakersfield, California
EMERSON D. BAUGH, Juvenile Judge for Brunswick County, Lawrenceville, Virginia;
Past President, Virginia Conference of Social Work

MRS. G. W. BENNINGTON, Kansas Council for Children and Youth, Towanda

MARY M. CONDON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Helena, Montana

ROBERT C. HATCH, Executive Secretary, Alabama State Teachers Association, Montgomery

MARY E. LEEPER, Teacher Extension Division, University of Virginia; Executive Secretary Emeritus, Association for Childhood Education International, Washington, D. C.

ROMAINE P. MACKIE, Chief, Exceptional Children and Youth, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

GLYN A. MORRIS, Director of Guidance, Board of Cooperative Service, Port Leyden, New York

MRS. HILDEGARD THOMPSON, Chief, Education Branch, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

A. L. WINSOR, Director, School of Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

MRS. MARGUERITE ZAPOLEON, Special Assistant, Occupational Outlook Services, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

ASSEMBLY THREE

MONDAY 2:00 P.M.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM

To explore the means by which adequate educational opportunities can become available to rural people.

Presiding

MRS. MARJORIE B. LEINAUER, Superintendent, DeKalb County Schools, Sycamore, Illinois

A School Administrator's Viewpoint

FRANK W. CYR, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

An Agricultural Leader's Viewpoint

JOHN K. COX, Secretary, General Services, Illinois Agricultural Association, Chicago

Discussion of questions presented in writing by members of the Assembly

Panel of Consultants:

Chairman: SAMPSON G. SMITH, Superintendent, Somerset County Schools, Somerville, New Jersey

Consultants:

E. J. BRAUN, Assistant Superintendent, Arlington County Schools, Arlington, Virginia

MRS. VERDA DIERZEN, Principal, Westwood Consolidated Unit School, Woodstock, Illinois

PAUL E. FARNUM, Chief, Division of Administrative Services, State Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire

CLAYTON D. HUTCHINS, Specialist, School Finance, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

MICHAEL S. KLES, Superintendent, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MELVIN BEXLER, Assistant Superintendent, Stark County Schools, Canton, Ohio

BEATRICE MCCONNELL, Chief, Legislative Standards and State Services Division, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

J. J. MCPHERSON, Director, Audio-Visual Instructional Service, NEA, Washington, D. C.

ALVIN E. RHODES, Superintendent, San Luis Obispo County Schools, San Luis Obispo, California

J. G. STRATTON, President, National School Boards Association, Inc., Clinton, Oklahoma

RALPH S. SWAN, Deputy Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

ASSEMBLY FOUR

MONDAY 2:00 P.M.

THE SCHOOL IN THE COMMUNITY

To explore the relationships of school and community; their implications for public education in rural communities.

Presiding

MRS. MARIE R. TURNER, Superintendent, Breathitt County Schools, Jackson, Kentucky

An Educator's Viewpoint

WILLARD E. GOSLIN, Chairman, Division of School Administration and Community Leadership, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

A Community Leader's Viewpoint

GUSCOM MORGAN, Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio

Discussion of questions presented in writing by members of the Assembly

Panel of Consultants:

Chairman: MILO J. PETERSON, Head, Department of Agricultural Education, University of Minnesota, St. Paul

Consultants:

- F. S. CROCKETT, Chairman, Council on Rural Health, American Medical Association, West Lafayette, Indiana
 M. L. CUSHMAN, Dean, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
 DONALD R. FESSLER, Extension Sociologist, Extension Service, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg
 MRS. MARY KENAN HADLEY, Librarian, Prince Georges County Memorial Library, Hyattsville, Maryland
 HAROLD K. JACK, State Director of Health and Physical Education, Richmond, Virginia
 LLOYD HALVORSON, The National Grange, Washington, D. C.
 MILLARD Z. POND, Project Coordinator for CPEA, Ohio State University, Columbus
 WALTER F. PRETZER, Director, American Country Life Association; member, Cuyahoga County School Board, Cleveland, Ohio
 WOODROW J. SIZER, Superintendent, Mayville Public Schools, Mayville, Wisconsin
 GORDON A. WESS, Superintendent, Ascension Parish Schools, Donaldson, Louisiana
 GRAHAM T. WINSLOW, Chairman, Massachusetts Council for Public School, Boston

THE DIVISIONAL MEETINGS

To consider specific problems and promising lines of action for their solution.

DIVISION I

THE NEEDED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM—SCOPE AND QUALITY

This Division program planned by a Committee from the U. S. Office of Education, FRANK THOMAS, Chairman

Session One: Rural Education in the Years Ahead **MONDAY 8:00 P.M.**

Session Chairman: W. E. PAFFORD, Director, Division of Field Services, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia

Educational Progress Since 1944

W. CARSON RYAN, Kenan Professor of Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Cultural Changes and What They Mean for Educational Goals

WAYNE C. ROHLER, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park

Identification of Problems and Issues for Consideration in Tuesday's Work Groups
 AUDIENCE AND PANEL

Panel Members:

- ELIZABETH HENSON, Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Board of Education, Richmond, Virginia
 J. DAN HULL, Chief, Secondary Schools, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 MRS. HARRY NELSON, General Secretary, Alabama Congress of Parents and Teachers, Montgomery
 HERBERT F. MAYNE, Assistant, Bureau of Adult Education, State Education Department, Albany, New York
 MRS. HELEN ADLE WHITING, Director of Teacher Education, Allen University, Columbia, South Carolina

DIVISION 1

Session Two: Problems to be Faced in Educating

Today's Rural Citizens

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Group 1: Elementary School

Group Chairman: R. LEE THOMAS, Director, Division of Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee

Important Problems at the Elementary Level

FRANCIS L. DRAG, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Services Division, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

Resource Persons:

ROBERT W. EAVES, Executive Secretary, Elementary School Principals, NEA, Washington, D. C.

GERTRUDE LEWIS, Consultant in Elementary Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

MRS. HELEN B. McDONALD, Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Winsted, Connecticut

MRS. SARA DIVINE, Supervisor, Tifton County Schools, Tifton, Georgia

FRANCES HAMILTON, Executive Secretary, Association for Childhood Education, International, Washington, D. C.

LOUISE WIERIG, Area Director of Schools, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Billings, Montana

TOM WILEY, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Santa Fe, New Mexico

DIVISION 1

Session Two

Group 2: Secondary School

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Group Chairman: WOODROW WILKERSON, State Supervisor of Secondary Education, Richmond, Virginia

Important Problems at the Secondary Level

EUGENE LAWLER, Professor of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Resource Persons:

MRS. CARL C. BRINKLEY, Supervisor of Instruction, Davidson County Schools, Lexington, North Carolina

JAMES R. BRADEN, Assistant Superintendent, Washington County Schools, Washington, Pennsylvania

JOHN R. LUDINGTON, Specialist in Industrial Arts, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

BERENICE MALLORY, Assistant Chief, Home Economics Branch, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

HAZEL G. MURRAY, Mathematics Instructor, Austin High School, Austin, Minnesota

LENN SHEETS, Principal, Berkeley Springs Union School, Berkeley Springs, West Virginia

HERBERT B. SWANSON, Assistant Chief, Agricultural Education Branch, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

ANDREW TORRENCE, Acting Head, Department of Agricultural Education, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

DIVISION 1

Session Two

Group 3: Post-High School Education in the Community TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Group Chairman: GEORGE P. DEVOE, Professor of Agricultural Education, University of Illinois, Urbana

Important Problems of Post-High School Education in Rural Communities

ROY W. ROBERTS, Head, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Resource Persons:

ROSIE COLOGNE, Specialist in Community Adult Education, Pennsylvania State College, State College

H. B. KNAPP, Director, Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute, Farmingdale, New York

GORDON NELSON, Superintendent of Schools, Maple, Wisconsin

G. HENRY RUCHERT, Director of Distributive Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

FRANK THOMAS, Assistant to the Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

RUA VAN HORN, Program Specialist, Home Economics Education Branch, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 1

Session Three: Promising Lines of Action for Improved Educational Programs in Rural Areas TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Session Chairman: W. E. PLEFFORD, Director, Division of Field Services, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia

Reports of Work Groups

Questions and Discussions

Participants:

WILLIS M. BOYD, Chairman, Rural Service Committee, Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Adairville

B. M. EYMAN, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio

LEO B. HART, District Superintendent of Schools, Pocatello, California

JOHN MORGAN, Superintendent, Burlington County Schools, Mt. Holly, New Jersey

DIVISION 2

THE SCHOOL AS A COMMUNITY INSTITUTION

Division Chairman: NORMAN FROST, Director of Rural Education, American Institute of Cooperation, Nashville, Tennessee

Session One: "Community" and "Community School" MONDAY 8:00 P.M. —their meaning and significance

Session Chairman: MAURICE F. SBAY, Director, Education Division, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan

Symposium

The Community as a Major Aspect of American Life

SLOAN R. WAYLAND, Associate Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

The Schools as a Community Institution

HUGH B. MASTERS, Director, Georgia Center for Continuing Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Significance of the Community School Concept

MARTELLE L. CUSHMAN, Dean, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

Questions from the Audience

Session Summary: MAURICE F. SEAY

DIVISION 2

Session Two: Community Schools that Serve the Needs of People—illustrations and evaluations

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Session Chairman: RICHARD E. JAGGERS, Professor of Education, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond

*Symposium**Community Schools in a County Unit System*

MRS. F. C. BEYERLEY, former Principal, Whitwell Farm Life School, Danville, Virginia

Community Schools in a County of the Intermediate Unit Type

H. C. THAYER, Deputy Superintendent, Washtenaw County Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Community School Needs on the Secondary Level

J. M. STANFIELD, Superintendent, Logan County Schools, Bellefontaine, Ohio

Community Schools Serving Rural and Urban People

W. E. BISHOP, Superintendent of Schools, Englewood, Colorado

Vocational Education Serves Community Needs

B. E. YOUNGQUIST, Principal, Southern School of Agriculture, Waseca, Minnesota

Community School Development in Suburban Expansion

DOUGLAS G. MACRAE, Assistant Superintendent, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Questions from the Audience

Session Summary: RICHARD E. JAGGERS

Session Three: The Community's Citizens—inter-relationships of schools, organizations, and citizens groups

TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Session Chairman: MRS. C. W. DIETJEN, President, Missouri Congress of Parents and Teachers, Webster Groves

*Symposium**Parent-Teacher Associations*

MRS. D. D. BLACK, President, Alabama Congress of Parents and Teachers, Montgomery

Citizens Committees and Community Schools

MAURICE D. BEMENT, Southern Regional Director, National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky

Farm Organizations and Cooperatives and the Community Schools

MRS. VIOLA ARMSTRONG, Manager, Home Department, Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative, Indianapolis

Youth Organizations and the Community Schools

C. DIANA BENNETT, Director, Farm Film Foundation, Washington, D. C.

Some Guideposts in School-Community Relations

GEORGE W. DENEMARK, Executive Secretary, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, Washington, D. C.

Questions from the Audience

Session Summary: MRS. C. W. DETJEN

DIVISION 3

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL TRENDS RELATED TO RURAL EDUCATION

Division Chairman: OSCAR R. LEBEAU, Farmer Cooperative Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Session One: Population Characteristics and Income Distribution as Major Factors Affecting Education MONDAY 8:00 P.M.

Population Distribution and Trends in Rural Areas

CALVIN L. BEALE, Farm Population and Rural Life Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Income Distribution and Trends in Rural Areas

ERNEST W. GROVE, Division of Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Panel Discussion

Leader:

ROBERT A. POLSON, Professor of Rural Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Members:

FRANK ALEXANDER, Social Services Analyst, TVA, Knoxville, Tennessee
SAMUEL W. BLIZZARD, Associate Professor of Rural Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, State College, and Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York

A. G. CAPPS, Professor of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia
R. STAFFORD CLARK, Superintendent, Troup County School, La Grange, Georgia

D. R. STANFIELD, Vice President, Ohio Farm Bureau, Columbus
KENNETH STEAN, President, American Institute of Cooperation, Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 3

Session Two: Special Aspects of a Changing Rural Life TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Cultural Changes in American Rural Life

ALVIN L. BERTRAND, Associate Professor of Rural Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge

Economic Changes in American Rural Life

OTIS DUNCAN, Head, Department of Sociology and Rural Life, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater

Panel Discussion

Leader:

EVLON J. NIEDERFRANK, Extension Rural Sociologist, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Members:

KENNETH L. BACKMAN, Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

JOHN HICKMAN, Farmer Cooperative Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

JAMES L. ROBINSON, Extension Economist, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DR. L. HUNTINGTON, Superintendent, Jasper County Schools, Rensselaer, Indiana

MRS. GERTRUDE WEISS, Assistant Chief, Home Economics Research Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

HORACE WILLIAMSON, Supervisor, Union County Schools, El Dorado, Arkansas

DIVISION 4

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Division Chairman: KENNETH E. MCINTYRE, Associate Professor of Educational Administration, University of Texas, Austin

Session One: Present Status—description and evaluation MONDAY 8:00 P.M.

Symposium

A General Overview of School District Reorganization in the U. S.

WILLIAM J. ELLENA, Assistant to the Director, Division of Rural Service, NEA, Washington, D. C.

Status and Evaluation of School and School District Reorganization in New England

ERNEST O. NYBAKKEN, Chief, Bureau of Rural Supervisory Service, State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut

Status and Evaluation of School and School District Reorganization in the South-eastern States

J. WILKINS SMITH, Superintendent, Coweta County Schools, Newnan, Ga.

W. F. LOGGINS, Superintendent, Greenville County Schools, Greenville, South Carolina

Status and Evaluation of School and School District Reorganization in the Midwest

ARTHUR L. SUMMERS, Director, District Reorganization and Transportation, State Department of Education, Jefferson City, Missouri

Questions from the Audience

DIVISION 4

Session Two: Standards of Organization

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Symposium

Standards of Organization Pertaining to Administration and the Educational Program

JULIAN E. BUTTERWORTH, Professor of Education Administration, Emeritus, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Standards of Organization Pertaining to the Community to be Served

BURTON W. KREITLOW, Associate Professor of Rural Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Standards of Organization Pertaining to School Finance

M. L. CUSHMAN, Dean, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

Standards of Organization for the Intermediate Unit

JENS H. HUTCHENS, Assistant Superintendent, San Diego County Schools,
San Diego, California

Questions from the Audience

DIVISION 4

Session Three: How to Attain Reorganization

TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Symposium

Reorganization of School Districts in a Metropolitan Area

MICHAEL S. KIRS, Superintendent, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee,
Wisconsin

Case Histories of School District Reorganization Programs in Minnesota

T. C. ENGUM, Division Director, Elementary and Secondary Schools, State
Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota

Successful Reorganization Programs in Illinois

S. M. BISHOP, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield,
Illinois

The Role of the State Department of Education in School District Reorganization

FRANCIS E. GRIFFIN, Chief, Bureau of Rural Administrative Services, State
Education Department, Albany, New York

What Experience Tells Us About How to Attain Reorganization

C. O. FITZWATER, Specialist in County and Rural School Administration, U. S.
Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Questions from the Audience

DIVISION 5

TEACHERS AND OTHER PERSONNEL FOR SCHOOLS SERVING RURAL PEOPLE

Division Co-Chairmen:

JOHNNY CIX, Director, Education of Supervisors, University of Georgia,
Athens

JANE FRANSSETH, Specialist in Rural Education, U. S. Office of Education,
Washington, D. C.

*Session One: Present Status, Number and Variety
of Personnel Needed*

MONDAY 8:00 P.M.

Present Status of Personnel Needed

T. M. STINNETT, Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Edu-
cation and Professional Standards, NEA, Washington, D. C.

Number and Variety of Personnel Needed

JENS HUTCHENS, Assistant Superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San
Diego, California

General Discussion

DIVISION 5

*Session Two: Selection and Preparation of
Needed Personnel*

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Selection and Preparation of Teachers

JULIUS M. MURRY, Department of Elementary Education, State Teachers College,
Oswego, New York

Selection and Preparation of Supervisors

GRACE SCOTT, Director, Education of Supervisors, West Virginia University, Morgantown

Selection and Preparation of Administrators

CLARENCE A. NEWELL, Professor of School Administration, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park

Selection and Preparation of Guidance Workers

LEONARD M. MILLER, Specialist in Guidance and Personnel Services, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

General Discussion

DIVISION 5

Session Three: The Task Ahead in Selection and Education of Personnel Serving Rural People TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Factors Related to Teacher Shortage

RAY C. MAUL, Assistant Director, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D. C.

Panel Discussion

Members:

LYLE O. JOHNSON, National President, Future Teachers of America, Denver, Colorado

N. E. FITZGERALD, Dean, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

MARY EVA HITE, Supervisor of Teacher Education, State Department of Education, Columbia, South Carolina

HAROLD E. MOORE, Director, School of Education, University of Denver, Colorado

DIVISION 6

FINANCING THE EDUCATION OF RURAL PEOPLE

Division Chairman: H. F. ALVES, Director, SWSPEA, University of Texas

Session One: Special Aspects of Finance—buildings and equipment, Transportation, educating the handicapped, etc. MONDAY 8:00 P.M.

Session Chairman: H. F. ALVES, Director, Southwestern CPEA, University of Texas, Austin

Presentation of Subject

LEROY PETERSON, Professor of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Panel Discussion

Members:

J. M. DODSON, Executive Secretary, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville

RAY L. HAMON, Chief, School Housing, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

VAUGHN D. SEIDEL, Superintendent, Alameda County Schools, Oakland, California

W. A. SHANNON, Superintendent of Schools, Morristown, Tennessee

W. J. TERRY, State Superintendent of Education, Montgomery, Alabama

FOSTER G. ULRICH, Superintendent, Lebanon County Schools, Lebanon, Pennsylvania

General Discussion

Session Summary: W. L. SHUMAN, Superintendent, Cuyahoga County Schools, Cleveland, Ohio

DIVISION 6

Session Two: Present Systems of State Finance—
evaluation and recommendations

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Session Chairman: CLAYTON D. HUTCHINS, Specialist in School Finance, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Presentation of Subject:

E. L. LINDMAN, Professor of Educational Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

Panel Discussion

Leader:

HAROLD E. MOORE, Director, School of Education, University of Denver, Colorado

Members:

P. A. BENNETT, Superintendent of Schools, Woodsville, New Hampshire
EDWIN W. CHITTUM, Superintendent, Norfolk County Schools, Norfolk, Virginia

EYRETT KEITH, Executive Secretary, Missouri State Teachers Association, Columbia

ERROL C. REES, Superintendent, Multnomah County Schools, Portland, Oregon

A. B. WETHERINGTON, Director of Research, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas

General Discussion

Session Summary: CLAYTON D. HUTCHINS

DIVISION 6

Session Three: Federal Participation in Financing the
Education of Rural People—status and recommendations

TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Session Chairmen: H. F. ALVES, Director, Southwestern CPEA, University of Texas, Austin

Presentation of Subject:

EUGENE LAWLER, Professor of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Panel Discussion

Leader:

REX H. TURNER, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Oakland, California

Members:

H. M. CLEMENTS, Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Independence, Missouri

MRS. FLORENCE H. PRICE, Roseville Avenue School, Newark, New Jersey; Legislative Commission, NEA

HELMER E. SORENSON, Professor of Education, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater

General Discussion

Session Summary: WALTER C. REUSSER, Dean, Adult Education and Community Service, University of Wyoming, Laramie

DIVISION 7

PHYSICAL FACILITIES FOR SCHOOLS SERVING RURAL PEOPLE AND THEIR COMMUNITIES (BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, ETC.)

Division Chairman: MERLE A. STONEMAN, Professor of School Administration, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Session One: Functional Planning of Physical Facilities for Community Schools TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Functional Planning in Terms of the Program to be Accommodated

REX K. RECKEWEY, Assistant Professor of Education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Characteristics and Specifications of Physical Facilities Needed for Community Schools

JAMES L. TAYLOR, Specialist in School Plant Planning, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Panel Discussion

Leader: MERLE A. STONEMAN, Professor of School Administration, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Members:

MARGARET BAUER, Supervisor of Nurses, School Health Department, Arlington, Virginia

MRS. MAY CHESAK, Principal, Greenwood Consolidated Unit School, Woodstock, Illinois

RAY L. HAMON, Chief, School Housing, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

BETTY HANDY, School Lunch Branch, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

SARAH JONES, Chief Library Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia

NORMAN KEY, Secretary, National Commission on Safety Education, NEA, Washington, D. C.

JAY VAN NUYS, Architect, Somerville, New Jersey

DIVISION 7

Session Two: Community and School Related Use of School Facilities TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Use of School Buildings for Activities Other Than Instruction

THEODORE J. JENSON, Superintendent of Schools, Shorewood, Wisconsin

Use of School Transportation Facilities for Community and Auxiliary Purposes

EARL C. WELSHIMER, Educational Consultant, Carpenter Body Works, Worthington, Ohio

Panel Discussion

Leader: MERLE A. STONEMAN, Professor of School Administration, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Members:

JOHN BIGGER, Assistant Director, Division of Adult Education Service, NEA, Washington, D. C.

W. T. EDGREN, Director, Transportation Division, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa

T. H. NAYLOR, Director, Division of School Building and Transportation, State Department of Education, Jackson, Mississippi

- I. FRED SIMMONS, Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Birmingham, Alabama
 IRVIN H. SCHMITT, Superintendent, Falls Church Public Schools, Falls Church, Virginia
 ROGER UNRUH, President, Kansas Association of School Boards, Pawnee Rock

DIVISION 8

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT

Division Chairman: CHARLES H. BOEHM, Superintendent, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Session One: Emerging Concepts of the Intermediate Unit **MONDAY 8:00 P.M.**

Session Chairman: ERNEST W. BARKER, Superintendent, Pottawattamie County Schools, Council Bluffs, Iowa

Presentation of Subject

JOHN GUY FOWLKES, Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Panel Discussion

Leader:

MICHAEL S. KIES, Superintendent, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members:

MEDILL BAIR, Superintendent, Pennsbury Community Schools, Fallsington, Pennsylvania

BERNARD L. BRYAN, Director, Board of Cooperative Educational Services, White Plains, New York

JOHN M. LUMLEY, Deputy Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

L. A. ROBERTS, Superintendent, Dallas County Schools, Dallas, Texas

FRED VESCOLANI, Project Associate, Department of Administration, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

CLINTON F. WHETSTONE, Superintendent, Calhoun County Schools, Marshall, Michigan

B. O. WILSON, Superintendent, Contra Costa County Schools, Martinez, California

ROB M. WRIGHT, Business Manager, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago, Illinois

General Discussion

DIVISION 8

Session Two: Services to the Community Schools
 by the Intermediate Unit

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Session Chairman: CHARLES H. BOEHM, Superintendent of Schools, Bucks County, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Symposium

Curriculum Consultant Services

MORTON BOTEL, Reading Consultant, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Curriculum Materials Center Services

FRED C. BEYER, Superintendent, Stanislaus County Schools, Modesto California

Speech and Hearing Coordinator

ALICE V. STONE, Speech Coordinator, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Program for Handicapped Children, Child Guidance Clinics, and Services of School Psychologists and Psychiatrists

LESTER MYER, Chief, Special Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Administrative Services

ALFRED W. BEATTIE, Superintendent, Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Special Information Services

ALVIN E. RHODES, Superintendent, San Luis Obispo County Schools, San Luis Obispo, California

Services to State and Federal Agencies and Semipublic Organizations

C. C. TRILLINGHAM, Superintendent, Los Angeles County Schools, Los Angeles, California

Use of Intermediate Services by Community School Systems

J. EDWARD SMITH, Superintendent, Doylestown Community Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

General Discussion

DIVISION B

Session Three: Operational Processes and Procedures
of the Intermediate Unit

TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Session Chairman: L. A. ROBERTS, Superintendent, Dallas County Schools, Dallas, Texas

Control, Authority, Relationships and Leadership as Functions of the Intermediate Unit Personnel

WILLIAM J. EMERSON, Superintendent, Oakland County Schools, Pontiac, Michigan

Financing the Intermediate Unit

EDMUND H. CRANE, Associate Director, Division of Research, State Education Department, Albany, New York

Panel Discussion

Leader:

SAMPSON G. SMITH, Superintendent, Somerset County Schools, Somerville, New Jersey

Members:

JULIAN E. BUTTERWORTH, Professor of Educational Administration, Emeritus, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

JOSEPH S. NEIDIG, Superintendent, Quakertown Community Schools, Quakertown, Pennsylvania

CLARENCE A. POUND, Associate Professor and Consultant in Rural Education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

HOWARD G. SACKETT, District Superintendent, Lewis County Schools, Port Leyden, New York

MRS. MELBA C. SNYDER, Assistant Superintendent, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

O. H. STOWE, Superintendent, Tarrant County Schools, Fort Worth, Texas

General Discussion

Summary: ROBERT M. ISENBERG, Assistant Secretary, Department of Rural Education, NEA, Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 9

THE COUNTY UNIT OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Division Chairman: R. D. BALDWIN, Professor of Educational Administration, West Virginia University, Morgantown

Session One: Advantages, Limitations and Future Development of Existing County Units

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Presentation of Subject

S. J. KNEZEVICH, Associate Professor of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City

Panel Discussion

Members:

GEORGE H. BARNES, Superintendent, Shelby County Schools, Memphis, Tennessee

HUGH G. GREER, Superintendent, Monroe County Schools, Monroeville, Alabama

SAMUEL M. JENNESS, Superintendent, Carroll County Schools, Westminster, Maryland

SAM M. LAMBERT, Assistant Director, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D. C.

C. FRANK NEWELL, Superintendent, Calhoun County Schools, Anniston, Alabama

General Discussion

Session Summary: R. J. LAWRENCE, Superintendent, Bullock County Schools, Union Springs, Alabama

DIVISION 9

Session Two: Unique Administrative Problems of the County Unit

TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Presentation of Subject

STARK WILMOTH, Superintendent, Randolph County Schools, Elkins, West Virginia

Panel Discussion

MRS. RUTH A. KEPLEY, Director of Education, Inyo County Schools, Independence, California

W. F. LOGGINS, Superintendent, Greenville County Schools, Greenville, South Carolina

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH, Assistant Superintendent, Baltimore County Schools, Towson, Maryland

C. A. VAUGHN, Superintendent, Lake County Schools, Tavares, Florida

General Discussion

Session Summary: LULA B. REED, Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Red Oak, Iowa

DIVISION 10

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED AND MINORITY GROUPS IN RURAL AREAS

Division Chairman: FRED MCCUITION, Associate Director, Southern Education Foundation, Prairie Grove, Arkansas

Session One: Identification of These Groups; Programs to Meet Their Needs TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Presentation of Subject

LEWIS W. JONES, Director of Research, Rural Life Council, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

Panel Discussion

Leader: FRED MCCUITION

Members:

REV. SHIRLEY GREENE, Director of Intergroup Relations, National Farmers Union, Merom, Indiana

ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Chief, Division of Child Labor and Youth Employment, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

W. B. JONES, JR., American Program Director, Save the Children Federation, Knoxville, Tennessee

MRS. MARY MCCOLLOM MARTIN, Teacher, Toltec Schools, Eloy, Arizona
JESSE D. STOCKTON, Superintendent, Kern County Schools, Bakersfield, California

ELIZABETH SUTTON, Supervisor of Education of Migrant Children, Palm Beach County Schools, West Palm Beach, Florida, and Northampton Public Schools, Eastville, Virginia

MRS. HILDEGARD THOMPSON, Chief, Branch of Education, Bureau of Indian Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 11

THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OF ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES SERVING RURAL PEOPLE

Division Chairman: E. W. AITON, 4-H Club and YMW Programs, Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Session One: Adult Needs and Programs to Serve Them MONDAY 8:00 P.M.

Meeting the Needs of Adult Rural Citizens

PAUL E. NYSTROM, Director of Instruction, College of Agriculture, University of Maryland, College Park

A Special Project in Rural Extension Education

JOSEPH B. GYTTLER, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York

Informal Panel to Explore Implications

Members:

C. R. COBLENTZ, Superintendent, Preble County Schools, Eaton, Ohio

GEORGE H. FERN, Associate Director, Education Department, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, New York

COLIN D. GUNN, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Gainesville, Florida

LUCILLE NIX, Chief Library Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia

RUSSEL I. THACKERAY, Executive Secretary, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 11

Session Two: Youth Needs and Programs to Serve Them TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Session Chairman: NORMAN C. MINDRUM, Executive Director, National 4-H Foundation, Silver Spring, Maryland

Presentation of the Subject

DANIEL PRESCOTT, Director, Institute of Child Development, University of Maryland, College Park

Informal Panel to Explore Implications

Leader:

Members:

HARRY K. EBY, National Director of School Relations, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, New Jersey

MRS. HELEN LAWRENCE, Regional Vice President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Jericho, Vermont

MRS. RUTH O'BRIEN, American Public Relations Association, Washington, D. C.

MIL O. J. PETERSON, Head, Department of Agricultural Education, University of Minnesota, St. Paul

GERTRUDE L. WARREN, Woman's National Farm and Garden Association, Inc., Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 11

Session Three: Coordination of School and Non-School Programs TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Session Chairman: KARL KNAUS, Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Presentation of the Subject

PAUL E. MILLER, District Governor, Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D. C.

Promising Developments in Co-Ordination of School and Non-School Programs

PANEL AND AUDIENCE

Panel Members:

MRS. ELIZABETH H. HUGHEY, Secretary and Director, Library Commission, State Library Building, Raleigh, North Carolina

A. D. McCALL, General Supervisor, Santa Rosa County Board of Public Instruction, Milton, Florida

RAY A. MURRAY, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

MRS. RUTH B. ROBINSON, Administrative Assistant, Department of Town and Country Church, National Council of Churches, New York, New York

DIVISION 12

IMPROVEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF SMALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

(Since it is desirable that programs of elementary and secondary schools in small systems be closely integrated, attendance at both sessions rather than just one should prove most profitable.)

Division Co-Chairmen:

EFFIE G. BATHURST, Research, Elementary Schools, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

WALTER H. GAUMNITZ, Specialist, Rural Secondary Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Session One: Ways of Providing Good Programs and Services in One- to Three-Teacher Schools **TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.**

Session Chairman: ELIZABETH SUTTON, Supervisor of Education of Migrant Children, Palm Beach County Schools, West Palm Beach, Florida, and Northampton Public Schools, Eastville, Virginia

*Identification of Problems and Lines of Action in Meeting Them**PANEL MEMBERS AND AUDIENCE**Suggested Problems*

- Planning and carrying on the day's program;
- Finding the place of home and community in the curriculum;
- Meeting individual needs;
- Cooperative use of material and supplies by groups of schools;
- Grouping children for effective learning;
- Use of resource people from the community and elsewhere;
- Helping children learn to work independently.

Panel Members

DANIEL R. CHADWICK, Head Teacher, Cave Creek Elementary School, Cave Creek, Arizona

MRS. LILLIAN JOHNSTON, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, Arizona

CHARLES KINCER, Rural School Improvement Project, Pine Mountain, Kentucky

ADDIE MAYNARD, State Helping Teacher, Fair Haven, Vermont

FLORENCE TAYLOR, Professor of Education, Pennsylvania State University, State College

DIVISION 12

Session Two: The High School Serving Fewer Than One Hundred Pupils **TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.**

Session Chairman: ALBERT J. OLIVER, Associate Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

*Issues and Problems from the "Grass Roots"**PANEL MEMBERS AND AUDIENCE**Panel Members*

W. BERNIE CATON, Superintendent of Schools, Almagordo, New Mexico

EVERETT A. McDONALD, JR., Superintendent of Schools, Johnsville, Pennsylvania

GLYN A. MORRIS, Director of Guidance, Board of Cooperative Services, Port Leyden, New York

C. P. TITUS, Superintendent of Schools, Inkster, Michigan

KENNETH G. YOUNG, Director of Curriculum, Siskiyou County Schools, Yreka, California

DIVISION 13

THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT'S DISTINCTIVE IMPACT ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Division Chairman: ANNE S. HOPPOCK, Assistant in Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey

Session One: Distinctive Experiences and Their Effects on the Rural Child

MONDAY 8:00 P.M.

Session Chairman: EDITH L. WELLS, Supervisor of Instruction, Wayne County Schools, Dearborn, Michigan

The Elementary School Child in the Rural Environment
ANNE S. HOPPOCK

The Teen-Age Child in the Rural Environment

GLENN C. DILDINE, Coordinator, Research and Training Project on Developing Needs, National 4-H Club Foundation, Silver Spring, Maryland

Informal Panel to Explore Implications

Members:

A. B. CALDWELL, Area Director of Schools, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma

RAY C. HAWLEY, Superintendent, La Salle County Schools, Ottawa, Illinois
HELEN HAY HEYL, Chief, Bureau of Elementary Curriculum Development, State Education Department, Albany, New York

OLIVE M. POTRUS, Superintendent, Wexford County Schools, Cadillac, Michigan

THOMAS W. PYLE, Assistant Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Rockville, Maryland

DIVISION 13

Session Two: The Utilization of Appropriate Community Resources for Learning

TUESDAY 9:30 A.M.

Session Chairman: ANNE S. HOPPOCK

Utilization of Community Resources for Learning—The Elementary School

KATE HOUS, Consultant in Elementary Education, Santa Barbara County Schools, Santa Barbara, California

Utilization of Community Resources for Learning—The Secondary School

MARK NICHOLS, Director of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah

Informal Panel to Explore Implications

Members:

GENEVIEVE LYDICK, Superintendent, Brown County Schools, Hiawatha, Kansas

JEANETTE MOLLOY, Associate Professor of Elementary Education, Pennsylvania State University, State College

HAROLD O. SPEIDEL, Assistant Superintendent, Schuylkill County Schools, Pine Grove, Pennsylvania

JOHN WILCOX, Supervising Principal, Candor Central School, Candor, New York

OPAL SLAVENS, Macomb County Helping Teacher, Mt. Clemens, Michigan

DIVISION 14

RURAL EDUCATION AND THE WORLD SCENE

Division Chairman: CLIFFORD P. ARCHER, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Director, International Center for Rural Education

Session One: Rural Education as a World Need;
Implications for the United States

TUESDAY 2:00 P.M.

Symposium

Rural Community Schools of the Philippines

FRANCIS DRAG, Assistant Superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

The Work of the Division of Community Education in Puerto Rico

ELLERY FOSTER, Former Community Development Adviser, Point-Four Program, Bethesda, Maryland

Problems and Prospects of Education in Korean Villages and in Japan

B. I. HUMMEL, Extension Sociologist, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg

Rural Education and Community Development in Villages of India

MARGARET SNYDER, Richmond, Virginia

Developments in Rural Community Schools of Egypt

MURIEL BROWN, Specialist in Community Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Implications for Education in the United States

LUTHER AMBROSE, Chairman, Department and Division of Rural School Improvement Program, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky

OLIVER J. CALDWELL, Assistant Commissioner for International Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

DIVISION 15

OPPORTUNITIES FOR RURAL YOUTH AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL

Division Chairman: G. KERRY SMITH, Executive Secretary, Association for Higher Education, NEA, Washington, D. C.

Session One: Problems Involved and Means of Solving Them MONDAY 8:00 P.M.
Obstacles and Opportunities for Higher Education for Rural Youth; Lines of Action Which Show Promise

TROY L. STEARNS, Professor of Education, Michigan State College, East Lansing

INFORMAL PANEL

Members:

R. B. ATWOOD, President, Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Kentucky

R. B. DICKERSON, Associate Professor, College of Agriculture, Pennsylvania State University, State College

ERNEST HILTON, Director of Elementary Education, State Teachers College, Fredonia, New York

IRENE M. SPENCER, General Supervisor of Instruction, Contra Costa County, Martinez, California

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP MEETINGS

Arranged by the organization or agency listed to consider a problem in which the sponsoring group has special concern or responsibility.

1. Ways of Bringing the Rural School and Home Closer Together to Improve the Quality of Education for Children Two to Twelve

Sponsor: Association for Childhood Education, International TUESDAY 8:00 P.M.
Presiding: MYRA DeHAVEN WOODRUFF, President of the Association

II. Scouting in Rural Areas.

Sponsors: Boy Scouts of America; Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. TUESDAY 8:00 P.M.
Co-Chairmen: E. H. BAKKEN, Director of Rural Scouting, Boy Scouts of America; MRS. THOMAS J. FORD, Director of School Relations, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

III. Continuing Education Services for Rural Areas.

Sponsors: Federal Extension Service, TUESDAY 8:00 P.M.
 U. S. Department of Agriculture

Presiding: THE HON. C. M. FERGUSON, Administrator, Federal Extension Service, USDA

IV. Problems Facing Our Professional Organizations in Reaching the Isolated Rural Teacher.

Sponsor: NEA Department of Classroom Teachers TUESDAY 7:30 A.M.
Presiding: LUCILLE CARROLL, President of the Department

V. Federal Aid for School Construction.

Sponsor: NEA Legislative Commission TUESDAY 8:00 P.M.

Presiding: J. L. McCASKILL, Executive Secretary, NEA Legislative Commission

Panel: Members of Subcommittee on School Construction of House Committee on Education and Labor

CONGRESSMAN CARROLL D. KEARNS, (R.) Pennsylvania, *Chairman*
 CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, (D.) West Virginia
 CARL ELLIOTT, (D.) Alabama
 PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., (R.) New Jersey
 LEE MITCHELL, (D.) Montana
 STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, (R.) New York
 CLIFTON YOUNG, (R.) Nevada

Interrogators:

LUCILLE CARROLL, Ohio; President, NEA Department of Classroom Teachers
 HOWARD A. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.; Executive Secretary, NEA Department of Rural Education
 MRS. HELEN LAWRENCE, Vermont; Vice President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers
 ERICK L. LINDMAN, Tennessee; Professor of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers
 WORTH MCCLURE, Washington, D. C.; Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, NEA
 REX PUTNAM, Oregon; State Superintendent of Public Instruction

VI. Child Labor in Agriculture and the Schooling of Children of Migratory Agricultural Laborers.

Sponsor: National Council of Agricultural Life and Labor TUESDAY 8:00 P.M.

Presiding: SOL MARKOFF, Assistant Secretary, National Child Labor Committee, New York, New York

Discussants:

MRS. ELIZABETH COLEMAN, U. S. Department of Labor
 GERTRUDE M. LEWIS, U. S. Office of Education

BEATRICE MCCONNELL, U. S. Department of Labor
 ELIZABETH SUTTON, Specialist on Migrant Education, NCALL
 SHIRLEY E. GREENE, National Farmers Union

CLOSING GENERAL SESSION

WEDNESDAY 9:50 A.M.

Presiding

MRS. LUCILLE L. KLINGE, President, Department of Rural Education

Main

OXON HILL HIGH SCHOOL BAND, Prince Georges County, Maryland, William Johnson, Director

Recognition of Charl Ormond Williams, Executive Chairman, First White House Conference on Rural Education

Greetings

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Labor

VICTOR REUTHER, Assistant to the President, Congress of Industrial Organizations

Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Industry

WALTER D. FULLER, Chairman of the Board, Curtis Publishing Company

Rural Education from the Viewpoint of Agriculture

THE HONORABLE EZRA TAFT BENSON, U. S. Secretary of Agriculture

LUNCHEON MEETING, ADVISORY COUNCIL
AND CONFERENCE LEADERS

WEDNESDAY 1:00 P.M.

Presiding

MRS. LUCILLE L. KLINGE, President, Department of Rural Education

Main

THE WASHINGTON-LEE MADRIGAL SINGERS, Washington-Lee High School, Arlington County, Virginia, Florence Bocker, Director

One Man's Interpretation of the Conference

SHIRLEY COOPER, Associate Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, NEA, Washington, D. C.

Open Forum: Implication for the Future

CONFERENCE OFFICIALS

Honorary Chairmen:

WILLIAM G. CARR, Executive Secretary, National Education Association

SAMUEL M. BROWNELL, U. S. Commissioner of Education

Co-Chairmen:

MRS. LUCILLE L. KLINGE, President of the Department of Rural Education, NEA
 FRANK THOMAS, Assistant to the Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education

Executive Chairman:

HOWARD A. DAWSON, Executive Secretary of the Department of Rural Education, NEA

Conference Director:

LOIS M. CLARK, Assistant Secretary, Department of Rural Education

Assistant Directors:

ROBERT M. ISENBERG, Assistant Secretary, Department of Rural Education

WILLIAM J. ELLENA, Assistant to the Executive Secretary, Department of Rural Education

Special Assistants:

JULIAN E. BUTTERWORTH, Professor Emeritus, Cornell University
BURTON W. KREITLOW, Assistant Professor of Rural Education, University of Wisconsin

Conference Press Service:

MRS. VIRGINIA REYNOLDS POWELL, Director of Convention Press Service, Press and Radio Relations, NEA

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Representing the Department:

Mrs. Lucille L. Klinge, Oregon,
President
C. P. Archer, Minnesota
Ernest W. Barker, Iowa
Charles E. Braker, Michigan
Hugh K. Cassell, Virginia
Shirley Cooper, Washington, D. C.
M. L. Cushman, North Dakota
H. C. DeKock, Iowa
Robert S. Fox, Michigan
H. G. Greer, Alabama

Audrey James, Minnesota
Mrs. Marjorie B. Leinauer, Illinois
Clarence A. Pound, Indiana
Thomas E. Robinson, New Jersey
Cecil Shuffield, Arkansas
Sampson G. Smith, New Jersey
E. Guy Stapleton, Maryland
Mrs. Marie R. Turner, Kentucky
Mrs. Mary R. Watson, New Mexico
B. O. Wilson, California

Representing the U. S. Office of Education:

Frank Thomas, *Chairman*
Effie G. Bathurst
Ambrose Caliver
William N. Elam
E. Glenn Featherston
Jane Franseth
Charles O. Fitzwater
Walter H. Gaumnitz

J. Dan Hall
Galen Jones
Gertrude M. Lewis
Berenice Mallory
Leonard M. Miller
R. Edward Naugher
Alfred V. Overn
Herbert B. Swanson
Rosa Van Horn

Host State Committees:

The County Superintendents of Maryland through the leadership of Edward G. Stapleton and Samuel M. Jenness, and the Division Superintendents of Virginia through the leadership of Hugh K. Cassell and Frank J. Critzer are serving as Conference hosts. Special assistance has been given by the Superintendents and their associates in Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Virginia, and Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland.

OFFICIAL STATE COMMITTEES FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Alabama: H. G. Greer, chairman; V. C. Helms, R. E. Moore, Hulda Coleman, E. W. Mellow, AEA, R. C. Hatch, ASTA.

Arizona: Lillian B. Johnston, chairman; Vernon Hathcock, Lafe Nelson.

Arkansas: Cecil E. Shuffield, chairman; Fay Dunn, W. E. Orr, Roy W. Roberts, AEA, Frank W. Smith, ATA.

California: No formal committee.

Colorado: C. A. Carlson, chairman; R. Burdett Burk, Lucille H. Letting, Stanley A. Lefrwich, Ruth R. Lytle, Miriam Martensen, Albert McCall, Lyle Sionecker, Lucie Van Den Berg.

STATE COMMITTEES (Cont'd)

- Connecticut:* Ernest O. Nybakken, chairman; Andrew Ferrigno, Frank Formica, Mrs. Bernice C. Nicjadlik, John C. Reilly.
- Delaware:* Mrs. May B. Leasure, chairman; Calvin E. Afflerbach, Grace E. Hastings, Stanley James.
- Florida:* No formal committees.
- Georgia:* W. E. Pafford and William S. Smith, co-chairmen; Reba Burnham, R. S. Clark, M. D. Collins, Mrs. Ralph Hobbs, J. Harold Saxon, Paul D. West.
- Idaho:* Arley F. Rost, chairman; Edith E. Crowley, Gertrude Eastman, Melvin Gruwell, Amos B. Hulme.
- Illinois:* Mrs. Marjorie B. Leinauer, chairman; Dwight L. Bailey, George Deyoe, Dorothy Dixon, Mrs. Mary P. Endres, Hans C. Olsen, Robert M. Ring.
- Indiana:* Ira L. Huntington, chairman; E. J. Eberhart, George W. Gerichs, Clarence A. Pound, W. E. Wilson.
- Iowa:* Ralph Norris, chairman; M. L. Cushman, J. L. Davies, H. C. DeKock, W. T. Edgren.
- Kansas:* Minter E. Brown, chairman; Mrs. G. W. Bennington, Agnes Engstrand, K. O. Esping, Floyd Herr, John King, Fred Meek, Adel F. Throckmorton, Carl Tjerandsen.
- Kentucky:* D. T. Ferrell, chairman; Mitchell Davis, Lee Francis Jones, Elizabeth Sutton, Mrs. Marie R. Turner.
- Louisiana:* Horace C. Robinson, chairman; Mrs. Alton Kirby, F. H. Shiel, B. S. Walker, F. F. Wimberly, Koscoe H. White.
- Maine:* Edward L. McMonagle, chairman; Alfred A. Bracy, Reginald H. Dority, Asa A. Gordon, John C. MacLeod, Charles L. Puffer.
- Maryland:* Samuel M. Jenness, chairman; R. Bowen Hardesty, Forbest H. Norris, Morris W. Rannels, William S. Schmidt, E. Guy Stapleton, B. Melvin Cole.
- Massachusetts:* No formal committee.
- Michigan:* Mrs. Daisy E. Howard, chairman; Mrs. Ruth N. Bacon, Charles E. Brake, Mrs. Mayme M. Ross, Howard Thayer, Lyle Tarrant, Clinton Whetstone.
- Minnesota:* W. W. Salmi, chairman; C. P. Archer, T. C. Engum, Milo J. Peterson.
- Mississippi:* J. A. Travis.
- Missouri:* Philip J. Hickey, chairman; J. Abner Beck, Bernard Campbell, Moss McDonald, Arthur L. Summers.
- Montana:* Mrs. Winnafern Moore, chairman; Mrs. Agnes Cooper, P. C. Crump, Mrs. Sylvia Haight, Mr. Effie S. Pentz.
- Nebraska:* Merle Stoneman, chairman; Doris E. Bigelow, Nettie Clark, Rosalie Farley, O. F. Moore, Edna P. Nigh, Evangeline Waite.
- Nevada:* Mrs. Kate St. Clair, chairman; John H. Fant, Roxie Copenhaver, Flo Z. Reed, Mrs. Kathryn L. Scribner.
- New Hampshire:* David Appleton, chairman; Lloyd P. Young.
- New Jersey:* Sampson G. Smith, chairman; Mildred H. Harden, Frances Peterman, Thomas E. Robinson, Myrtle Townsend.
- New Mexico:* Adolfo Chavez, chairman; Earl Nunn, Wayoe Owens, Haskel Smith, Mrs. Mary R. Watson.
- New York:* G. Howard Gould, chairman; Allan P. Bradley, Edward A. Burke, Francis E. Griffin, Howard G. Sackett, J. Edward Smith.
- North Carolina:* No formal committee, NCEA; W. L. Greene, NCTA.
- North Dakota:* Mrs. Luba E. Johnson, chairman; Mrs. Clara D. Brown, Leila C. Ewen, Charles Johnson, M. F. Peterson.

STATE COMMITTEES (Cont'd)

- Ohio:* Charles B. Crouch, chairman; George C. Beery, Samuel H. Dillon, James L. McBride, W. E. Weagly, H. D. West.
- Oklahoma:* L. A. Bondurant, chairman; A. H. Bartow, J. C. Fitzgerald, Maxine Frey, Guy Massey, H. E. Sorenson, F. E. Willingham.
- Oregon:* Mrs. Lucille L. Klinge, chairman; Florence Beardsley, Mrs. Agnes C. Booth, Mrs. Velma Buckingham, A. B. Meckvold, John M. Miller, Cecil W. Posey, Errol C. Rees.
- Pennsylvania:* James E. Butts, chairman; Charles H. Boehm, W. W. Eshelman, Hobart A. Farber, Raymond H. Koch, Maurice E. Kolpien.
- Rhode Island:* Mark C. S. Noble, Jr. and committee.
- South Carolina:* T. M. Verdin, Jr., chairman; Mrs. Lillian W. Jenkins, C. P. Key, Verd Peterson, Ella Wyman.
- South Dakota:* Mark Delzell, chairman; Mrs. Olive Berg, Mrs. Helen Bergh, Margaret Long, Mrs. June Martin.
- Tennessee:* H. Claude Moore, chairman; C. R. Avery, W. D. Human, Elmo Johnson, T. Wesley Pickel.
- Texas:* R. E. Harris, chairman; Roy Boyd, Frank M. Jackson, Floyd Manry, F. L. Moffett, R. S. Morgan, Elmer A. Wooten, TSTA, Leslie J. White, TSAT.
- Utah:* Mark Nichols, chairman; D. Garron Brian, Wallace Brockbank, Alma Burton, Clifford L. Frye, Milton Moody, Lloyd Theurer.
- Vermont:* Ernest M. Coddington, chairman; Max W. Barrows, Addie E. Maynard.
- Virginia:* Hugh Cassell, chairman; Dowell J. Howard, B. I. Hummel, M. I. Shanholtz, Robert F. Williams, VEA, J. Rupert Picott, VTA.
- Washington:* L. M. Dimmitt, chairman; Elmer L. Breckner, G. Ira Loree, Mrs. Eva Stull.
- West Virginia:* Mrs. Juanita Thompson, chairman; James L. Creasy, H. Cliff Hamilton, Stanley Hawse, Harry B. Heflin, Charles Hill, John Montgomery, Stark Wilmoth.
- Wisconsin:* A. I. Winther, chairman; Robert L. Johnson, Marie Kennedy, Olga Ottum, Theo A. Sorenson.
- Wyoming:* Mrs. Adria A. Davis, chairman; Mrs. Rosella Carson, Arthur Dugan, H. T. Emmett, Mrs. Rosalie Hockett, Helen Nelson, Dorris Sander, Mrs. Florence Wogoman, Walter C. Reusser.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Representing the National Education Association

- Waurine Walker, Texas, President
- Lyle W. Ashby, Assistant Secretary for Professional Relations
- Elizabeth Avery, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation
- Gerald Baysinger, Michigan, American Industrial Arts Association
- Lee E. Boyer, Pennsylvania, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
- John Bigger, Adult Education Service
- Ivan A. Booker, American Education Week
- Robert H. Carleton, National Science Teachers Association
- Lucille Carroll, Ohio, Department of Classroom Teachers
- Barbara Catton, Deans of Women
- Francis G. Cornell, Illinois, American Educational Research Association
- G. E. Damon, National Association of Secondary School Principals
- George W. Denemark, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- William A. Early, Georgia, Junior Past President
- Robert W. Eaves, Department of Elementary School Principals

ADVISORY COUNCIL (Cont'd)

Belmont Farley, Press and Radio Relations
 Earl C. Funderburk, North Carolina, Board of Directors
 Hollis Guy, United Business Education Association
 Merrill F. Hartshorn, National Council for the Social Studies
 Frank W. Hubbard, Research Division
 Rees Hughes, Kansas, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
 Lyle W. Johnson, Colorado, Future Teachers of America
 Katherine Kelleher, Future Teachers of America
 Richard B. Kennan, Defense Commission
 Norman Key, National Commission on Safety Education
 L. Poe Leggette, Washington, D. C., Speech Association of America
 Velma Linford, Wyoming, Executive Committee
 James McCaskill, Legislation and Federal Relations
 Worth McClure, American Association of School Administrators
 Hilda Maehling, Classroom Teachers
 J. Cloyd Miller, New Mexico, Board of Trustees
 Joy Elmer Morgan, National Education Association *Journal*
 Robert Reid, International Relations
 Agnes Samuelson, Iowa, Life Director
 G. Kerry Smith, Association for Higher Education
 Glenn E. Snow, Assistant Secretary for Lay Relations
 T. M. Stinnett, Teacher Education and Professional Standards
 Rex Turner, California, Legislative Commission
 Charl O. Williams, Washington, D. C., Life Director
 Roy K. Wilson, National School Public Relations Association
 Harley Z. Wooden, International Council for Exceptional Children

*Representing The Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health,
 Education, and Welfare*

Samuel M. Brownell, Commissioner of Education
 Effie G. Bathurst, Research, Elementary Schools
 Fred F. Beach, State School Administration
 Oliver J. Caldwell, Assistant Commissioner, International Education
 Ambrose Caliver, Assistant Commissioner, Program Development and Coordination
 Ralph Dunbar, Services to Libraries
 Charles O. Fitzwater, County and Rural School Administration
 Jane Franseith, Rural Elementary Education
 Walter H. Gaumnitz, Rural Secondary Education
 Bess Goodykoontz, Comparative Education
 Rall I. Grigsby, Assistant Commissioner, School Assistance
 Ray Hamon, School Housing
 Claude M. Hirst, School Assistance
 J. Dan Hull, Secondary Schools Education
 Clayton D. Hutchins, School Finance
 Gertrude M. Lewis, Elementary Education
 J. Kenneth Little, Deputy Commissioner
 Romaine P. Mackie, Exceptional Children and Youth
 Helen K. Mackintosh, Elementary Schools Education
 Berenice Mallory, Home Economics Education
 Leonard M. Miller, Guidance and Pupil Personnel
 Alfred V. Overn, School Assistance
 James H. Pearson, Assistant Commissioner, Vocational Education
 Wayne O. Read, Assistant Commissioner, State and Local School Systems

ADVISORY COUNCIL (Cont'd)

Herbert B. Swanson, Agricultural Education
 Frank Thomas, Assistant to the Commissioner
 Rua Van Horn, Home Economics Education

Representing Other Agencies of the U. S. Government

Department of Agriculture
 Agricultural Marketing Service
 Farm Population and Rural Life Branch: Margaret Jarman Hagood, (Louis J. Ducoff, alternate)
 School Lunch Branch, Food Distribution Division: Nelson J. Post
 Bureau of Human Nutrition and Health Education
 Home Economics Research Branch: Gertrude Weiss
 Farmer Cooperative Service: Oscar R. LeBeau (John H. Heckman, alternate)
 Federal Extension Service
 4-H and YMW Programs: E. W. Aiton
 Agricultural Programs: J. Edward Crosby, Jr.
 Home Economics Programs: Frances Scudder
 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
 Childrens Bureau: Elizabeth H. Ross
 Public Health Service: Nell McKeever
 Department of the Interior
 Bureau of Indian Affairs: Hildegard Thompson
 Department of Labor
 Bureau of Labor Standards: Beatrice McConnell
 Special Committee on Migrants: Elizabeth Johnson

Representing Cooperating National Organizations

Note: Groups listed formally accepted status as cooperating or participating organizations and most designated representatives to the Advisory Council. Representatives of many other organizations participated.

Adult Education Association: Lois McCarthy, Executive Secretary, Council of National Organizations

Alliance for the Guidance of Rural Youth: Mrs. Amber Arthun Warburton

American Association of Junior Colleges

American Association of University Women: Helen D. Bragdon, General Director

American Council on Education: F. G. Lankford, Jr., University of Virginia

American Country Life Association

American Farm Bureau Federation, Associated Women: Mrs. Haven Smith, Vice President

American Farm Economics Association

American Home Economics Association

American Institute of Cooperation: J. K. Stern, President; Howard McClarren, Director of Youth Education

American Library Association: Helen Clark, Library Extension, Maryland State Department of Education

American Library Association, Library Extension Section: Mrs. Mary Kenan Hadley, Past President

American Medical Association, Committee on Rural Health: F. S. Crockett, Chairman

American Red Cross: Gwen Marshfield, Program Consultant, Junior Red Cross

American Teachers Association: Elmer T. Hawkins, Vice President

American Vocational Association: Mark Nichols, President; M. D. Mobley, Executive Secretary

Association for Childhood Education International: Frances Hamilton, Executive Secretary

ADVISORY COUNCIL (Cont'd)

Association of American Colleges: Theodore A. Distler, Executive Director
 Association of Land-Grant Colleges: Russell I. Thackrey, Executive Director
 Boy Scouts of America: E. H. Bakken, National Director, Rural Scouting
 Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges: R. B. Atwood, Secretary
 Cooperative League of the U.S.A.: Wallace Campbell, Director, Washington Office
 Delta Kappa Gamma: Margaret Stroh, Executive Secretary
 Farmers Union: John Baker, Assistant to the President
 General Federation of Women's Clubs: Mrs. Theodore Chapman, President
 Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.: Mrs. Thomas Ford, Director of School Relations
 National Association of 4-H Club Agents: Sarah I. Harmon, Second Vice President
 National Association of High School Supervisors and Directors of Secondary Education: Woodrow W. Wilkerson, President
 National Association of Home Demonstration Agents: Mrs. Eugenia P. Van Landingham, President
 National Association of Manufacturers, Education Department: George Fern, Associate Director
 National Association of State Directors of Special Education
 National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
 National Child Labor Committee: Mrs. Gertrude Folks Zimand, General Secretary
 National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools: Maurice Bement, Regional Director
 National Conference of Christian and Jews, Commission on Educational Organizations: Herbert L. Seamans, Director
 National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration: Harold E. Moore, Chairman, Planning Committee
 National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers: Jeanetta Chase, Secretary
 National Congress of Parents and Teachers: Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, President; John S. Carroll, Chairman of Rural Service
 National Council of Chief State School Officers: Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary
 National Council of Negro Women: Mrs. Vivian Carter Mason, President
 National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor: Elizabeth Herring, Executive Secretary
 National Council on Schoolhouse Construction
 National 4-H Club Foundation of America: Norman Mindrum, Executive Director
 National Grange: E. G. Mansfield, Chairman, Committee on Education and Health
 National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association: Clay L. Cochran, Economist
 National School Boards Association: J. G. Stratton, President
 National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc.
 National Society for Crippled Children and Adults: Mrs. T. Jackson Lowe, representative
 National Society for the Study of Education: Francis S. Chase, University of Chicago
 National University Extension Association: Charles P. McCurdy, Executive Secretary
 National Vocational Guidance Association, Rural Service Section: Glyn Morris, Chairman
 Phi Delta Kappa: Emory Stoops, President; Paul Cook, alternate
 Rural Youth of the U.S.A.: Joseph Matejka, Vice President
 Rural Sociological Society: Robert A. Polson, Cornell University
 Save-the-Children Federation: Richard P. Saunders, President
 Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

Representing State Education Associations

Alabama: Mrs. Laura Gaines Sprott, President; Frank L. Grove, Executive Secretary, AEA; J. T. Gaines, President, Robert C. Hatch, Executive Secretary, ASTA

ADVISORY COUNCIL (Cont'd)

Arizona: Vernon Hathcock, President
 Arkansas: Cecil Shuffield, AEA
 Colorado: Colbert E. Cushing, Assistant Executive Secretary
 Connecticut: Frank Formica, Conference Advisory Council; Bernice Niejadlik, CEA
 Board of Directors
 Florida: Gilbert L. Porter, Executive Secretary, FSTA
 Georgia: L. H. Cook, GEA
 Illinois: Paul Street, President; Irving F. Pearson, Executive Secretary
 Iowa: J. Leonard Davies, Immediate Past President
 Kentucky: J. M. Dodson, Executive Secretary, KEA
 Maine: Clifford O. T. Wieden
 Maryland: B. Melvin Cole, President
 Michigan: William Emerson
 Mississippi: J. T. Travis, Assistant Secretary, MEA; N. R. Burger, President, MTA
 Missouri: Everett Keith, Executive Secretary
 Montana: Mrs. Winnafern Moore
 Nebraska: Rosalie Farley
 New Jersey: Mrs. May C. Smith, President
 New Mexico: Charles H. Wood, Field Secretary
 New York: Kenneth A. Myers, President; G. Howard Goold, Executive Secretary
 North Carolina: Mrs. Ethel N. Meekins, President, NCEA; W. L. Greene, Executive Secretary, NCTA
 North Dakota: Harrie Selznick
 Ohio: W. R. Gongwer, President; Walton B. Bliss, Executive Secretary
 Oregon: Cecil W. Posey, Executive Secretary
 South Carolina: Mary Eva Hite
 Vermont: Ernest Coddling
 Virginia: James B. Woodson, President; J. Rupert Picott, Executive Secretary, VTA
 West Virginia: Mrs. Juanita Thompson, WVEA

Representing the Chief State School Officers

Alabama: W. J. Terry, State Superintendent
 Arkansas: A. W. Ford, State Commissioner
 California: Dean E. Triggs, Superintendent, Ventura County Schools
 Colorado: Mrs. Allegra Saunders, State Board of Education
 Connecticut: Willis H. Umberger, District Superintendent
 Delaware: Robert C. Stewart, Assistant State Superintendent
 Georgia: W. E. Pafford, Director, Division of Field Services
 Illinois: Robert M. Ring, Assistant Superintendent
 Indiana: Merle Eaton, Indiana University
 Iowa: W. T. Edgren, Director of Transportation
 Kansas: Agnes Engstrand, State Elementary School Supervisor
 Louisiana: Shelby M. Jackson, State Superintendent
 Maryland: W. Theodore Boston, Assistant Director of Certification and Accreditation
 Michigan: Roland Strolle, Chief, School District Organization and School Plant
 Minnesota: T. C. Engum, Director of Elementary and Secondary Schools
 Missouri: Hubert Wheeler, Commissioner of Education
 Montana: Mary M. Condon, State Superintendent
 New Hampshire: Paul E. Farnum, Chief, Division of Administrative Services
 New Mexico: Tom Wiley, State Superintendent
 New York: Ralph C. S. Sutliff, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education

ADVISORY COUNCIL (Cont'd)

North Dakota: M. F. Peterson, State Superintendent
Ohio: R. M. Eyman, Assistant State Superintendent
Oregon: Rex Putnam, State Superintendent
Pennsylvania: John M. Lumley, Deputy Superintendent
South Carolina: R. A. Durham, State Supervisor of Transportation
South Dakota: Mrs. Olive S. Berg, Supervisor of Elementary Education
Tennessee: F. E. Bass, Executive Secretary, Tennessee Education Association
Texas: W. R. Goodson, Director, Division of School Accreditation
Utah: Mark Nichols, State Director of Vocational Education
Vermont: Addie Maynard, State Helping Teacher
Virginia: Dowell J. Howard, State Superintendent
Wisconsin: G. E. Watson, State Superintendent

FINDINGS COMMITTEES

Division 1

Willis Boyd, Georgia	W. E. Pafford, Georgia
Colbert E. Cushing, Colorado	Priscilla Ransohoff, New Jersey
George Deyoe, Illinois	Wayne C. Rohrer, Maryland
J. C. Fitzgerald, Oklahoma	W. Carson Ryan, North Carolina
Gladys Horgan, Iowa	Herbert B. Swanson, Washington, D. C.
J. Dan Hull, Washington, D. C.	Frank Thomas, Washington, D. C.
H. B. Knapp, New York	R. Lee Thomas, Tennessee
Eugene Lawler, Florida	Andrew Torrence, Alabama
Gertrude Lewis, Washington, D. C.	Mrs. Helen A. Whiting, Georgia
Woodrow Wilkerson, Virginia	

Division 2

Mrs. Ruth Bacon, Michigan	Elmer T. Hawkins, Maryland
Mrs. F. C. Beverley, Virginia	Rees Hughes, Kansas
W. E. Bishop, Colorado	Richard E. Jagers, Kentucky
Martelle L. Cushman, North Dakota	John M. Lumley, Pennsylvania
Mrs. C. W. Detjen, Missouri	Hugh B. Masters, Georgia
Mrs. Lula Evanson, North Dakota	Nell McKeever, Washington, D. C.
Harley Fite, Tennessee	J. M. Stanfield, Ohio
Norman Frost, Tennessee	Fred Vescolani, New York
C. A. Furr, North Carolina	Sloan R. Wayland, New York

Division 3

Oscar R. LeBeau, Washington, D. C.	Otis Duncan, Oklahoma
Robert A. Polson, New York	Evlon J. Niederfrank, Washington, D. C.
Frank Alexander, Tennessee	Mrs. Gertrude Weiss, Washington, D. C.
Samuel W. Blizzard, New York	Glenn E. Holmes, Iowa
A. G. Capps, Missouri	Paul Street, Illinois
James L. Robinson, Washington, D. C.	Arthur M. Ahalt, Maryland
Kenneth L. Backman, Washington, D. C.	

Division 4

Kenneth R. McIntyre, Texas	Robert C. Stewart, Delaware
T. C. Engum, Minnesota	Arthur L. Summers, Missouri
C. O. Fitzwater, Washington, D. C.	S. M. Bishop, Illinois
Calvin S. Frankenfield, Pennsylvania	France E. Griffin, New York
Burtis E. Taylor, Colorado	

Division 5

Johnnye Cox, Georgia	T. M. Stinnett, Washington, D. C.
Grace Scott, West Virginia	Clarence A. Newell, Maryland
Ray C. Maul, Washington, D. C.	Harold E. Moore, Colorado
N. E. Fitzgerald, Tennessee	Mary Eva Hite, South Carolina
Mrs. Mabel Lane Bartlett, Illinois	Florence Beardsley, Oregon
Thomas E. Robinson, New Jersey	Clifford O. T. Wieden, Maine
G. Howard Goold, New York	Wm. McKinley Robinson, Michigan

Division 6

Foster G. Ulrich, Pennsylvania	Allen B. Wetherington, Arkansas
Errol Rees, Oregon	E. L. Lindman, Tennessee
LeRoy Peterson, Wisconsin	Walter Reusser, Wyoming
Vaughn D. Seidel, California	H. F. Alves, Texas
Lester C. Winder, Missouri	W. J. Terry, Alabama
Carl Baker, Oregon	Clayton Hutchins, Washington, D. C.
Charles H. Wood, New Mexico	Lee Francis Jones, Kentucky
D. W. Zimmerman, Maryland	

Division 7

James S. Snook, Pennsylvania	Earl Welshimer, Ohio
William Earl Darnell, West Virginia	T. H. Naylor, Mississippi
J. L. Taylor, Washington, D. C.	W. T. Edgren, Iowa
Merle Stoneman, Nebraska	Rex H. Reckewey, Indiana
Mrs. May Chesak, Illinois	T. J. Jensen, Wisconsin

Division 8

LaVerne Arnold, Kansas	L. M. Dimmitt, Washington
Kenneth Barneburg, Oregon	L. A. Roberts, Texas
Charles H. Boehm, Pennsylvania	Sampson G. Smith, New Jersey
Michael S. Kies, Wisconsin	Alvin E. Rhodes, California
Ernest W. Barker, Iowa	William Emerson, Michigan
Clarence A. Pound, Indiana	Howard G. Sackett, New York
Harry W. Gross, New York	C. C. Trillingham, California
Roe M. Wright, Illinois	George Watson, Wisconsin

Division 9

R. D. Baldwin, West Virginia	George H. Barnes, Tennessee
Stark Wilmoth, West Virginia	Hugh G. Greer, Alabama
Ralph F. W. Brimley, North Carolina	C. A. Vaughn, Florida
James A. Sensenbaugh, Maryland	Jackson K. Randolph, West Virginia
I. E. Simmons, Alabama	

Division 10

Fred McCuiston, Arkansas	Shirley Greene, Indiana
Elizabeth Johnson, Washington, D. C.	Elizabeth Sutton, Virginia
Mrs. Hildegard Thompson, Washington, D. C.	Ambrose Caliver, Washington, D. C.
Elizabeth Herring, Washington, D. C.	J. Crockett Farnell, Florida
Ralph B. Jones, Arkansas	Peter Bancroft, California
	Harrie Selznick, North Dakota

Division 11

Mildred L. Batchelder, Illinois	Mrs. Ray Lawrence, Vermont
Agnes Engstrand, Kansas	A. D. McCall, Florida
Mrs. Thomas J. Ford, New York	Lois McCarthy, New York
C. Maurice Wieting, Ohio	E. W. Alton, Washington, D. C.
May Hare, Kansas	Mrs. Florence Low, Maryland
James Duncan, Virginia	Harry K. Eby, New York
W. W. Eure, Washington D. C.	Gertrude Warren, Washington, D. C.
Ray Murray, Maryland	

Division 12

Effie G. Bathurst, Washington, D. C.	Florence Taylor, Pennsylvania
Charles Kincer, Kentucky	Walter H. Gaumnitz, Washington, D. C.
Everett A. McDonald, Jr., Pennsylvania	Albert I. Oliver, Pennsylvania
Keneth G. Young, California	W. R. Goodson, Texas
Harlan Hagman, Iowa	M. F. Peterson, North Dakota
Addie Maynard, Vermont	

Division 13

M. E. Yount, North Carolina	Jeanette Molloy, Pennsylvania
Leila C. Ewen, North Dakota	Alice Drake, Wisconsin
Olive M. Potrude, Michigan	Edith L. Wellever, Michigan
Thomas W. Pyle, Maryland	Harold O. Speidel, Pennsylvania
Kate Houx, California	Genevieve Lydick, Kansas
Glenn C. Dildine, Maryland	Helen Hay Heyl, New York
Anne Hoppock, New Jersey	

Division 14

John S. Carroll, Texas
Luther Ambrose, Kentucky

Bess Goodykoontz, Washington, D. C.
Clifford P. Archer, Minnesota
B. I. Hummel, Virginia

Division 15

Elwin S. Shoemaker, New York
Charles Orr, Alabama

Q. M. Smith, Tennessee
Luther Ambrose, Kentucky

RECORDERS

Assembly I: Clara Cockerille, Pennsylvania

Assembly II: Robert Fox, Michigan

Assembly III: Clifton B. Huff, Kansas

Assembly IV: James Duncan, Virginia

Division 1

Irving Chatterton, Pennsylvania
Milton Pierce, Wisconsin
Richard Moffitt, Pennsylvania
B. F. Bullock, Georgia
Malcom B. Galbreath, New York
Wilhelmina Hill, Washington, D. C.

Division 2

J. D. Boyd, Mississippi
Phila Humphries, Ohio
Robert R. Leeper, Washington, D. C.
H. Bently Hobart, New York

Division 3

G. C. Matzner, New Jersey
Bryan Heise, Illinois
Reba Burnham, Georgia

Division 4

John Shultz, Iowa
Oscar T. Hawke, Ohio
Roy Buck, Pennsylvania
William J. Ellena, Washington, D. C.

Division 5

Ernest Coddington, Vermont
D. T. Ferrell, Kentucky
Lucille Sollenberger, Nebraska
Jennie Kaufman, Michigan

Division 6

W. E. Laws, Ohio
Henry DeKock, Iowa
Viola B. Thompson, Minnesota
Matt Knedle, Wisconsin

Division 7

Maurice Dunkle, Maryland
E. Craig Donnan, New York
Edward G. Fennell, New York

Division 8

Sheridan Ellsworth, Wisconsin
Rosalie Farley, Nebraska
R. E. Harris, Texas
Howard G. Sackett, New York

Division 9

Earl Boggs, Virginia
Lynn Clark, Michigan
B. Melvin Cole, Maryland

Division 10

Frank Philpot, Alabama

Division 11

Howard McClarren, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Laurel Sabrosky, Washington, D. C.
Rowena Allen, Wisconsin
Norman Mindrum, Washington, D. C.

Division 12

Calvin Affierbach, Delaware
Howard Wakefield, Ohio
Steve Knezevich, Iowa

Division 13

James O. Ansel, Michigan
Evelyn Hodgdon, New York
Delmer Somerville, West Virginia

Division 14

Bernice Dondineau, Michigan

Division 15

Eli Mittler, Missouri



PRESENTATION OF THE CHARL ORMOND WILLIAMS AWARD

HOWARD A. DAWSON

Executive Secretary

Department of Rural Education

National Education Association

Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends of Rural Education:

The cause of rural education, like other worthy enterprises of the American People, has moved forward and contributed to the national well-being through the unswerving devotion, continuous diligence, and high competence of individuals. Today it is our high privilege to honor such a person, one of our century's truly great women, Doctor Charl Ormond Williams.

It has often been said that the times make the person, but in this case it can appropriately be said that the person made the time.

Miss Charl, as her many personal friends know her, has spent a life-time career in the service of public education, particularly of rural education. She has received many honors and served with distinction in some of the most important positions in education and in women's organizations.

In 1921 she was elected President of the National Education Association, the only county superintendent of schools to be chosen for that office, the fourth woman, the youngest, and the first Southern woman to be elected to the NEA presidency.

In 1922 she became Field Secretary of the National Education Association, in which position she spent years of tireless and effective work in the field of Federal legislation affecting education, in the promotion of NEA membership and lay relations and in promoting the profession of teaching especially among women. For twenty-seven years she thus served the teaching profession, retiring from the NEA staff December 1, 1949.

In 1921 she was elected an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa, the mother Chapter at the College of William and Mary. In 1951 she was elected to Phi Beta Kappa Associates, a group of 200 distinguished persons.

In 1925 she received the degree of Doctor of Literature from Southwestern-at-Memphis, Tennessee, the first woman to receive that degree from that university. She is an honorary member of Chi Omega and a state founder of Delta Kappa Gamma.

In 1930 Miss Williams helped to organize the International Federation of Business and Professional Women in Geneva, Switzerland. Following the First World War she was active in the Committee on International Relations of the NEA and helped to organize The World Federation of Education Associations.

In 1935 she was chosen President of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the first teacher to be chosen for that great position of leadership.

In 1944 she originated the idea of holding a White House Conference on Rural Education. She suggested the idea to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who enthusiastically accepted it. The President and Mrs. Roosevelt made all necessary facilities available at the White House for the conference for three days, and were the hosts to the 230 persons in attendance. Dr. Williams served as Executive Chairman of the First White House Conference on Rural Education, the predecessor of this National Conference on Rural Education occurring according to plans on the tenth anniversary of that historic White House event.

Dr. Williams was born and educated in a Tennessee village of 300 people. She taught her first school in a one-room building ten miles from a railroad, and her other years of teaching were spent in villages of not over 300 population, with the exception of two years teaching in the new West Tennessee Normal School, now State College.

As a result of her success as a teacher and her qualities of leadership she became County Superintendent of Schools, Shelby County, Tennessee, her native county.

When Dr. Williams resigned from the Shelby County Superintendency to become Field Secretary of the National Education Association, the two Shelby County Boards of Education for elementary and high schools presented her with a beautiful silver loving cup bearing the following inscription:

Presented to Miss Charl Ormond Williams, October 19, 1922, by Boards of Education and her assistants in loving appreciation of her work as Superintendent of Shelby County Schools, January 1915—November 1922, and in recognition of her untiring efforts in the cause of education throughout the Nation. Court House, Memphis, Tennessee.

This loving cup, as Miss Charl has said, "My dearest possession," has been given to the Department of Rural Education to be used in some appropriate way to recognize achievement in rural education as the Charl Ormond Williams Award. In the presentation to Dr. Dawson, she made the following suggestion that will, no doubt, be followed by the Department of Rural Education.

"The membership of the Rural Department, now too small, must include every rural worker throughout the United States. In the National Education Association itself we have enrolled only a little more than half of the teachers in the United States. One use of the Charl Ormond Williams Award that is to be the permanent property of the Rural Department of the National Education Association could be found in the enrollment of members in these two important groups. Many of the rural leaders will think of other ways in which the silver cup might be used to advance rural education."

It is now my pleasure to present to you Dr. Charl Ormond Williams, compatriot of rural educators everywhere, wise leader, and my personal friend.

Madam President,, Dr. Dawson, Mrs. Roosevelt, distinguished guests and members of the Conference:

I deeply appreciate the cordial and generous recognition that Dr. Dawson has accorded me on the tenth anniversary of the First White House Conference on Rural Education. It is true that the inspiration for this historic meeting

was mine. The idea came like a flash of light as I stood at my office window after the last chore had been done for the First White House Conference on "How Women May Share in Post-War Policy-Making" to begin the next day—June 14, 1944.

Truly I was excited over the idea and I hurried at once to Dr. Dawson's office. I put three basic questions to him. Would such a conference aid in building the Department of Rural Education? Would it be helpful in obtaining federal aid to rural education? Would it be useful to the National Education Association? His eyes opened wide and he said with great emphasis: "I should say it would." I asked that nothing be said about it until I could talk with Mrs. Roosevelt.

Immediately I phoned the White House and asked Mrs. Roosevelt if I could see her for a few minutes before the women's conference began. The next morning there was just time enough to ask her if she thought it possible to hold a conference on rural education in the early fall. She thought it possible, and promised to think it over. At the close of the meeting that day she came out on the White House portico and asked me to come up to Hyde Park on August 1 to talk over my proposal. After Dr. Dawson, the next person to consult was Miss Lois Clark, who was President of the Department of Rural Education. At the annual convention in Pittsburgh she put the question to the Executive Committee of the Department of Rural Education, and the proposal for such a conference was ratified unanimously.

During my visit to the home of President and Mrs. Roosevelt we spoke in general terms about the conference, how many could be invited under the wartime conditions, and how long it would last. Then my work was finished. From that point Dr. Dawson took over the task, called to the NEA headquarters a corps of able assistants, and planned a program that "charted the course of rural education for fifty years." The full story of that historic conference is recorded in the volume of proceedings that was dedicated to the President and Mrs. Roosevelt. Neither of them made any suggestions of persons to be invited, speakers to address the conference, or topics to be discussed. President Roosevelt spoke to the group the last day, and Mrs. Roosevelt attended every meeting. They did everything possible to make the meeting memorable. I have poignant recollections of the closing day, for that was the last time I spoke to the President.

And now I want to express my deep appreciation to Dr. Dawson and the Department of Rural Education for their acceptance of my beautiful loving cup, to be used in any feasible and desirable way toward strengthening the schools in the villages and small towns, and in the open country.

One little story will make it clear to you that the cup was, and has been, my dearest possession. I lived for a few months after my arrival in Washington on the fourth floor of the headquarters of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. One cold gray morning the manager of the building waked me out of a sound sleep and told me to get together my valuable possessions and hurry down to the sidewalk. The oil furnace was on fire in the basement. I had previously loaned my cup to grace the table for a reception the day before,

so I ran down the stairs to the dining room to get it. The other sleepy residents on the sidewalk looked askance at me, since they carried suitcases, purses, and clothes on their arms. I could think of nothing to take out but that beautiful piece of silver.

That cup, filled with happy memories, has been a constant source of inspiration to me in the intervening years. It has challenged me, as well, when I was faced with difficult assignments.

I was always proud to be a rural teacher, and to serve eight years as the county superintendent of Shelby County schools. Those years thus spent were the happiest and most fruitful years of my life and they were a sound preparation for all the work that followed. I can never forget the loyal support of the teachers, white and colored, and the outstanding work of the office staff. The support of the teachers and the parents, and of the children in the schools, of the two boards of education, the city officials of Memphis, the newspapers, the bankers, the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, and the County Court that elected me three times to the superintendency, was largely responsible for the progress made in those years.

I want all teachers, especially rural teachers, to be proud of their calling. In the long years ahead I hope the loving cup will carry to rural teachers and officials in many parts of our country something of the inspiration and challenge and pride that I have derived from it these thirty-two years. I want my treasure to be used, and I hope you will love it and take care of it for me.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON RURAL EDUCATION

The report of the 1944 White House Conference contains a selected bibliography on each of the problems considered by the 10 groups into which that Conference was organized. The present bibliography, prepared for the National Conference on Rural Education in October 1954, is again organized around the discussion groups—in this case 15. In this listing no material published before 1944 is included since the 1944 Conference Report appears to give a reasonably satisfactory coverage of the older materials. As *selected* bibliographies, both fail to include numerous items of merit. No master's or doctor's thesis appears here unless it has been published.

For your information the cost of each book and pamphlet is indicated whenever possible. Attention should be called, however, to the fact that the prices of some publications have been increased during the last few years.

This listing has been prepared under the direction of Julian E. Butterworth, professor emeritus at Cornell University, with the cooperation of the chairmen of the division groups, the several departments of the National Education Association, the United States Office of Education, and certain other divisions of the federal government having a special interest in rural life and education.

COMPREHENSIVE VOLUMES ON RURAL EDUCATION, RURAL SOCIOLOGY, AND RURAL ECONOMICS

1. ANDERSON, LOGAN, editor. "Current Problems in Rural Education." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 36:1-67; October, 1954.

Content: Perspective and a look ahead; the reality of rural education; sociological aspects; the value of school reorganization; community schools as rural centers; for these children in this school; the earth is theirs—and its fullness; preparing teachers; rural supervision; little plans stir no minds; all we want are the facts; getting them there; cooperating for better rural schools; special problems in finance; vocational education; a blueprint for progress; signs of promise beyond our borders.

2. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E.; DAWSON, HOWARD A.; and OTHERS. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952. 494 p. \$5.

Contents: Part I. Rural education yesterday and tomorrow. Part II. Some social and economic backgrounds of rural education: major trends; rural income; making farming pay; the rural community; resource-use education. Part III. An educational program: purposes and program; education of children and youth; vocational education in agriculture, homemaking, business, and industry; educational activities outside the school; special services; education for disadvantaged groups; the community-centered school. Part IV. Ways and

means of implementing the program; leadership; more effective districts; the intermediate district; personnel; transportation; school plant; improving tax program; financing rural schools. List of visual aids in rural education.

3. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E., editor. *Rural Schools for Tomorrow*. Year-book 1945. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 152 p. 50c.

Contents: Goals for rural living in America; major social problems; making agriculture pay; rural income and taxation as they affect the education program; trends in rural population; purposes of rural schools; attracting and holding competent teachers; administration and organization; coordination of community activities; transportation; the school plant; equalizing educational opportunities.

4. COOPER, SHIRLEY, and FITZWATER, CHARLES O. *County School Administration*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 566 p. \$5.

Contents: The American county; county educational needs; unity in democratic control; the intermediate district; the county superintendent; the county unit; educational leadership through the county superintendent's office; providing essential educational services; the county professional staff; relation of county staff to local staff; function of county superintendent with boards of education; relations with the public; coordinating school and other educational activities and organizations; personnel accounting; school business management; transportation; evaluation and adjustment.

5. HAYES, WEYLAND J., and NETBOY, ANTHONY. *The Small Community Looks Ahead*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1947. 276 p. \$3.

Contents: The small community in new perspective; the structure and functions of small communities; the process of community evaluation; community life and leadership; technics and tools of creative leadership; the planning process in Tennessee Valley communities; the university and the small community; citizens workshops; small communities—whither bound?

6. KOLB, J. H., and BRUNNER, EDMUND DE S. *A Study of Rural Society*. Revised edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1952. 532 p. \$5.50.

Contents: What is rural society; cultural origins and regional distribution; changing patterns of fertility, residence and age; psychological characteristics; the agricultural enterprise; man and his land; cooperation; agriculture adjusting to national and world economy; rural families; country neighborhoods; agricultural villages; rural communities; special interest groups; rural-urban relationships; standards of living; education; religion and the rural church; recreation and cultural activities; rural health; rural welfare; local government; rural society and the great society.

7. KREITLOW, BURTON. *Rural Education: Community Backgrounds*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 411 p. \$4.

Contents: Orientation to education in rural communities; the educational level of the rural citizen; the economic basis of rural education; the sociology of the rural community; the changing rural community; the historical role of the rural school; the educational needs of rural society; rural community schools; school

district reorganization; adult education; the Agricultural Extension Service; vocational training in agriculture; the big three—Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, Grange; organizations for rural youth; the rural church; rural library service; trends in rural living.

8. LANDIS, PAUL H. *Rural Life in Process*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948. 538 p. \$4.

Contents: Rural life in an urban-industrial society; the structural pattern of rural society; the structure of the rural population; fertility; natural factors in farm experience; associational life in the rural setting; traditional cultural patterns; rural functions and social equality; personality traits and farm experience; rural socialization; interactive processes; mobility; migration; social differentiation and the process of stratification; cultural change; social control; the farm family; the rural school; the farmer's church; rural government; economic values in the new standard of living; problems of farm youth; farm tenure; farm labor; rural pathology; rural welfare; rural health; implications of the rural trend.

9. NEA DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION. *The White House Conference on Rural Education*. October 3-5, 1944. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association. 272 p. 50c.

Contents: Trouble at the crossroads; building the future of rural America; better educational opportunities; education of rural children and youth; building communities thru education; the rural child and the Children's Bureau; building rural schools and communities to cope with the problems of tomorrow; reports of 10 groups on various phases of rural education.

10. NELSON, LOWRY. *Rural Sociology*. New York: American Book Co., 1948. 567 p. \$4.75.

Contents: Concepts and methods; characteristics of rural life; regional patterns of rural life; patterns of land settlement; the rural community; the rural population; migration; conflict, competition, and accommodation; cooperation; culture contact; assimilation and acculturation; stratification; social mobility; property in land; farming systems; marriage; levels of family living; the rural church; the rural school; other educational agencies; local government; farm people and the federal government.

10a. NELSON, LOWRY. *American Farm Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. 192 p. \$3.75.

Contents: The rural heritage; a general survey of American farms and farmers; the technological frontier; the farm labor force; the farmer's community; the farm family; the farmer's schools; the rural church; farm organizations; farmers' cooperative associations; the farmer and his local government; the farmer and the federal government; the new farmer.

11. REEVES, FLOYD W., and OTHERS. *Education for Rural America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. 213 p. \$2.50.

Contents: Emergency problems in rural education; economic and social factors; farm income, migration and leisure; education for the use of resources; the land-grant college; the school; what rural schools can learn from the training

programs of the armed forces; organization and financing of rural education; library service; economic cooperation and adult education; the Michigan State Farm Bureau; training rural youth for leadership; the educational program of the Farmers Union.

12. STRANG, RUTH M., chairman. *Education in Rural Communities*. Fifty-First Yearbook, Part II. National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952. 359 p. Cloth, \$3.50; paper, \$2.75.

Contents: Education in a changing rural life; potentialities of education in rural communities; rural education today; pilot programs in rural education; reorganization of the administrative unit and the curriculum; improved educational leadership; the united front in rural education; evaluating rural education; first steps and a look ahead; films and other aids.

13. TAYLOR, CARL C., and OTHERS. *Rural Life in the United States*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949. 549 p. \$6.75.

Contents: Rural life and rural sociology; the evaluation of American rural society; the farm home; rural neighborhoods and communities; rural trade areas; the rural school; the rural church; local government; health and welfare; recreation and art; population characteristics; dynamics of rural population; occupational patterns; land owners and tenants; farm laborers; standards of living; rural social differentials; rural regions; farmers in a changing world.

DIVISION 1

The Needed Educational Program for Rural Children and Youth—Its Scope and Quality

14. BASS, M. REED, chairman. *Vocational Education in the Years Ahead*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Vocational Division Bulletin, 1945, No. 234. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1945. 329 p. 50c.

15. BATHURST, EFFIE. *Petersburg Builds A Health Program*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1949, No. 9. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1949. 50 p. 20c.

16. FARGO, LUCILLE F. *The Library in the School*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1947. 405 p. \$4.

17. FOX, LORENE K. *The Rural Community and Its School*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1948. 233 p. \$3.25.

18. FROELICH, CLIFFORD P. *Guidance Services in Smaller Schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950. 352 p. \$5.50.

19. GAUMNITZ, WALTER H., and TOMPKINS, ELLSWORTH. *Holding Power and Size of High Schools*. Circular No. 322. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1950. 25 p. 20c.

20. GILLILAND, JOHN W. *School Camping: A Frontier of Curricular Improvement*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1954. 64 p. 75c.

21. HAMLIN, HERBERT M. *Agricultural Education in Community Schools*. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1949. 487 p. \$3.75.
22. HECKER, STANLEY E. *Early School Leavers in Kentucky*. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, Vol. 25, No. 4, June 1953. Lexington: College of Education, University of Kentucky. 78 p.
23. INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH. *Youth—the Nation's Richest Resource; Their Education and Employment Needs*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1951. 54 p. 20c.
24. KIRK, SAMUEL A., chairman. *The Education of Exceptional Children*. Forty-Ninth Yearbook, Part II. National Society for the Study of Education, 1950. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 350 p. Cloth, \$3.50; paper, \$2.75.
25. MACKINTOSH, HELEN K., and OTHERS. *Schools at Work in 48 States*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1952, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1952. 138 p. 45c.
26. MARSHALL, DOUGLAS, and PETERSON, MILO. *Factors Associated with Variations in School Attendance of Minnesota Farm Boys*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1948. 24 p.
27. MC VEY, FRANK L. "Educational Standards for Rural People." *Proceedings of the 24th American Country Life Conference*, 1944. p. 72-87. Champaign, Ill.: Garrard Press.
28. MORRIS, GLYN. *Practical Guidance Methods for Principals and Teachers*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 266 p. \$3.75.
29. NEA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION. *Education for All American Children*. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1948. 292 p. \$1.
30. NEA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION. *Education for All American Youth: A Further Look*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1952. 402 p. \$2.
31. NEA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION. *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1951. 100 p. \$1.
32. NEA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION. *Education of the Gifted*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950. 88 p. 35c.
33. OBERTEUFFER, DELBERT. *School Health Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949. 405 p. \$3.25.
34. RAGSDALE, C. E., chairman. *Education for Rural Wisconsin's Tomorrow*. Madison: Committee on Rural Community High Schools, University of Wisconsin, 1946. 36 p.

35. RANSOM, WILLIAM L. "How Well Does Your High School Rate on the Ten Imperative Needs of Youth?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* 33:8-46; October 1949.

36. RICHMOND, LUCILLE MCGRAW, and BATHURST, EFFIE. *Culloden Improves Its Curriculum*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1951, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1951. 24 p. 15c.

37. ROBERTS, ROY W., editor. *On-the-Job Education in Rural Communities*. Yearbook 1947. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 139 p. 75c.

38. SCHULLER, CHARLES F., editor. *The School Administrator and His Audio-Visual Program*. Yearbook 1954. Department of Audio-Visual Instructional Services, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 367 p. \$3.75.

39. U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE. *Education: An Investment in People*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1954. 45 p. \$1.

40. WARBURTON, AMBER A. *Guidance in a Rural Community*. Yearbook 1952. Department of Rural Education. Prepared for the Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 156 p. \$2.

41. WARBURTON, AMBER A. *Guidance in a Rural-Industrial Community*. A report made for the Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth and the Department of Rural Education. 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 249 p. Cloth, \$4; paper, \$3.

42. WEBER, JULIA. *My Country School Diary*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. 270 p. \$2.50.

43. WEINRICH, ERNEST F., and SOPER, WAYNE W. *A Five-Year Study of the Adjustment of Rural Schools to the Needs of Youth*. Bulletin No. 1379. New York State Education Department, 1949. Albany: State Education Department. 64 p.

44. WILLIAMSON, MAUDE, and LYLE, MARY S. *Homemaking Education in the High School*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1941. 484 p. \$3.

45. WRIGHT, GRACE S.; GAUMNITZ, WALTER H.; and MC DONALD, EVERETT A., JR. *Education Unlimited: A Community High School in Action*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1951, No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1951. 35 p. 15c.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 20-24, 51-54); 2 (chapters 7-17); 3 (p. 79-105); 4 (chapter 1); 7 (chapters 7, 12, 17); 9 (p. 29-53, 61-74, 86-97, 121-28, 138-45, 172-94); 11 (chapters 1, 6, 13); 12 (chapters 3, 5, 9); 190; 192; 195; 205; 218; 222; 240; 241; 245; 248; 250; 252; 255; 257; 260; 263; 265.

DIVISION 2

The School as a Community Institution

46. BABIN, LARRY J. "Dutchtown Develops a Community Program." *Educational Leadership* 8:283-86; February 1951.
47. BAILEY, ELIZABETH M., and MC GLOTHLIN, NELL W. "A Cooperative Study at Indian Knoll." *Educational Leadership* 7:398-401; March 1950.
48. BATHURST, EFFIE G. *Schools Count in Country Life*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1947, No. 8. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1947. 62 p. 20c.
49. BROWN, CARL F. "A Rural Community Goes to School." *Educational Leadership* 7:307-11; February 1950.
50. CLARK, LOIS M. "Together Parents and Teachers Study the Children." *Association for Childhood Education International, Bulletin* No. 62, 1953, p. 5-9.
51. CYR, FRANK W., and LIPTON, JAMES H. *What High Schools Are Teaching about Cooperatives*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1945. 20 p. 25c.
52. EAVES, ROBERT W., chairman. *Community Living and the Elementary School*. Twenty-Fourth Yearbook, 1945. Department of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 351 p. \$2.
53. ESSERT, PAUL L. *Creative Leadership of Adult Education*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951. 333 p. \$5.
54. FITZWATER, C. O. "When Schools Reach Out." *Educational Leadership* 8:262-66; February 1951.
55. GUCKY, JOSEPH B., and COREY, H. "A Community Organizes To Help Itself." *Educational Leadership* 7:388-92; March 1950.
56. MC CHAREN, WILLIAM K. *Selected Community School Programs in the South*. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1948. 216 p. \$2.50.
57. MC CLUSKEY, HOWARD Y. "Twelve Years of Community Councils in Michigan." *School of Education Bulletin* (University of Michigan) 20:113-16; May 1949.
58. NEA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION. *Strengthening Community Life: Schools Can Help*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1954. 42 p. 35c.
59. OGDEN, JEAN CARTER, and OGDEN, JESSE. *Small Communities in Action*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. 244 p. \$3.
60. OLSEN, EDWARD G., and OTHERS. *School and Community*. Second edition. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954. 534 p. \$5.75.
61. OLSEN, EDWARD G. *School and Community Programs*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949. 510 p. \$5.65.

62. OLSON, CLARA M., and FLETCHER, NORMAN D. *Learn and Live*. New York: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (30 Rockefeller Plaza), 1946. 101 p. \$1.50.

63. SEAY, MAURICE F., chairman. *The Community School*. Fifty-Second Yearbook, Part II. National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. 292 p. \$3.50.

64. STRANG, RUTH M. "Planning with and for Youth in a Rural-Industrial Community." *Nation's Schools* 43:41-43; January 1949.

65. TIREMAN, L. S., and WATSON, MARY. *A Community School in a Spanish-Speaking Village*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1948. 169 p. \$2.50.

66. TURNER, MARIE R. "All Community Resources Help to Supplement Too Small School Staff." *School Management* 18:4-5; March 1949.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 15-19, 37-39, 43-46); 2 (chapters 5, 17); 3 (p. 121-27); 4 (chapter 8); 7 (p. 385-92); 9 (p. 75-85, 129-37); 12 (chapter 4); 159; 160; 233; 236; 238; 239; 244; 253; 257; 264.

DIVISION 3

Economic and Social Trends Related to Rural Education

67. AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF COOPERATION. *Youth and Cooperatives*. Reprint from *American Cooperation*, p. 657-790. Washington, D.C.: American Institute of Cooperation, 1950. 35c.

68. BATHURST, EFFIE G. *Your Life in the Country*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948. 399 p. \$2.80.

69. BERGER, ROLLAND D., and OTHERS. *Economic and Social Resources for Community Development*. Community Development Service, Vol. 2, No. 4, Madison: University of Wisconsin, July 1949. 46 p.

70. BURCHFIELD, LAVERNE. *Our Rural Communities: A Guide to Published Materials on Rural Problems*, Chicago: Public Administration Service (1313 E. 60th St.), 1947. 201 p. \$2.50.

71. CYR, FRANK W., and CALLAHAN, JOHN. *Cooperatives in School and Community*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947. 84 p.

72. CYR, FRANK W., and TIPTON, JAMES H. *What High Schools Are Teaching about Cooperation*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1945. 20 p. 25c.

73. FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION. *Motion Picture Films Available on Cooperation*. Information and Extension Division. Miscellaneous Report 144, 1952. Washington, D.C.: Farm Credit Administration. 21 p.

74. FETROW, WARD W., and ELSWORTH, R. H. *Agricultural Cooperation in the United States*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Bulletin 1947, No. 54. Washington, D.C.: Farm Credit Administration. 214 p.

75. FLAGG, GRACE L., and LONGMAN, T. WILSON. *Trends in Rural and Urban Levels of Living*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Information Bulletin 1949, No. 11. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 75 p.

76. GROVE, ERNEST W., and KOFFSKY, NATHAN M. *Measuring the Income of Farm People*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1949. 8 p.

77. HECKMAN, JOHN H. *Guide for Teaching Farmer Cooperation*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Circular E-34, 1950, developed in cooperation with the American Institute of Cooperation. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 34 p. 15c.

78. HITCH, EARLE. *Rebuilding Rural America*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. 273 p. \$3.50.

79. LE BEAU, OSCAR R., and HECKMAN, JOHN H. *Cooperative Business Training for Farm Youth*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Circular E-37, 1951. Washington, D.C.: Farm Credit Administration. 53 p. 25c.

80. LE BEAU, OSCAR R., and HECKMAN, JOHN H. *Patrons Appraise Cooperative Relations*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration. Circular C-140, 1951. Washington, D.C.: Farm Credit Administration. 46 p. 20c.

81. MC KAY, A. W. *Farmer's Cooperatives in Our Community*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Circular E-32, 1950. Washington, D.C.: Farm Credit Administration. 37 p. 10c.

82. RAPER, ARTHUR F. *A Graphic Presentation of Rural Trends*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service and Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1952. 33 p. (Mimeo.)

83. ROBINSON, J. L. *Using a Local Cooperative as Source Material For Teaching*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Circular E-25, 1950. Washington, D.C.: Farm Credit Administration. 9 p. 5c.

84. SCHULTZ, THEODORE W. "A Guide to Better Policy for Agriculture." *Consumer Reports* 19:185-89; April 1954.

85. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. *The Farm Income Situation*. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1954. 56 p.

86. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS. *Family Income in the United States: 1952*. Current Population Reports, Series F 50, No. 15, 1954. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 16 p. 10c.

87. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS. *Farms and Farm People*. Special Cooperative Report. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 98 p. 50c.

88. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS. *Fertility of the Population: April 1952*. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 46, 1953. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 22 p. 15c.

89. WAYLAND, SLOAN R.; BRUNNER, EDMUND DES.; and CYR, FRANK W. *Farmers of the Future*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953. 85 p. \$1.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 7-10); 2 (chapters 2, 3, 4, 5); 3 (p. 22-77); 4 (chapter 1); 5; 6; 7 (chapters 1-5); 8; 9 (p. 205-15); 10; 11 (chapters 2, 3); 12 (chapter 2); 13; 147; 148; 155.

DIVISION 4

School District Reorganization

90. BOSLEY, HOWARD E. *Size-Cost Relationships in Illinois Public Schools*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1949. 23 p.

91. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E. "What Research Advises on School District Reorganization." *Nation's Schools* 48:52-55; July 1951.

92. CALIFORNIA STATE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL DISTRICTS. *Findings and Recommendations of the Commission on School Districts*. Sacramento: the Commission, 1949. 95 p.

93. CARPENTER, C. C. "Characteristics of a Satisfactory Administrative Unit." *American School Board Journal* 117:27-28; December 1948.

94. COOPER, SHIRLEY. "Organization and Administration of Local School Systems," Chapter I, "District Organization." *Review of Educational Research* 19:283-90; October 1949.

95. COOPER, SHIRLEY, and OTHERS. "Needed Research in School District Reorganization." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 32:356-59; April 1951.

96. CUSHMAN, M. L. *An Analysis of Legislation for School District Reorganization in the Midwest*. Ames: Iowa State College, 1948. 32 p.

97. CUSHMAN, M. L. "District Organization." *Review of Educational Research* 22:356-65; October 1952.

98. DAWSON, HOWARD A., and ELLENA, WILLIAM J. "School District Reorganization." *School Executive* 11:39-42; July 1954.

99. DAWSON, HOWARD A., and ELLENA, WILLIAM J. *The Status of Schools, School Districts, and School District Reorganization*. A mimeographed bulletin of the Department of Rural Education, March 15, 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 8 p. 50c.

100. DAWSON, HOWARD A.; REEVES, FLOYD W.; and OTHERS. *Your School District*. Report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948. 286 p. Available thru library loan, NEA.

101. ESSERT, PAUL, and HOWARD, ROBERT WEST. *Educational Planning by Neighborhoods in Centralized Districts*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. 132 p. \$2.25.

102. FITZWATER, C. O. *Educational Change in Reorganized School Districts*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1953, No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 33 p. 20c.
103. FITZWATER, C. O. *Selected Characteristics of Reorganized School Districts*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1953, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 49 p. 20c.
104. GRIEDER, CALVIN. *School District Reorganization for Colorado*. Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado, 1944. 30 p.
105. GRIEDER, CALVIN. "Relation of School District Reorganization to Finance and Business Administration." *Review of Educational Research* 17:167-77; April 1947.
106. HAMLIN, H. W., and SUMPTION, M. R. *New Community Unit School Districts*. University of Illinois Bulletin, 1951, No. 45. Urbana: University of Illinois. 32 p. 40c.
107. KREITLOW, BURTON W. "Factors Limiting School Reorganization." *Nation's Schools* 51:81-84; February 1953.
108. MASSANAR, KARL LOUIS. "Public Opinion as Related to the Problem of School District Reorganization in Selected Areas in Illinois." *Journal of Experimental Education* 17:389-458; June 1949.
109. MINNESOTA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND STATE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SCHOOL REORGANIZATION. *Revised Manual for County School Survey Committee*. St. Paul: the Department, 1949. 82 p.
110. MC INTYRE, KENNETH E. "State School Redistricting Continues." *American School Board Journal* 128:31-33; February 1954.
111. MC INTYRE, KENNETH E. "The Progress and Problems of Redistricting." *American School Board Journal* 128:38-40; March 1954.
112. MONROE, WALTER S., editor. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. "School-District Organization," p. 1083-89. New York: Macmillan Co., 1950.
113. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION AND DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION. *A Model School District Reorganization Bill*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948. 16 p. (Mimeo.)
114. REUSSER, WALTER C. "Steps in Redistricting." *Nation's Schools* 41:50-51; May 1948.
115. SUMPTION, M. R., and BEEM, HARLAN D. *A Guide to School Reorganization in Illinois*. Educational Research Circular No. 59. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1947. 52 p.
116. *The Phi Delta Kappan*. "School District Reorganization." 32:297-344; March 1951.
- xxx. See also: 1 (p. 11-14, 55-62); 2 (chapter 19); 3 (p. 112-20); 7 (chapter 9, pp. 393-402); 9 (p. 153-62); 11 (chapter 8); 12 (chapter 6); 14; 15; 16; 18; 24; 28; 29; 30; 32; 33; 34; 35; 37; 38; 40; 45; 194; 195.

DIVISION 5

Teachers and Other Personnel for Schools Serving Rural People

117. EVERETT, MARCIA, editor. *The Rural Supervisor at Work*. Yearbook 1949. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 242 p. \$1.

118. FRANSETH, JANE. *Learning to Supervise Schools*. Circular No. 289. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1952. 50 p. 30c.

119. FRANSETH, JANE. "What is Good Supervision?" *Journal of the National Education Association* 42:573-75; December 1953.

120. JONES, ARTHUR J., and MILLER, LEONARD M. "The National Picture of Pupil Personnel and Guidance Services in 1953." *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* 38: 105-59; February 1954.

121. LAMBERT, S. M. "Meet Today's Rural Teacher." *Journal of the National Education Association* 42:229-31; April 1953.

122. NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMISSION FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. *How Can We Get Enough Good Teachers?* New York: the Commission, 1953. 92 p.

123. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS. *The Albany Conference Report—Lay-Professional Action Programs To Secure and Retain Qualified Teachers*. Washington: National Education Association, 1954. \$2.

124. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Legal Status of the School Superintendent." *Research Bulletin* 29:87-130; October 1951.

125. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Public-School Retirement at the Half Century." *Research Bulletin* 28:115-75; December 1950.

126. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Rural Teachers in 1951-52." *Research Bulletin* 31:1-64; February 1953.

127. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Teacher Personnel Practices, 1950-51; Appointment and Termination of Service." *Research Bulletin* 30:3-31; February 1952.

128. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Teacher Personnel Procedures, 1950-51; Employment Conditions in Service." *Research Bulletin* 30:35-63; April 1952.

129. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Teachers in the Public Schools." *Research Bulletin* 27:127-59; December 1949.

130. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Teaching Load in 1950." *Research Bulletin* 29:3-51; February 1951.

131. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "The 1954 Teacher Supply and Demand Report." *Journal of Teacher Education* 5:3-52; March 1954.

132. REED, HAROLD J. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Teaching Effectiveness and the Teacher's Attitude of Acceptance." *Journal of Experimental Education* 21:277-325; June 1953.

133. ROGERS, VIRGIL M. *The American School Superintendency*. Thirtieth Yearbook 1952. American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 663 p. \$5.

134. WOFFORD, KATE V., editor. *Education of Teachers for Rural America*. Yearbook 1946. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 150 p. 50c.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 29-34); 2 (chapter 21); 3 (p. 106-11); 4 (p. 464-77); 9 (p. 146-52); 12 (chapter 7).

DIVISION 6

Financing the Education of Rural People

135. BURKE, ARVID J. *Financing Public Schools in the United States*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931. 584 p. \$4.50.

136. CHASE, FRANCIS S., and MORPHET, EDGAR L. *The Forty-Eight State School Systems*. Chicago: The Council of State Governments, 1949. 245 p.

137. CORNELL, FRANCIS G.; MCLURE, WILLIAM P.; MILLER, VAN; and WOCHNER, RAYMOND E. *Financing Education in Efficient School Districts*. Urbana: Bureau of Research and Services, University of Illinois, 1949. 165 p. \$1.25; Illustrated with maps \$3.

138. CUSHMAN, M. L., director. *The Financial Equalization of Educational Opportunity in Iowa*. A report of the Iowa Research Committee on School Finance. Des Moines: Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, 1950. 178 p.

139. FLORIDA CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION. *Education and the Future of Florida*. Tallahassee: the Committee, 1947. 448 p.

140. HUTCHINS, CLAYTON D., and MUNSE, ALBERT R. *Expenditures for Education at the Midcentury*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1953, Miscellaneous 18. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 136 p. 65c.

141. JOHNS, ROE L., and MEYER, H. A. "Distributing State Funds: How To Estimate Taxpaying Ability of Local School Districts." *Nation's Schools* 49:49-50; February 1952.

142. JOHNS, ROE L., and MORPHET, EDGAR L. "Relation of School District Reorganization to Finance and Business Administration." *Review of Educational Research* 20:115-23; April 1950. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. \$1.50.

143. JOHNS, ROE L.; MORPHET, EDGAR L.; and OTHERS. *Problems and Issues in Public School Finance*. National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. 492 p. \$4.50.

144. LINDMAN, ERICK L.; HUTCHINS, CLAYTON D.; MORPHET, EDGAR L.; and RELLER, THEODORE L. *State Provisions for Financing Public-School Capital Outlay Programs*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1951,

No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1951. 170 p. 40c.

145. MORPHET, EDGAR L., and LINDMAN, ERICK L. *Public School Finance Programs of the Forty-Eight States*. Circular No. 274. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1950. 110 p. 60c.

146. MORT, PAUL W., and REUSSER, WALTER C. *Public School Finance*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951. Second edition. 639 p. \$6.

147. NEA COMMITTEE ON TAX EDUCATION AND SCHOOL FINANCE. *Guides to the Development of State School Finance Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1949. 24 p. 25c.

148. NEA COMMITTEE ON TAX EDUCATION AND SCHOOL FINANCE. *New Sources of Local Revenues for Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950. 23 p. 25c.

149. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. *Ability and Effort of States To Support Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1954. 2 p.

150. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Public School Revenues, 1949-50." *Research Bulletin* 30: 107-67; December 1952.

151. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. "Statutory Bases of State Foundation Programs of Education." *Research Bulletin* 26:43-99; April 1948.

152. NORTON, JOHN K., and LAWLER, EUGENE S. *Unfinished Business in American Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1946. 64 p.

153. NORTON, JOHN K., and MORT, PAUL R. *Still Unfinished*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948. 34 p. 25c.

154. QUATTLEBAUM, CHARLES A. *Federal Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education*. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1948. 191 p. \$2.

155. WAKEFIELD, HOWARD. "The Ratio Between the Labor Force and the School-Age Population as an Index of Ability to Support Education." *Rural Sociology* 19:68-70; March 1954.

156. WELCH, ROBERT H. W., JR. "Our Public Schools and Their Financial Support." *NAM News* (2 East 48th Street, New York) 24:1-24; August 1954.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 47-50); 2 (chapters 24, 25); 3 (p. 141-52); 4 (chapter 16); 9 (p. 195-204); 85; 86.

DIVISION 7

Physical Facilities for Schools Serving Rural People and Their Communities

A. The School Plant

157. NEA DEPARTMENT OF AUDIO-VISUAL INSTRUCTION. *Planning Schools for Use of Audio-Visual Materials: No. 1, Classrooms*. 1953. 40 p. \$1.; *No. 2, Auditoriums*. 1953. 36 p. \$1.; *No. 3, The Audio-Visual Instructional Materials Center*. 1954. 80 p. \$1. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

158. BEST, CLARENCE J. *Music Rooms and Equipment*. Music Educators Research Council Bulletin No. 17. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference (64 E. Jackson Boulevard), 1949. 111 p. \$1.50.
159. CYR, FRANK W., and LINN, HENRY H. *Planning Rural Community School Buildings*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949. 162 p. \$3.75.
160. ILLINOIS LIBRARY ASSOCIATION. *Planning School Library Quarters*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1950. 64 p. \$1.50.
161. JOHNSON, PHILIP G., chairman, and OTHERS. *Science Facilities for Secondary Schools*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Miscellaneous Bulletin 1952, No. 17. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1952. 38 p. 25c.
162. LEE, ATA. *Space and Equipment for Home Making Programs*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Miscellaneous Bulletin 1950, No. 9. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1950. 72 p. 45c.
163. NATIONAL COUNCIL ON SCHOOLHOUSE CONSTRUCTION. *Guide for Planning School Plants*. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers (W. D. McClurkin), 1953. 179 p. \$2.
164. NATIONAL FACILITIES CONFERENCE. *A Guide for Planning Facilities for Athletics, Recreation, Physical and Health Education*. Chicago: Athletic Institute, (209 S. State Street), 1947. 127 p. \$1.50.
165. PERKINS, LAWRENCE B., and COCKING, WALTER D. *Schools*. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1949. 264 p. \$11.50.
166. STONEMAN, MERLE A.; BROADY, KNUTE O.; and BRAINARD, ALANSON D. *Planning and Modernizing the School Plant*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1949. 328 p. \$3.50.
167. TAYLOR, JAMES M., and OTHERS. *Designing Elementary Classrooms*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Special Publication No. 1, 1953. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 55 p. 35c.
168. VILES, NELSON E. *Improving School Custodial Service*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1949, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1949. 32 p. 15c.
169. VILES, NELSON E. *School Buildings: Remodeling, Rehabilitation, Modernization, Repair*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1950, No. 17. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1950. 37 p. 20c.
170. VILES, NELSON E. *School Fire Safety*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1951, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1951. 58 p. 20c.

171. WHITE, WARREN T., chairman. *American School Buildings*. Twenty-Seventh Yearbook 1949. American Association of School Administrators. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 525 p. \$4.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 35, 36); 2 (chapter 23); 3 (p. 135-40); 9 (p. 165-71); 242.

B. Transportation

172. BELKNAP, BURTON H. *The School Bus*. Philadelphia: Educational Test Bureau, 1950. 212 p. \$4.60.

173. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E. "What Effect Has the Size of District on Pupil Transportation?" *Nation's Schools* 44:42-44; August 1949.

174. COVERT, TIMON. *State Plans for Financing Pupil Transportation*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Pamphlet No. 99. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1946. 52 p.

175. CULP, D. P., chairman; ISENBERG, ROBERT M., editor. *Pupil Transportation*. Yearbook 1953. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 190 p. \$2.

176. CYR, FRANK W., and DARLAND, D. C. "Growth and Development of School Transportation." *School Executive* 66:48-49; February 1947.

177. FEATHERSTON, E. GLENN. *School Bus Drivers*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Pamphlet No. 100. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1946. 38 p. 10c.

178. FEATHERSTON, E. GLENN. *School Bus Maintenance*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1948, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1948. 42 p. 15c.

179. FEATHERSTON, E. GLENN, and GIBBS, ANDREW H. *Records and Reports for Pupil Transportation*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Special Series No. 2. 1949. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1949. 27 p. 20c.

180. ISENBERG, ROBERT M. "Discovering Better Education Through Extended Use of Buses." *Nation's Schools* 52:76-79; September 1953.

181. ISENBERG, ROBERT M. *Guide for Analyzing a Pupil Transportation Program*. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1953. 18 p. 50c.

182. MARSH, BURTON W. *Training School Bus Drivers*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Vocational Division Bulletin 1945, No. 233. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1945. 162 p. 30c.

183. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SAFETY EDUCATION. *Minimum Standards for School Buses*. Revised edition. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1949. 60 p. 35c.

184. NEA RESEARCH DIVISION. *School Transportation Insurance*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Pamphlet No. 101. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1948. 34 p. 15c.

185. POPE, FARNHAM G. "A Comparison of Pupil Transportation Costs under District-Owned and Contract Systems." *Journal of Experimental Education* 19:95-100; September 1950.

186. ROBINSON, R. W. "Laying Out of Bus Routes." *School Executive* 66:56-58; February 1947.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 40-43); 2 (chapter 22); 3 (p. 128-34); 4 (chapter 17).

DIVISION 8

The Development of the Intermediate Unit

187. BRACKEN, JOHN L. "St. Louis County Learns To Cooperate." *School Executive* 65:50-51; November 1945.

188. BUELL, W. R., chairman, and CYR, FRANK W., director. *Rural Leadership and Service*. A discussion guide for developing the future status of the District Superintendency in New York State. Two bulletins: a. Information leading to the statement of major function of the district superintendency; b. Structure. Albany: New York State Educational Department, 1951, 1953. 76 p. and 64 p.

189. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E. "A Study of the Intermediate School District in New York." *Journal of Educational Research* 41:88-96; October 1947.

190. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E., and OTHERS. *Improving Educational Opportunities in Rural Areas*. Bulletin 1322. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1946. 155 p.

191. BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E.; CRANE, EDMUND H.; and OTHERS. *A New Intermediate School District for New York State*. Bulletin 1336. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1947. 60 p.

192. COOPER, SHIRLEY, chairman and editor. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*. Yearbook 1950. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 188 p. Cloth, \$2.50; paper, \$2.

193. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA. *Report of the State Committee on County School Instructional Services*. Working draft No. 5, September 1954. Sacramento: Department of Education. 83 p. (Mimeo.)

194. FOX, ROBERT S., chairman; ISENBERG, ROBERT M., editor. *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*. Yearbook 1954. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 259 p. Cloth, \$3; paper, \$2.50.

195. HARDESTY, CECIL D., and OTHERS. *A Survey of Services Provided by the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools*. (San Diego County, California.) San Diego: Office of the Superintendent of County Schools (209 Civic Center), 1953. 127 p.

196. HEFFERNAN, HELEN, and OTHERS. "Orange County Organization for Educational Services." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 22:1-64; August 1953.

197. LANGSTON, D. W. "Trends in County-Level School Guidance Services." *Occupations* 29:579-83; May 1951.

198. MC CANNON, ROLAND. "County Superintendents in Reorganized Systems." *School Management* 18:14-15; April 1949.

199. MC CLURE, WILLIAM P. *The Role of the Intermediate Type of County Superintendent*. Urbana: College of Education, University of Illinois, 1952. 116 p. (Mimeo.)

200. MOORE, HOLLIS J. "There's a New Look in County School Administration." *Nation's Schools* 52:96, 98, 100; December 1953.

201. MORRISON, J. CAYCE; BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E.; and OTHERS. *The Intermediate District in New York State: Special Studies*. Bulletin 1356. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1948. 149 p.

202. POUND, CLARENCE A. *Legal Responsibilities and Leadership Opportunities for Indiana County Superintendents*. Studies in Education, No. 4, 1953. Lafayette: Purdue University, Division of Education. 26 p. (Mimeo.)

203. RELLER, T. L. "Characteristics of a Desirable Intermediate District." *American School Board Journal* 129:29-31; August 1954.

204. ROBERTS, L. A., and OTHERS. *The County Superintendency in Texas*. Austin: The Southwestern Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, University of Texas, 1954. 29 p. (Mimeo.)

205. SILVEY, H. M. "County-wide Guidance Program," Bremer County, Iowa. *School and Society* 71:114-16; February, 1950.

206. WALTER, ROBERT B. *A Study of Educational Functions of the County Superintendents of Schools in California*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1951. 58 p.

207. WEST, JOSEPH S., editor. *Ohio County Superintendents' Workshop*. Columbus: The School-Community Development Study, Ohio State University, 1953. (Mimeo.)

xxx. See also: 2 (chapter 20); 4; 14; 18; 20; 21; 24; 28; 30; 32; 33; 34; 35; 37; 38; 40; 41; 97; 98; 99; 100; 208; 210; 212.

DIVISION 9

The County Unit of School Administration

208. BALDWIN, R. D. *Continuing Professional Development of School Administrators*. New York: Cooperative Program in Educational Administration—Middle Atlantic Region. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953. 59 p. \$1.

209. FLINN, V. L. "Organization and Administration in Kanawha County Schools." *American School Board Journal* 113:21-24; December 1946.

210. PIERCE, TRUMAN M., and WILSON, L. CRAIG. "Research in County Educational Administration." *The School Executive* 72:97-106; March 1953.

211. SPAIN, CHARLES R., director and editor. *Public Education in Harlan County, Kentucky*. A Survey Report. Bulletin No. 2. Lexington: Bureau of School Services, University of Kentucky, 1947. 210 p. 50c.

212. WEST VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS. *The Leadership Project. Progress Reports 1-6*. Elkins, West Virginia: Stark Wilmoth, Superintendent of Randolph County Schools. 1950-1954.

xxx. See also: 4; 14; 18; 20; 21; 24; 28; 30; 32; 33; 34; 35; 37; 38; 40; 41; 187; 192; 195; 197; 202; 205; 206; 207.

DIVISION 10

Education for the Disadvantaged and Minority Groups in Rural Areas

213. ASHMORE, HARRY S. *The Negro and the Schools*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 228 p. \$2.75.

214. BROWN, WILLIAM H. "Financial Support of Secondary Education for Negroes in Georgia." *Journal of Negro Education* 21:478-83; Fall 1952.

215. CHICK, C. A., SR. "Recent Southern Industrialization and Its Implications for Negroes Living in the South." *Journal of Negro Education* 22:475-83; Fall 1953.

216. GINSBERG, ELI, and BRAY, DOUGLAS W. *The Uneducated*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953. 246 p. \$4.50.

217. GREENE, SHIRLEY E. *Children of Misfortune: A Study of Migrant Children*. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor (1751 N Street, N.W.), 1954. 37 p. 25c.

218. GREENE, SHIRLEY E., editor. *The Education of Migrant Children*. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1954. Cloth, \$3; paper, \$2.50.

219. MC WILLIAMS, CAREY. *North from Mexico*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1949. 324 p. \$4.

220. MARDEN, C. F. *Minorities in American Society*. New York: American Book Co., 1952. 493 p. \$4.50.

221. SANCHEZ, GEORGE I. "Spanish-Speaking People in the Southwest—A Brief Historical Review." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 22:106-107; November 1953.

222. SANCHEZ, GEORGE I. *The People—A Study of the Navajos*. Lawrence, Kansas: U.S. Indian Service (Haskell Institute Print Shop), 1948.

223. STEWART, MAXWELL S., editor. *Segregation and the Schools*. Public Affairs Document No. 209, 1954. New York: Public Affairs Committee (22 East 38th Street). 28 p. 25c.

224. THOMPSON, CHARLES H. "Availability of Education in the Negro Separate School." *Journal of Negro Education* 16:263-79; Fall 1947.

225. THOMPSON, CHARLES H., editor. "Next Steps in Racial Desegregation in Education." *Journal of Negro Education* 23:201-309; Summer 1954.

226. THOMPSON, CHARLES H., editor. "The Relative Status of the Negro Population in the United States." *Journal of Negro Education* 22:221-451; Summer 1953.

227. VANCE, RUPERT V., and DANILEVSKY, NADIA. *All These People*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945. 503 p. \$5.

228. VAN HECKE, MAURICE T., chairman. *Migratory Labor in American Agriculture*. Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, 1951. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 188 p. 75c.

229. WILLIAMS, MARY L., chairman. *Legal Status of Segregated Schools*, Parts I and II. A study sponsored by the Joint Committee of the National Education Association and the American Teachers Association. 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 32 and 46 p. 25c each.

230. WILLIAMS, ROBIN M., JR., and RYAN, MARGARET W. *Schools in Transition*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1954. \$3.

xxx. See also: 2 (chapter 16).

DIVISION 11

The Educational Programs of Organizations and Agencies Serving Rural People

231. BRUNNER, EDMUND DE S., YANG, E. HSIM PAO. *Rural America and the Extension Service*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949. 210 p. \$3.

232. CHILDS, MARQUIS. *The Farmer Takes a Hand: The Electric Power Revolution in Rural America*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1952. 256 p. \$3.50.

233. CLAPP, ELSIE R. *The Use of Resources in Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 174 p. \$4.

234. KELSEY, LINCOLN D., and HEARNE, CANNON C. *Cooperative Extension Work*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Comstock Publishing Company, 1949. 424 p. \$4.

235. KILE, ORVILLE M. *The Farm Bureau Through Three Decades*. Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1948. 416 p. \$3.50.

236. LANDIS, BENSON G. *Rural Welfare Services*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. 201 p. \$3.

237. LINDSTROM, DAVID E. *American Farmers and Rural Organizations*. Champaign, Illinois: Garrard Press, 1948. 457 p. \$4.75.

238. MOTT, FREDERICK D., and ROEMER, MILTON I. *Rural Health and Medical Care*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948. 608 p. \$6.50.

239. ZAKI, ABD-EL-HAMID. *A Study of Child Welfare in a Rural New York County*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947. 225 p. \$2.90.

xxx. See also: 2 (chapter 14); 4 (chapter 16); 7 (chapters 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16); 11 (chapters 5, 9, 10, 11).

DIVISION 12

Improvement and Administration of Small Schools

240. BATHURST, EFFIE G., and FRANSETH, JANE. *Modern Ways in One- and Two-Teacher Schools*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bul-

letin 1951, No. 18. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1951. 48 p. 20c.

241. BOWEN, GENEVIEVE M. *Living and Learning in a Rural School*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1944. 324 p. \$4.

242. CLARK, LOIS M. "A Schoolhouse for Oak Hill." *Journal of the National Education Association* 38:192-93; March 1949.

243. GAUMNITZ, WALTER H., and BLOSE, DAVID T. *The One-Teacher School—Its Midcentury Status*. Circular No. 318. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1950. 30 p. 20c.

244. GAUMNITZ, WALTER H., and DEVILBISS, WILBUR. *Cooperative Planning the Key to Improved Organization of Small High Schools*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Pamphlet No. 102. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1947. 21 p. 10c.

245. GAUMNITZ, WALTER H., and WRIGHT, GRACE S. *Broadening the Services of Small High Schools*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1948, No. 9. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1948. 45 p. 20c.

246. GAUMNITZ, WALTER H., and OTHERS. *How Large Are Our Public High Schools?* Circular No. 304. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1949. 39 p. 25c.

247. HILTON, ERNEST. *Rural School Management*. New York: American Book Co., 1949. 278 p. \$3.25.

248. NEA DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION. *Health, Physical Education, and Recreation in Small Schools*. Joint Yearbook 1948. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 67 p. 50c.

249. PINKSTON, EVA G., editor; CLARK, LOIS M., guest editor. "The Rural Child in the Elementary School." *The National Elementary Principal* 29: No. 5; April 1950.

250. SCHNEIDER, ELSA, editor. *Physical Education in Small Schools*. Department of Rural Education and American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948. Reprinted 1954. 160 p. \$1.

251. SMITH, ROSE MARIE. *Education in Rural and City School Systems; Some Statistical Information for 1947-48*. Circular No. 329. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, 1951. 13 p. 15c.

252. STEVENSON, ELIZABETH. *Home and Family Life Education in Elementary Schools*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1946. 309 p. \$2.75.

253. WEBER, JULIA. *My Country School Diary: An Adventure in Creative Teaching*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. 270 p. \$2.50.

254. WOFFORD, KATE V., chairman. *Instructional Leadership in Small Schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1951. 88 p. \$1.25.

255. WOFFORD, KATE V. *Modern Education in the Small Rural School*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. 582 p. \$4.

256. WOFFORD, KATE V. *Teaching in Small Schools*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949. 399 p. \$3.75.

xxx. See also: 2; 4; 15; 17; 18; 20; 24; 27; 28; 29; 31; 32; 33; 34; 35; 42; 46; 47; 48; 49; 50; 52; 56; 58; 59; 61; 62; 66.

DIVISION 13

The Rural Environment's Distinctive Impact on Children and Youth

257. BATHURST, EFFIE G. *How Children Use the Community for Learning*. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1953, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 46 p. 20c.

258. BATHURST, EFFIE G. *Where Children Live Affects Curriculum*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1950, No. 7. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1950. 76 p. 30c.

259. BATHURST, EFFIE G. *Your Life in the Country*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948. 399 p. \$3.60.

260. COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN REGIONAL STUDIES AND EDUCATION. *Education for Use of Regional Resources*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944. 129 p. 25c.

261. DUNN, FANNIE W. *The Child in the Rural Environment*. Yearbook 1951. Department of Rural Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 253 p. \$3.

262. MC GLOTHLIN, W. J., chairman. *Large Was Our Bounty*. Yearbook 1948. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 216 p. \$2.50.

263. MORPHET, EDGAR L., editor. *Building a Better Southern Region Through Education*. Tallahassee, Florida: Southern States Work Conference on Administrative Problems, 1945. 418 p. \$1.50.

264. OLSON, CLARA M., and FLETCHER, NORMAN D. *Learn and Live*. New York: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, (30 Rockefeller Plaza), 1946. 101 p. \$1.50.

265. BLOUGH, GLENN, and BLACKWOOD, PAUL E. *Science Teaching in Rural and Small Town Schools*. U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1949, No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1949. 55 p. 20c.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 25-28); 2 (chapter 6); 7 (chapter 17); 11 (chapter 4); 15; 17; 241; 242; 249.

DIVISION 14

Rural Education and the World Scene

266. AGUILAR, JOSE V. "Development of Community-School Concepts in Other Countries." *Fifty-Second Yearbook*, Part II. National Society for the

Study of Education, p. 212-17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. \$3.50.

267. AGUILAR, JOSE V. *This is Our Community School*. Manila, P.I.: Bookman, 1951. 137 p.

268. ARCHER, CLIFFORD P. "The Community School—A Force in Strengthening Community Life on the World Scene." *Developing Community Schools*. Department of Rural Education. Atlantic City Reports, February 15-18, 1954, p. 29-31. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

269. BODEMAN, P. S. "Educational Cooperation with Foreign Countries." *Higher Education* 9:145-50; March 1, 1953. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 10c.

270. BRUNNER, EDMUND DE S.; SANDERS, IRWIN T.; and FNSMINGER, DOUGLAS. *Farmers of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945. 208 p. \$2.50.

271. CANNELL, CHARLES F.; WALE, FRED G.; and WITHEY, STEPHEN B., editors. "Community Change; An Action Program in Puerto Rico." *Journal of Social Issues* 9:1-60; No. 2, 1953.

272. HUSSEIN, AHMED. *Rural Social Welfare Centres in Egypt*. Cairo, Egypt: Ministry of Social Affairs, 1951. 27 p.

273. LAYA, JUAN CABREROS. *Little Democracies*. Revised edition. Manila, P.I.: Inang Wika Publishing Co., 1951. 241 p. 4.50 ps.

274. LAYA, JUAN CABREROS. *New Schools for the Little Democracies*. Manila, P.I.: Inang Wika Publishing Co., 1953. 405 p.

275. MATTHEWS, RODERIC D., and AKRAWI, MATTA. *Education in Arab Countries of the Near East*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949. 584 p. \$6.

276. METAWEH, IBRAHIM E. "An Egyptian Experiment in Functional Education: A Rural Community School." *Social Education* 17:173-75; April 1953.

277. MORGAN, ARTHUR E. *Higher Education in Relation to Rural India*. Sevagram, Hindustan: Talimi Sangh, 1950. 97 p.

278. NEA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION. *Point Four and Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950. 27 p. 20c.

279. PHILIPPINE ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS. *Adult Education in Action*. Yearbook 1951. Manila, P.I.: Bookman, 1952. 250 p.

280. PHILIPPINE ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS. "The Community School Program for Economic Development." *Quarterly Bulletin* 2: No. 4; June 1953. Manila, P.I.: Bookman. 57 p.

281. PHILIPPINE ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS. *Education in Rural Areas for Better Living*. Yearbook 1950. Manila, P.I.: Bookman. 278 p.

282. PUERTO RICO, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. *Morovis Plan*. San Juan, P.R.: The Department, 1952. 23 p.

283. RODRIQUEZ, ANTONIO, JR. *The Second Unit and the Rural School Problem of Puerto Rico*. San Juan, P.R.: Imprenta Venezuela, 1945. 238 p. \$2.50.

284. TAYLOR, CARL C. *Community Development in Economically Underdeveloped Areas*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. May 14, 1953. 11 p. (Mimeo.)

285. TURNER, HOYT J. B. "Education and Point IV in Iran." *Journal of the National Education Association* 43:150-52; March 1954.

286. UNITED NATIONS. *Sample List of Community Welfare Centers and Community Development Projects*. Department of Social Affairs of United Nations. ST/SOA/10. June 1952. New York: United Nations. 38 p.

287. UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Mission on Rural Community Organization and Development in the Caribbean Area and Mexico*. ST/SOA/Ser 0/7. March 1953. New York: United Nations. 45 p.

xxx. See also: 1 (p. 63-66).

DIVISION 15

Opportunities for Rural Youth at the College Level

288. AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION. *On Getting into College*. A study made for the Committee on Discriminations in College Admissions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949. 99 p. \$1.

289. BIRDIE, RALPH F. *After High School—What?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954. 240 p. \$4.25.

290. HENDERSON, ALGO D. "What Are the Implications of the Projected Increases in College Enrolment for Organizational Patterns of Higher Education?" *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 321 p. \$3.

291. HOLLINSHEAD, BYRON S. *Who Should Go to College?* New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. 190 p. \$3.

292. INGRAM, IRVIN S. *The College in the Community*. Carrollton: West Georgia College, 1953. 6 p.

293. KENNEDY, THOMAS. "Removing the Barriers to Educational Opportunity." *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1950. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 253 p. \$2.

294. PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION. *Higher Education for American Democracy—Establishing the Goals*. Vol. I. 1947. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 103 p. 35c.

295. PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION. *Higher Education for American Democracy—Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity*. Vol. II. 1947. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. 69 p. 35c.

296. THOMPSON, RONALD B. "Implications of Impending College Enrollments." *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 321 p. \$3.

297. VAN ZWOLL, JAMES A. "Higher Education in the United States and the Need for Physical Facilities." *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 321 p. \$3.

298. WARNER, W. LLOYD; HAVIGHURST, ROBERT J.; LOEB, MARTIN B. *Who Shall Be Educated?* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. 190 p. \$2.50.

299. WELLEMAYER, J. F., JR. "Implications of Forthcoming Enrolment Increases for Faculty." *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1954. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. 321 p. \$3.

300. WHITE, REUEL CLYDE. *These Will Go to College*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1952. 108 p. \$2.75.

301. WOLFLE, DAEL. *America's Resources of Specialized Talent*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 332 p. \$4.

Official Records

THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION, NEA

Dues: \$4.00

Membership: All persons engaged or interested in rural education are eligible for membership, provided they are members of the National Education Association. The membership year is the calendar year. Members are eligible to attend the annual convention meetings of the Department, to vote, to hold office, and to receive: The Yearbook, the *NEA Research Bulletin* (4 issues per year), *Rural Education News*, and other publications as available.

Meetings: Annual meeting at the time of AASA meeting, program meeting in connection with the NEA Representative Assembly.

The Department of Rural Education, which gives leadership in solving distinctive problems of rural education and promotes the general advancement of rural education, grew out of the Department of Rural and Agricultural Education authorized by the NEA Board of Directors in 1907. In 1919 it was reorganized under its present name. Since 1936 the Department of Rural Education has had the assistance of the NEA Division of Rural Service, with the same headquarters staff serving both. Existing divisions as provided for under the Department Constitution are (a) County and Rural Superintendents, and (b) Pupil Transportation.

A REVIEW OF THE 1955 PROGRAM

The year 1955 promises to be especially significant for all persons concerned or interested in the educational well-being of rural people and rural communities. Many activities now under way promise much for the year ahead.

The Tenth National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents will be held in San Diego, California, October 9-12, 1955. Theme of the Conference is "Leadership and Services for Today's Schools." The theme is indeed descriptive of the emerging role of the county superintendency. This Conference should greatly assist county superintendents in exploring the implications of this concept, *leadership and service*, for their respective offices.

The Department continues to have committees actively working on such problems as: the recruitment and preparation of rural teachers; rural life and education on the world scene; sociological factors

involved in the success or failure of reorganized school districts; and the role of the intermediate unit in making services available to all children regardless of where they may live. The Department also maintains liaison relationships with the C.P.E.A.

The Department of Rural Education in cooperation with AASA has jointly sponsored three conferences for community school administrators.

The National Conference on Rural Education held in 1954 has provided renewed interest and impetus for further positive action in successfully meeting the problems urgently before us. This Conference drew on the resources of many representative groups of lay and professional people as it brought into focus the problems and accomplishments of a half-century of dedicated work on behalf of rural children, youth, and adults. The implementation of the findings of this conference is a challenge to each of us.

Additional services of the Department continue to forge ahead. The theme of the Department's annual meeting held in St. Louis, Missouri, March 1, 1955, "The Preparation, Certification and Recruitment of Teachers to Serve Rural People," again recognized the continuing concern for the teacher.

In addition to sharing in the forthcoming NEA Summer meeting, the Department has participated in the three regional AASA conventions. The Department also participated in the Regional Instructional Conference held at Denver.

The publications program continues to produce materials which assist in giving immediate and authoritative help on pertinent problems. The 1954 Yearbook, *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*, as well as the 1953 Yearbook, *Pupil Transportation*, were reprinted to meet the demand.

Among other important publications released during the past year were: *The Education of Migrant Children* and a 16 page brochure prepared by the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit entitled, *Effective Intermediate Units—A Guide for Development*. This brochure has been prepared to serve as a guide for developing intermediate units which both strengthen local communities and employ sound principles of educational administrative organization.

Planning is already under way for the 1956 and 1957 Yearbooks. The 1956 book will deal with problems of concern to teachers in small communities while the 1957 volume will discuss administration of the twelve-year school in the small community.

OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

(Terms expire in February)

*President—Mrs. Lucille L. Klinge, superintendent, Lane County Schools, Eugene, Oregon

President-elect—Clifton B. Huff, professor of education, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas

*Vice President—Charles E. Brake, superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit, Michigan

Executive Secretary—Howard A. Dawson, director, Division of Rural Service, NEA

Executive Committee

President, Vice President, Presidents of Divisions, plus:

*M. L. Cushman, past president, dean, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota

H. C. DeKock, coordinator of field experience, College of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa (1956)

Leila C. Ewen, Rural Department, State Teachers College, Minot, North Dakota (1957)

J. C. Fitzgerald, director, Audio-Visual Education, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (1959)

Ernest O. Nybakken, chief, Bureau of Rural Supervisory Service, State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut (1957)

Clarence A. Pound, associate professor and consultant in rural education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana (1955)

Thomas E. Robinson, president, State Teachers College, Glassboro, New Jersey (1958)

Howard G. Sackett, district superintendent of schools, Port Leyden, New York (1958)

R. E. Tidwell, assistant to the president, Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, Alabama (1956)

*Mrs. Marie R. Turner, superintendent of schools, Breathitt County, Jackson, Kentucky (1955)

T. M. Verdin, director of rural service, Division of Instructional Services, Greenville County School District, Greenville, South Carolina (1959)

DIVISION OF COUNTY AND RURAL AREA SUPERINTENDENTS

(Terms expire in October)

President—Ernest W. Barker, superintendent, Pottawattamie County Schools, Council Bluffs, Iowa

First Vice President—Cecil D. Hardesty, superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

Second Vice President—Ruth R. Lytle, superintendent, Otero County Schools, La Junta, Colorado

Executive Secretary—Howard A. Dawson, director, Division of Rural Service, NEA

Executive Committee

President, Vice Presidents, Plus:

*Cecil E. Shuffield, past president, supervisor, Howard County Schools, Nashville, Arkansas

James E. Butts, superintendent, Blair County Schools, Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania

George E. Graff, superintendent of rural education, Rockville, Connecticut

R. E. Harris, superintendent, Caldwell County Schools, Lockhart, Texas

Audrey James, superintendent, Murray County Schools, Slayton, Minnesota

DIVISION OF PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

(Terms expire in February)

President—John L. Vickers, director, Division of Pupil Transportation, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky

Vice President—J. F. Lautenschlager, superintendent, Coshocton County Schools, Coshocton, Ohio

Executive Secretary—Howard A. Dawson, director, Division of Rural Service, NEA

Executive Committee

T. Wesley Pickel, assistant director, Division of Schoolhouse Planning and Transportation, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee

Michael J. Haggerty, supervisor, School Transportation, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota

Earl Darnell, director, School Transportation, Greenbrier County, Lewisburg, West Virginia

*(Denotes members of the Department's Executive Council)

DEPARTMENT YEARBOOKS AVAILABLE

1. *The Community School and the Intermediate Unit*. Yearbook, 1954. Robert M. Isenberg, Ed. 259 p. \$3.00 cloth; \$2.50 paper
2. *Pupil Transportation*. Yearbook 1953. Robert M. Isenberg, Ed. 196 p. \$2.00 paper
3. *Guidance in a Rural Community*. Yearbook, 1952. By Amber Arthun Warburton. 176 p. \$2.00 paper
4. *The Child in the Rural Environment*. Yearbook 1951. By Fannie W. Dunn. 253 p. \$3.00 cloth
5. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*. Yearbook, 1950. Shirley Cooper, Ed. 188 p. \$2.50 cloth; \$2.00 paper
6. *The Rural Supervisor at Work*. Yearbook, 1949. Marcia A. Everett, Ed. 242 p. \$1.00 paper
7. *Health, Physical Education and Recreation in Small Schools*. Yearbook, 1948. Elsa Schneider, Ed. 67 p. \$.50
8. *On-the-Job Education in Rural Communities*. Yearbook, 1947. Roy W. Roberts, Ed. 139 p. \$.75
9. *Education of Teachers for Rural America*. Yearbook, 1946. Kate V. Wofford, Ed. 142 p. \$.50
10. *Rural Schools for Tomorrow*. Yearbook, 1945. Julian E. Butterworth, Ed. 152 p. \$.50
11. *Conservation Education in Rural Schools*. Yearbook, 1943. Effie G. Bathurst, Ed. 114 p. \$.50
12. *Community Resources in Rural Schools*. Yearbook, 1939. Kate V. Wofford, Ed. 109 p. \$.50
13. *Newer Types of Instruction in Small Rural Schools*. Yearbook, 1938. Kate V. Wofford, Ed. 144 p. \$.50
14. *Economical Enrichment of the Small Secondary-School Curriculum*. Yearbook, 1934. Frank W. Cyr, Ed. 94 p. \$.50

GOALS FOR THE CENTENNIAL ACTION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED TEACHING PROFESSION

Adopted by the NEA Representative Assembly at San Francisco, California,
1951

1951—————1957

These goals are the concern of Rural Department members as they are the concern of all teachers.

1. An active democratic local education association in every community.
2. A stronger and more effective state education association in every state.
3. A larger and more effective National Education Association.
4. Unified dues—a single fee covering local, state, and national and world services—collected by the local.
5. 100% membership enrollment in local, state, and national professional organizations.
6. Unified committees—the chairman of local and state committees serving as consultants to central national committees.
7. A Future Teachers of America Chapter in every institution preparing teachers.
8. A professionally prepared and competent person in every school position.
9. A strong, adequately staffed state department of education in each state and a more adequate federal education agency.
10. An adequate professional salary for all members.
11. For all educational personnel—professional security guaranteed by tenure legislation, sabbatical and sick leave, and an adequate retirement income for old age.
12. Reasonable class size and equitable distribution of the teaching load.
13. Units of school administration large enough to provide efficient and adequate elementary and secondary educational opportunities.
14. Adequate educational opportunity for every child and youth.
15. Equalization and expansion of educational opportunity including needed state and national financing.
16. A safe, healthful, and wholesome community environment for every child and youth.
17. Adequately informed lay support of public education.
18. An able, public spirited board of education in every community.
19. An effective world organization of the teaching profession.
20. A more effective United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
21. (Additional goal approved by the NEA Executive Committee.) More effective cooperation between adult, higher, secondary, and elementary education with increasing participation by college and university personnel in the work of the united profession.

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

A Department of the National Education Association of the United States

This roster includes the active membership of the Department for the calendar year 1954 and all additional members enrolled prior to April 1, 1955. It is arranged by states, and lists alphabetically for each member his name, position and location. Street addresses are not given except where other information is not available. Libraries and institutional members are listed under their respective states.

ALABAMA

Boeckholdt, J. H., Superintendent, Chilton County Schools, Clanton
 Carroll, Thomas W., Superintendent, Covington County Schools, Andalusia
 Clay, J. L., Principal, County High School, Lauderdale County Schools, Rogersville
 Coleman, Hulda, Superintendent, Lowndes County Schools, Hayneville
 Dalton, W. Theo., Professor of Education, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn
 Gibson, Roy, Superintendent, Saint Clair County Schools, Ashville
 Greer, Hugh G., Superintendent, Monroe County Schools, Monroeville; Executive Committee of the Department
 Gross, Solon, Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Hamilton
 Harden, Preston G., Superintendent, Autauga County Schools, Prattville
 Hatch, Robert C., Supervisor of Instruction, State Department of Education, Montgomery
 Helms, V. C., Superintendent, Lee County Schools, Opelika
 Johnson, Kermit A., Superintendent, Tuscaloosa County Schools, Tuscaloosa; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Jones, W. F., Superintendent, Wilcox County Schools, Camden
 Lawrence, R. J., Superintendent, Bullock County Schools, Union Springs; State Director
 Mellow, Elgin W., Superintendent, Sumter County Schools, Livingston
 Moore, R. E., Superintendent, Cullman County Schools, Cullman
 Myer, P. G., Superintendent of Schools, Alexander City
 Newell, C. Frank, Superintendent, Calhoun County Schools, Anniston
 Nunnally, N. F., Superintendent, Talladega County Schools, Talladega
 Orr, Charles W., Director of Instruction, Alabama A & M College, Normal
 Philpot, Frank, Supervisor of Resource Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
 Popejoy, W. E., Business Manager, Madison County Board of Education, Huntsville
 Richardson, O. P., Assistant Director, Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education, Montgomery
 Self, Geddes, Director of Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
 Simmons, I. F., Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Birmingham

Smith, (Mrs.) Estelle S., Supervisor of Instruction, Cherokee County Schools, Centre
 Smith, G. B., Supervisor of Instruction, Cullman County Schools, Cullman
 Smith, O. Romaine, Youngfolks Editor, *The Progressive Farmer*, Birmingham
 Taylor, Hugh L., Professor in Extension and Director, Counseling and Advisory Services, Extension Division, University of Alabama, University
 Terry, W. J., Supervisor of Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
 Tidwell, R. E., Assistant to the President, Stillman College, Tuscaloosa; Executive Committee of the Department; Planning Committee, Mid-south Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Torrence, Andrew P., Acting Head, Department of Agricultural Education, Tuskegee Institute

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn

ARIZONA

Fleetham, Fay, Head Teacher, Douglas School, Douglas
 Haldeman, Della M., Teacher, Canado School, Canado
 Johnston, Lillian, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix; State Director; Planning Committee, Western Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Martin, (Mrs.) Mary McCollum, Teacher, Toltec School, Eloy
 Smith, Harold W., Superintendent of Schools, Glendale
 Thomas, (Mrs.) Mabel Lee, Teacher, Wickenburg School, Wickenburg

ARKANSAS

Albright, J. G., Supervisor of Schools, Jackson County, Newport
 Allen, Roy E., Professor of Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 Anderson, Homer L., Supervisor of Schools, Ouachita County, Camden
 Armstrong, W. V., Supervisor of Schools, St. Francis County, Forrest City
 Arrant, (Mrs.) M. C., Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Little Rock
 Baker, W. E., Supervisor of Schools, Cleveland County, Rison
 Bell, N. H., Supervisor of Schools, Pope County, Russellville

- Black, Glenn W., Superintendent of Schools, Siloam Springs
- Blankenship, P. V., Supervisor of Schools, Madison County, Huntsville
- Bolding, G. P., Supervisor of Schools, Sevier County, De Queen
- Bollen, F. M., Superintendent of Schools, Omaha
- Bollen, J. D., Supervisor of Schools, Faulkner County, Conway
- Bradford, David E., Supervisor of Schools, Van Buren County, Clinton
- Brown, E. R., Supervisor of Schools, Hempstead County, Hope
- Casper, Revis, Supervisor of Schools, Lawrence County, Powhatan
- Cassady, Robert E., Supervisor of Schools, Pike County, Murfreesboro
- Castleberry, W. E., Supervisor of Schools, Prairie County, Des Arc
- Chrisco, I. L., Supervisor of Schools, Crawford County, Van Buren
- Clark, J. O., Superintendent of Schools, McGehee
- Clary, J. D., Superintendent of Schools, Stuttgart
- Coats, Earl, Superintendent of Schools, Alma
- Cook, Elmo W., Superintendent of Schools, Perryville
- Cooper, (Mrs.) Opal, Supervisor of Schools, Craighead County, Jonesboro
- Cos, Homer L., Superintendent, Bono High School, Bono
- Dagenhart, R. S., Supervisor of Schools, Polk County, Mena
- Ely, Wallace A., Supervisor of Schools, Miller County, Texarkana
- Fincher, Allen, Supervisor of Schools, Columbia County, Magnolia
- Forrest, M. D., Superintendent of Schools, Corning
- Poster, B. B., Supervisor of Schools, Baxter County, Mountain Home
- Futtrall, Alma, Supervisor of Schools, Lee County, Marianna
- Ginsberg, L. J., Supervisor of Schools, Benton County, Bentonville
- Griswold, J. G., Supervisor of Schools, Dallas County, Fordyce
- Head, Robert A., Superintendent of Schools, Lamar
- Hicks, Charles A., Supervisor for Negro Schools, State Department of Education, Little Rock
- Hinesly, M. M., Supervisor of Schools, Cross County, Wynne
- Holmes, O. G., Supervisor of Schools, Boone County, Harrison
- Hughes, James M., Supervisor of Schools, Chicot County, Lake Village
- Iaenman, Anne, Arkansas Education Association, Little Rock
- Jacobs, Fay, Supervisor of Schools, Franklin County, Ozark
- Keaton, William T., Superintendent, Howard County Training School, Mineral Springs
- Keeling, A. J., Supervisor of Schools, Searcy County, Marshall
- Lee, Eugene, Supervisor of Schools, Johnson County, Clarksville
- Little, E. W., Supervisor of Schools, Green County, Paragould
- Logan, Coy, Supervisor of Schools, Carroll County, Berryville
- Loudermilk, H. C., Supervisor of Schools, Perry County, Perryville
- Lyman, Joe, Supervisor of Schools, Saline County, Benton
- McCullaton, Ed, Director, Division of Negro Education, State Department of Education, Little Rock
- McKenzie, A. R., Superintendent of Schools, Sheridan
- Martin, John H., Supervisor of Schools, Arkansas County, Dewitt
- Mayer, John, Supervisor of Schools, Mississippi County, Rlytheville
- Middleton, W. E., Superintendent, Acorn Consolidated School, Mena
- Moore, Fred, Supervisor of Schools, Jefferson County, Pine Bluff
- Moore, G. H., Supervisor of Schools, Independence County, Batesville
- Morgan, Roy H., Supervisor of Schools, Garland County, Hot Springs
- Nichols, (Mrs.) Greer, Assistant Supervisor of Schools, Franklin County, Ozark
- Orr, W. E., Supervisor of Schools, White County, Searcy
- Parker, Maurice R., Supervisor of Schools, Little River County, Ashdown
- Patterson, T. E., Superintendent, Childress School, Nashville
- Petty, Paul V., Associate Professor of Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
- Polk, L. H., Supervisor of Schools, Crittenden County, Marion
- Poteet, Custer, Supervisor of Schools, Conway County, Morrilton
- Pyle, H. R., Executive Director, Arkansas State Teachers Retirement System, State Department of Education, Little Rock
- Rapp, J. C., Supervisor of Schools, Desha County, McGehee
- Rhoads, Silas, Supervisor of Schools, Scott County, Waldron
- Richardson, Rayburn O., Supervisor of Schools, Fulton County, Salem
- Ritchie, J. Bryan, Supervisor of Schools, Nevada County, Prescott
- Roberts, O. E., Supervisor of Schools, Sebastian County, Greenwood
- Roberts, Roy W., Head, Department of Vocational Teachers Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Planning Committee, Midsouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
- Robinson, L. D., Supervisor of Schools, Clay County, Piggott
- Ross, Clyde, Supervisor of Schools, Drew County, Monticello
- Rozzell, Forrest, Executive Secretary, Arkansas Education Association, Little Rock
- Scott, Emma, Arkansas Education Association, Little Rock
- Scott, H. O., Superintendent of Schools, Bryant
- Shuffield, Cecil E., Supervisor of Schools, Howard County, Nashville; Executive Council of the Department; President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 1953-54; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Planning Committee, Southwest Regional Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
- Simpson, Tom, Supervisor of Schools, Izard County, Melbourne
- Smith, Earl, Supervisor of Schools, Randolph County, Potosi
- Smith, T. L., Supervisor of Schools, Poinsett County, Harrisburg
- Strong, (Mrs.) Anna M. P., Principal, Robert R. Moton High School, Marianna
- Sugg, B. A., Supervisor of Schools, Phillips County, Helena
- Talbot, Ivey S., Supervisor of Schools, Calhoun County, Hampton
- Taylor, R. E., Superintendent of Schools, Barton
- Thornton, R. H., Supervisor of Schools, Grant County, Sheridan
- Thomason, R. B., Supervisor of Schools, Clark County, Arkadelphia
- Torry, Harry, Supervisor of Schools, Monroe County, Clarendon

Trice, (Mrs.) Grace B., Supervisor of Schools, Woodruff County, Augusta
 Trice, J. A., Supervisor of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Little Rock
 Turner, Jessie, Supervisor of Schools, Bradley County, Warren
 Vest, Alvin, Superintendent, County Line School, Branch
 Wetherington, A. B., Director of Finance, State Department of Education, Little Rock
 Wheat, M. Edward, Supervisor of Schools, Lonoke County, Lonoke
 Whitworth, (Mrs.) Robin H., Supervisor of Schools, Logan County, Booneville
 Williamson, Horace, Supervisor of Schools, Union County, El Dorado
 Wilson, E. B., Supervisor of Schools, Yell County, Danville
 Woolsey, Edgar, Superintendent of Schools, Ozark
 Woolsey, John, Superintendent, Altus-Dennings School, Altus
 INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS
 Torreyson Library, Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway

CALIFORNIA

Bandy, Eleanor K., Superintendent of Schools, Yolo County, Woodland
 Beyer, Fred C., Superintendent of Schools, Stanislaus County, Modesto
 Clark, George W., Superintendent of Schools, Merced County, Merced
 Cohen, Milton E., Superintendent of Schools, Inyo County, Independence
 Crazen, Dorothy Clara, Superintendent of Schools, Inyo County, Independence
 Denison, Alan M., Superintendent of Schools, Tuolumne County, Sonora
 Drag, Francis L., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, San Diego County, San Diego
 Emmerson, (Mrs.) Juanita H., Superintendent of Schools, El Dorado County, Placerville
 Erro, Mercedes, Elementary Coordinator of Schools, San Luis Obispo County, San Luis Obispo; deceased March 1955
 Ferguson, Harry L., 1108 Wencove Place, West Covina
 Fikes, Edith E., Superintendent of Schools, Santa Cruz County, Santa Cruz
 Frost, (Mrs.) Nellie L., Consultant in Elementary Education, Santa Barbara County, Santa Barbara
 Gansberg, Lucille, Superintendent of Schools, Lassen County, Susanville
 Gerholdt, Anna F., General Supervisor of Schools, Sonoma County, Santa Rosa
 Gibson, (Mrs.) Bernice, Superintendent of Schools, Sutter County, Yuba City
 Gibson, (Mrs.) Carmen, Director of Curriculum, Imperial County, El Centro
 Hardesty, Cecil D., Superintendent of Schools, San Diego County, San Diego; First Vice President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 1954-55
 Hart, Anna Marie, Supervisor of Schools, Weaverville
 Hart, Leo B., District Superintendent of Schools, Pond
 Hayes, John D., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Orange County, Santa Ana
 Heffernan, Helen, Chief, Bureau of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Sacramento; Planning Committee, Western Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Hill, (Mrs.) Margaret F., Teacher, Santa Barbara
 Hoffman, (Mrs.) Howardine G., Director, Division of Elementary Education, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles

Houx, Kate, Consultant in Elementary Education, Santa Barbara County, Santa Barbara
 Hubbard, O. S., Superintendent of Schools, Santa Clara County, San Jose
 Johnson, Lloyd G., Superintendent of Schools, Colusa County, Colusa
 Johnson, Ray W., Superintendent of Schools, Riverside County, Riverside
 Kaar, Harold W., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Educational Services, Contra Costa County, Martinez
 Kendall, Glenn, President, Chico State College, Chico
 Kepley, (Mrs.) Ruth A., Director of Education, Inyo County, Independence
 Martin, Walter G., Superintendent of Schools, Fresno County, Fresno
 McKee, Louise, Guidance Consultant, Contra Costa County, Martinez
 Meade, (Mrs.) Agnes Weber, Superintendent of Schools, Yuba County, Marysville
 Merrick, Nell, Guidance Consultant, Contra Costa County, Martinez
 Morphet, Edgar L., Professor, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley
 Nance, (Mrs.) Afton, Elementary Consultant, State Department of Education, Sacramento
 Overfield, Ruth, Consultant in Rural Education, Lassen County, Susanville
 Price, Thomas B., County and District Superintendent, Mariposa County Unified School District, Mariposa
 Rhodes, Alvin E., Superintendent of Schools, San Luis Obispo County, San Luis Obispo; Co-Chairman, National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Rogers, (Mrs.) Wilma S., Director, Instructional Materials Center, Placer County, Auburn
 Seidel, Vaughn D., Superintendent of Schools, Alameda County, Oakland
 Simmons, Linton T., Superintendent of Schools, Orange County, Santa Ana
 Sollenberger, Lucille, Elementary Consultant, Stanislaus County, Modesto
 Spener, (Mrs.) Irene, General Supervisor of Schools, Contra Costa County, Walnut Creek
 Stockton, Jesse D., Superintendent of Schools, Kern County, Bakersfield
 Stone, Gladys, Superintendent of Schools, Monterey County, Salinas
 Stroud, Clara, General Supervisor, Imperial County, El Centro
 Tierney, (Mrs.) Hallie M., Superintendent of Schools, Modoc County, Alturas
 Triggs, Dean E., Superintendent of Schools, Ventura County, Ventura
 Trillingham, C. C., Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles
 Walter, B. B., Chief Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles County, San Gabriel
 Williams, J. Post, Superintendent of Schools, Tulare County, Visalia
 Wilson, B. O., Superintendent of Schools, Contra Costa County, Martinez; State Director; Second Vice President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 1953-54; Committee to Work with CPEA; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Wishart, Blaine, Superintendent of Schools, El Dorado County, Placerville
 Young, Kenneth G., Director of Curriculum, Siskiyou County Schools, Yreka

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

California State Library, Sacramento
 Dunbar Union Elementary School, Glen Ellen
 Honnold Library, Claremont College, Claremont
 Library, Humboldt State College, Arcata
 Library, University of California, Berkeley

Library, Chico State College, Chico
 Library, University of California, Davis
 Library, Fresno State College, Fresno
 Library, Santa Barbara County Schools, Goleta
 Library, Los Angeles State College, Los Angeles
 Library, University of California, Los Angeles
 Library, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
 Library, University of Redlands, Redlands
 Library, San Jose State College, San Jose
 Nina Teachers Club, Doris Ballows, President,
 Del Mar
 Petaluma City Elementary School District,
 Petaluma

COLORADO

Archer, (Mrs.) M. Adella, Superintendent of Schools, Fremont County, Canon City
 Auld, Lucy C., Administrative Assistant, State Department of Education, Denver
 Bishop, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Englewood; Planning Committee, Rocky Mountain Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Cushing, Colbert E., Director, Division of Field Service, Colorado Education Association, Denver
 Davidson, Reva, Superintendent of Schools, Powers County, Lamar
 Gaylord, (Mrs.) Madge, Librarian, Pueblo County High School, Pueblo
 Grauberg, (Mrs.) Janet, Superintendent of Schools, Logan County, Sterling
 Heid, Bertha, Superintendent of Schools, Adams County, Brighton
 Kettle, Frances V., Superintendent of Schools, Custer County, Westcliffe
 Latting, (Mrs.) Lucille H., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Denver
 Lockwood, Marian, Superintendent of Schools, Morgan County, Fort Morgan
 Ludwig, Paul N., Superintendent of Schools, Weld County, Greeley
 Lytle, Ruth R., Superintendent of Schools, Otero County, La Junta; State Director; Second Vice President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 1954-55; Advisory Council to Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 McNally, Mary C., Superintendent of Schools, Pueblo County, Pueblo
 Mabee, (Mrs.) Nada D., Superintendent of Schools, Alamosa County, Alamosa
 Martin, (Mrs.) Hazel L., Superintendent of Schools, Bent County, Las Animas
 Maxwell, (Mrs.) Vivian J., Superintendent of Schools, La Plata County, Durango
 Penneck, Glen Wildman, Superintendent of Schools, Boulder County, Boulder
 Savage, Martha, Superintendent of Schools, Delta County, Delta
 Scott, Nora L., Superintendent of Schools, Gilpin County, Central City
 Sweeney, (Mrs.) June, Superintendent of Schools, Moffat County, Craig
 Taylor, Burtis E., Assistant Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Denver
 Watson, Claire J., Superintendent of Schools, Montezuma County, Cortez
 Wright, (Mrs.) Carolyn, Superintendent of Schools, Hinsdale County, Lake City

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Adams State College, Alamosa
 Library, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley

CONNECTICUT

Graff, George E., Superintendent of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Rockville; Executive Committee of the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; Committee to Work with CPEA
 Gustin, Margaret, Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Unionville
 Hoctor, Cathryn R., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, New Haven
 McDonald, (Mrs.) Helen B., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Winsted
 Nichols, Marjorie H., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Putnam
 Nybakken, Ernest O., Chief, Bureau of Rural Supervisory Service, State Department of Education, Hartford; Executive Committee of the Department; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Outlaw, Guy T., Teacher, Andover Elementary School, Andover
 Reilly, John C., Superintendent of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Willimantic; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Seidel, Ida E., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Willimantic
 Shultz, Wilmer L., Superintendent of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Canaan
 Stoddard, Paul W., Principal, Housatonic Valley Regional High School, Falls Village
 Umberger, William H., Superintendent of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Norwich
 Walker, (Mrs.) M. E., The Educational Publishing Company, Darien

DELAWARE

Afferbach, Calvin E., Rural Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Georgetown; State Director
 Baltz, Austin D., Principal, O'-Grove School, Elsmere
 Caum, Jack H., Principal, Cowlyck School, New Castle
 Cheavens, Anne E., Supervisor, Art Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Dover
 Eisenbrey, Preston G., Supervisor of Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Dover
 Hastings, Grace E., Teacher, Farmington School, Bridgeville
 James, J. Stanley, Principal, Georgetown
 Leasure, May R., Teacher, New Castle County School, Bear
 Monroe, Mary Elisabeth, Supervisor of Music Education, Sussex County, State Department of Public Instruction, Georgetown
 Moore, (Mrs.) Grace C., Elementary Principal, Newport, Wilmington
 Scott, Edith I. C., Principal, Milford
 Stewart, Robert C., Assistant State Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Dover

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, University of Delaware, Newark

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alton, E. W., Director, 4-H Club Work, Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture
 Bathurst, Effie, Research Assistant, Elementary Schools, Instruction, Organization, and

Services Branch, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies

Clark, Lois M., Assistant Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association; Assistant Executive Secretary of the Department

Cooper, Shirley, Associate Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association

Cornell, (Mrs.) Bertha, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association

Dawson, Howard A., Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association; Executive Secretary of the Department

Early, Anne Lois, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association

Ellens, William J., Assistant to the Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association

Fessenden, (Mrs.) Jewell G., Division of Research and Training, Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Fitzwater, C. O., County and Rural School Administration, School Administration Branch, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Co-Chairman, Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society

Franseth, Jane, Rural Education, Elementary Schools, Instruction, Organization, and Services Branch, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Gaumnitz, H. W., Small and Rural High Schools, Secondary Schools, Instruction, Organization, and Services Branch, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Hess, Walter E., Managing Editor, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association

Isenberg, Robert M., Assistant Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association; Assistant Executive Secretary of the Department

James, Stephen, Director, Education and Rural Division, Automotive Safety Foundation

Johnson, Elizabeth S., Chief, Division of Child Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards, U. S. Department of Labor

Lewis, Gertrude M., Upper Grades, Elementary Schools, Instruction, Organization, and Services Branch, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

McClure, Worth, Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association

McConnell, Beatrice, Chief, State Services Division, Bureau of Labor Standards, U. S. Department of Labor

McKeever, Nell, Assistant Chief, Public Health Education, Public Health Service, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Moreland, Mary L., Division of Rural Service, National Education Association

Pope, Farnham, Dependent Schools Section, I and E Branch, Personnel Services Division, Division of Military Personnel, Air Force Headquarters

Robinson, James L., Extension Economist, Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Rogers, Ira B., Jr., Staff Associate, Rural Division, Automotive Safety Foundation

Sabrosky, (Mrs.) Laurel K., Analyst, Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Taylor, J. L., School Plant Planning, School Housing, School Administration Branch, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Thomas, Frank, Assistant to the Commissioner, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Howard University

FLORIDA

Braxton, (Mrs.) Kathleen McGeachy, Teacher, Chipley School, Washington County Schools, Chipley

Christian, Floyd T., Superintendent, Pinellas County Schools, Clearwater

Darden, Woodrow J., Superintendent, Brevard County Schools, Titusville

Dominick, H. B., Superintendent, Hardee County Schools, Wauchula

Farnell, J. Crockett, Superintendent, Hillsborough County Schools, Tampa; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

Harden, Claude M., Sr., Superintendent, Polk County Schools, Bartow

Lovell, Broward, Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Ocala

McCall, Allen D., General Supervisor, Santa Rosa County Schools, Milton

Milwee, R. T., Superintendent, Seminole County Schools, Sanford

Sprinkle, (Mrs.) Iva T., Superintendent, Duval County Schools, Jacksonville

Sutton, Elizabeth, Supervisor of Education of Migrant Children, Palm Beach County Schools, West Palm Beach

Vaughn, C. A., Jr., Superintendent, Lake County Schools, Tavares

Walker, Judson B., Superintendent, Orange County Schools, Orlando

Wofford, Kate V., Professor of Education, College of Education, University of Florida Gainesville; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene; deceased November 1954

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Board of Public Instruction, Escambia County, Pensacola

GEORGIA

Adams, E. F., Principal, Wrens High School, Jefferson County Schools, Wrens

Attaway, Eugene, Sylvester School, Worth County Schools, Sylvester

Bacon, (Mrs.) Jordys M., Superintendent, Liberty County Schools, Milledgeville

Bailey, (Mrs.) Elizabeth Moss, Supervisor, Cherokee County Schools, Canton

Bates, Ferd B., Superintendent, Treuten County Schools, Soperton

Boyd, Willis M., Chairman, Rural Service Committee, Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Adairville

Brady, W. B., Superintendent, Bleckley County Schools, Cochran

Bridges, J. E., Superintendent, Bartow County Schools, Cartersville

Brookshire, J. K., Superintendent, Madison County Schools, Danielsville

Burnham, Reba, Director, Resource-Use Education, Department of Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Cherry, Jim D., Superintendent, DeKalb County Schools, Decatur; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

Clark, Mary Lee, Superintendent, Camden County Schools, Woodbine
 Clark, R. Stafford, Superintendent, Troup County Schools, La Grange
 Cleveland, Denver W., Superintendent, Hart County Schools, Hartwell
 Cook, L. H., Superintendent, Laurens County Schools, Dublin
 Cox, Johnney V., Director, Supervisor Training Program, University of Georgia, Athens
 Davis, Albert, Superintendent, Whitfield County Schools, Dalton
 Deariso, Elizabeth J., Supervisor, Worth County Schools, Sylvester
 Dewar, J. L., Superintendent, Lowndes County Schools, Valdosta
 Dickey, A. C., Jr., Superintendent, Putnam County Schools, Eatonton
 Divine, (Mrs.) Sara, Supervisor, Spalding County Schools, Griffin
 Donovan, Elizabeth, Instructional Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta
 Early, W. A., Superintendent, Chatham County Schools, Savannah; Committee to Work with CPEA
 Hood, R. E., Superintendent, Glynn County Schools, Brunswick
 Hughes, Frank M., Superintendent, Cook County Schools, Adel
 James, D. Ray, Principal, Folkston Consolidated School, Charlton County Schools, Folkston
 Jones, Sarah L., Chief Library Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta
 Kenimer, Zade, Superintendent, Harris County Schools, Hamilton
 Leake, F. D., Superintendent, Walker County Schools, Lafayette
 Lott, Dan W., Superintendent, Atkinson County Schools, Pearson
 Martin, George I., Director of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Atlanta
 McCall, Lorace E., Superintendent, Appling County Schools, Baxley
 Nix, Lucile, Chief Library Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta
 Outlaw, W. H., Superintendent, Berren County Schools, Nashville
 Pafford, W. E., Director, Division of Field Service, State Department of Education, Atlanta; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Committee on Rural Life and Education
 Phillips, K. N., Superintendent, Irwin County Schools, Ocilla
 Phillips, W. O., Superintendent, Emanuel County Schools, Swainsboro
 Riggsby, E. R., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Camilla Consolidated Schools, Mitchell County Schools, Camilla
 Rogers, N. A., Superintendent, Heard County Schools, Franklin
 Roffe, (Mrs.) Ethlyn Potter, Library, Eastman School, Dodge County Schools, Eastman
 Saxon, J. Harold, Executive Secretary, Georgia Education Association, Atlanta
 Smith, J. Wilkins, Superintendent, Coweta County Schools, Newnan
 Smith, William S., Superintendent, Charlton County Schools, Folkston; State Director; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Sprayberry, W. F., Superintendent, Cobb County Schools, Marietta
 Strickland, A. J., Superintendent of Schools, Trion
 Tabor, Lewis W., Superintendent, Houston County Schools, Perry
 Terry, John H., Blue Bird Body Company, Fort Valley
 Thigpen, (Mrs.) Clifford, Superintendent, Treutlen County Schools, Soperton

Threatte, J. W., Superintendent, Lanier County Schools, Lakeland
 West, Paul D., Superintendent, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta
 Wimberly, A. T., Superintendent, Twiggs County Schools, Jeffersonville
 Womack, H. P., Superintendent, Bulloch County Schools, Statesboro

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, University of Georgia, Athens
 Library, Georgia Teachers College, Collegeboro
 Library, North Georgia College, Dahlonega
 W. C. Bradley Memorial Library, Columbus

IDAHO

Radzeley, Mildred S., Superintendent of Schools, Shoshone County, Wallace
 Crowley, Edith E., Elementary Supervisor, Clearwater County, Orofino; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Eakin, Katharine S., Superintendent of Schools, Jerome County, Jerome
 Goodman, (Mrs.) Elma M., Superintendent of Schools, Elmore County, Mountain Home
 Gruwell, Melvin, Superintendent of Schools, District A-215, Fremont County, St. Anthony; Planning Committee, Northwest Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Hulme, Amos, B., Elementary Supervisor, Bear Lake County, Paris
 Robinson, L. C., Superintendent of Schools, Moscow
 Rost, Arley F., Assistant Professor of Education, Idaho State College, Pocatello; State Director
 Stradley, Doris, Superintendent of Schools, Twin Falls County, Twin Falls
 Warner, Carl W., Superintendent of Schools, Minidoka County, Rupert
 Williams, Homer D., Principal, Grace School, Grace

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Idaho State College, Pocatello

ILLINOIS

Apt., Chris S., Superintendent of Schools, Henderson County, Oquawka
 Bailey, Dwight L., Director of Rural Education, Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb
 Battershell, B., Superintendent of Schools, Shelby County, Shelbyville
 Beem, Harlan D., Director of Research, Illinois Association of School Boards, Springfield
 Black, Luther J., Secretary, State Teachers Certification Board, State Department of Public Instruction, Springfield; Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
 Blair, Clarence D., Superintendent of Schools, St. Clair County, Belleville
 Bracewell, George, Associate Professor, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Brudi, Lawrence E., Superintendent of Schools, Carroll County, Mt. Carroll
 Carney, Mabel, Life Member, Marseilles
 Chase, Francis S., Chairman, Department of Education, University of Chicago
 Conklin, Paul S., Superintendent of Schools, Winnebago County, Rockford
 Cook, Paul M., Executive Secretary, Phi Delta Kappa, Homewood
 Cox, John K., Secretary, General Services, Illinois Agricultural Association, Chicago
 Cracker, Vern E., Superintendent of Schools, Will County Schools, Joliet
 Devesee, Forest L., Assistant Superintendent, Community Unit School District #3, Taylorville

Deyoe, P. G., Professor, Agricultural Education, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Dickey, A. W., Superintendent of Schools, D. Witt County, Clinton
 Dix, I., Dorothy I., Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Supervision, McDonough County, Macomb
 Dodds, A. Gordon, Superintendent of Schools, Franklin County, Benton
 Elliott, R. H., Superintendent of Schools, Vermillion County, Danville
 Endres, (Mrs.) Mary P., Superintendent of Schools, McHenry County, Woodstock
 Goodrich, (Mrs.) Lucile, Superintendent of Schools, Livingston County, Pontiac
 Hance, Wayne, Superintendent of Schools, Cumberland County, Toledo
 Harshbarger, Ernest M., Superintendent of Schools, Champaign County, Urbana
 Hawley, Ray, Superintendent of Schools, LaSalle County, Ottawa
 Keefe, J. A., Superintendent of Schools, Ford County, Paxton
 Korty, Hester L., Superintendent of Schools, Scott County, Winchester
 Knapp, Royce H., Director, Educational Research, F. E. Compton and Company, Chicago
 Leffler, Harold G., Superintendent of Schools, Jasper County, Newton
 Leinauer, (Mrs.) Marjorie B., Superintendent of Schools, DeKalb County, Sycamore; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 McCannon, Roland, Manager, Illinois Pupils Reading Circle, Lincoln
 McCoy, E. E., Superintendent of Schools, Kane County, Geneva
 McLure, William P., Director, Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana; Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society
 Meek, Paul, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Community Unit District #5, Waterloo
 Meyer, Pauline, Superintendent of Schools, Menard County, Petersburg
 Miller, Van, Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Mueller, E. W., Secretary, Rural Church Program, National Lutheran Council, Chicago
 Olsen, Hans C., Director, Rural Education, Eastern Illinois State College, Charleston
 Peck, J. R., Superintendent of Schools, Knox County, Galesburg
 Puffer, Noble J., Superintendent of Schools, Cook County, Chicago
 Rice, Wilfrid E., Superintendent of Schools, Morgan County, Jacksonville
 Roberts, R. P., Superintendent of Schools, Iroquois County, Watseka
 Rosenstill, (Mrs.) Edith E., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Jo Daviess County, Galena
 Taft, Harold, Superintendent of Schools, Jo Daviess County, Galena
 Tazewell, R. L., Superintendent of Schools, McHenry County, Woodstock
 Torrens, John A., Superintendent of Schools, Lee County, Dixon; State Director
 Vincent, Grace E., Sublette
 Walker, Lillian K., Superintendent of Schools, Grundy County, Morris
 White, Arthur L., Superintendent of Schools, Henry County, Cambridge
 Wilkins, George T., Superintendent of Schools, Madison County, Edwardsville
 Wrench, Frank, Superintendent of Schools, Piatt County, Monticello
 Wright, H. E., Superintendent and Principal, Newton Community High School, Newton

Wright, Roe M., Business Manager, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Chicago Public Library, Education Department, Chicago
 Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Library, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, Charleston
 Library, University of Chicago, Chicago
 Library, Northern Illinois State College, DeKalb
 Library, National College of Education, Evanston
 Library, Northwestern University, Evanston
 Library, Western Illinois State College, Macomb
 Library, Illinois State Normal University, Normal
 Library, Illinois State College, Springfield

INDIANA

Adair, Joseph N., Superintendent of Schools, Noble County, Albion
 Beck, Paul H., Superintendent of Schools, Randolph County, Winchester
 Bookwalter, Karl, Professor of Physical Education, School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Indiana University, Bloomington
 Brannock, Robert J., Superintendent of Schools, Lake County, Crown Point
 Crawford, Eldon R., Superintendent of Schools, Posey County, Mt. Vernon
 Davisson, John N., Superintendent of Schools, Miami County, Peru
 Foote, Lawrence E., Superintendent of Schools, Allen County, Fort Wayne
 Gardner, Hawley A., Superintendent of Schools, Union County, Liberty
 Gerichs, G. W., Superintendent of Schools, Pulaski County, Winamac; Executive Committee, Division of Pupil Transportation
 Gladden, Robert F., Superintendent of Schools, Marion County, Indianapolis
 Guy, Philip A., Assistant Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Vernon
 Hines, Arthur H., Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Centerville
 Hodges, Thomas F., Superintendent of Schools, Owen County, Spencer
 Huntington, Ira L., Superintendent of Schools, Jasper County, Rensselaer; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Kelsay, H. Paul, Superintendent of Schools, St. Joseph County, South Bend
 Lange, Walter H., Indiana State Library, Indianapolis
 Mahoney, Irene, Argos High School, Argos
 McLane, Frank, Superintendent of Schools, Marshall County, Plymouth
 Noble, Charles B., Superintendent of Schools, Switzerland County, Vevay
 O'Hara, Warren, Director, Department of Education, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis
 Osborn, Haskell B., Superintendent, Nappanee Community School, Nappanee
 Peregrine, Donald, Superintendent of Schools, Starke County, Knox
 Pound, Clarence A., Associate Professor of Education and Consultant in Rural Education, Purdue University, Lafayette; Executive Committee of the Department; State Director; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

Ratliff, Fred, Superintendent of Schools, Grant County, Marion
 Rayburn, Russell H., Director, Special Education, Civil Defense, Plainfield
 Smith, Harold A., Superintendent of Schools, Huntington County, Huntington
 Sutton, Clyde E., Superintendent of Schools, Elkhart County, Gosben
 Tower, J. Harold, Superintendent of Schools, La Porte County, La Porte
 Vining, Edna L., Teacher, Bourbon Township School, Bourbon
 Werstring, Ralph J., Superintendent of Schools, Morgan County, Martinsville
 Whitehead, Glen, Superintendent of Schools, Kosciusko County, Warsaw
 Wilkinson, Ross, Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Angola
 Williams, Edgar P., Superintendent of Schools, Benton County, Fowler; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Wilson, Will, Superintendent of Schools, Dearborn County, Lawrenceburg
 Yoder, Harry, Superintendent of Schools, Whitley County, Columbia City
 York, I. R., Superintendent of Schools, Daviess County, Washington

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie
 Library, Butler University, Indianapolis
 Library, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute
 Library, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame
 Teachers Special Library, Indianapolis Instruction Center, Indianapolis
 Wayne Works Inc., I. G. Brown, Sales Manager, Richmond

IOWA

Albers, Martin Z., Superintendent of Schools, Hardin County, Eldora
 Amen, Clarence E., Superintendent of Schools, Henry County, Mt. Pleasant
 Barker, Ernest W., Superintendent of Schools, Pottawattamie County, Council Bluffs; Executive Committee of the Department; President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 1954-55
 Barker, Loren O., Superintendent of Schools, Plover
 Barnes, Edna, Superintendent of Schools, Adair County, Greenfield
 Barron, William E., Superintendent of Schools, Quimby
 Bell, Frank J., Chairman, County Board of Education, Pottawattamie County, Carson
 Beran, Don L., Assistant Professor of Education, College of Education, Drake University, Des Moines
 Borreson, R. O., Superintendent of Schools, Sheldon
 Bowersox, F. C., Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Clinton
 Brouhard, F. E., Superintendent of Schools, Shelby County, Harlan
 Byrley, (M. J.) Edith, Superintendent of Schools, Hamilton County, Webster City
 Chappell, Hazel V. Thomas, Superintendent of Schools, Cerro Gordo County, Mason City; deceased December 1964
 Clark, Charles C., Superintendent of Schools, Rockford
 Cleveland, G. E., Superintendent of Schools, Worth County, Northwood
 Coen, Edwin, Superintendent of Schools, Crawford County, Denison
 Davis, Floyd A., Superintendent of Schools, Knoxville

Davis, George W., Superintendent of Schools, Des Moines
 DeKock, H. C., Professor of Education, College of Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City; Executive Committee of the Department
 Dicke, Vera F., Superintendent of Schools, Ringgold County, Mount Ayr
 Dory, Rex G., Superintendent of Schools, Whiting
 Dreier, William H., Instructor, Rural and Elementary Education, Department of Education, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
 Edgren, W. T., Director of Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines; State Director
 Edie, Irwin W., Superintendent of Schools, Rudd
 Ellson, Floyd L., Superintendent of Schools, Webb
 England, J. H., Superintendent of Schools, Leon
 Erickson, Dwight A., Superintendent of Schools, Warren County, Indianola
 Esbeck, Leo J., Superintendent of Schools, Ventura
 Evans, Ralph C., Superintendent of Schools, Clarke County, Osceola
 Ewing, H. E., Superintendent of Schools, Carson
 Farris, Ralph J., Superintendent of Schools, Buchanan County, Independence
 Ferguson, C. L., Superintendent of Schools, Panora
 Field, Marshall R., Superintendent of Schools, Louisa County, Wapello
 Fitzgerald, H. C., Superintendent of Schools, Elk Horn
 Gaard, R. C., Superintendent of Schools, Bremer County, Waverly
 Gill, Lester N., Superintendent of Schools, Cedar County, Tipton
 Gividen, Noble J., Superintendent of Schools, Audubon County, Audubon
 Godfrey, Lloyd E., Superintendent of Schools, Dallas County, Adel
 Goede, M. H., Superintendent of Schools, Allamakee County, Waukon
 Green, R. J., Superintendent of Schools, Greenfield
 Harrison, A. E., Superintendent of Schools, Buena Vista County, Storm Lake
 Hartman, W. Harold, Superintendent of Schools, Blackhawk County, Waterloo
 Hendrickson, Abner A., Superintendent of Schools, Howard County, Cresco
 Herring, Findley M., Superintendent of Schools, Decatur County, Leon
 Horgen, Gladys, Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines
 Holmes, Glenn, Extension Specialist, Iowa State College, Ames
 Howell, Fannie G., Superintendent of Schools, Floyd County, Charles City
 Huehn, Kermith E., Superintendent of Schools, Hardin County, Eldora
 Hungerford, J. E., Superintendent of Schools, Coggon
 Isenberger, W. W., Superintendent, Hudson Consolidated School, Hudson
 Johnson, L. E., Superintendent of Schools, Appanoose County, Centerville
 Johnson, W. F., Superintendent of Schools, Spencer
 Kebo, Clifford, Superintendent of Schools, Coin
 Knesovich, S. J., Associate Professor of Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
 Konarska, C. H., Superintendent of Schools, Guthrie County, Guthrie Center

Krabill, Lester H., Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Washington
 Krueger, Ethel Mae, Elementary Supervisor, Floyd County, Charles City
 Lester, O. E., Superintendent of Schools, Oakland
 Lyon, Orissa, Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson County, Fairfield
 Manship, Raymond, Superintendent of Schools, Van Horne
 Martin, Charles F., Executive Secretary, Iowa State Education Association, Des Moines
 Meloy, F. E., Superintendent of Schools, Iowa County, Marengo
 Messer, Frances L., Superintendent of Schools, Humboldt County, Dakota City
 Milligan, Donald C., Superintendent of Schools, Davis County, Bloomfield
 Molsberry, W. W., Superintendent of Schools, Keokuk County, Sigourney
 Morris, R. A., Superintendent of Schools, Greene County, Jefferson
 Morse, A. S., Superintendent of Schools, Fayette County, West Union
 Norris, Paul H., Executive Secretary, Iowa Division, Isaac Walton League of America, Indianola
 Norris, Ralph C., Superintendent of Schools, Polk County, Des Moines; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 North, Ward T., Superintendent of Schools, Van Buren County, Keosauqua
 Ogden, Hartley, Superintendent of Schools, Odeboit
 Ortale, L. P., Superintendent of Schools, Mitchell County, Osage
 Parker, Jessie M., Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines
 Perry, Hartsel M., Superintendent of Schools, Scott County, Davenport
 Pickett, L. L., Superintendent of Schools, Ruthven
 Pond, Millard Z., Superintendent of Schools, Burlington
 Price, W. K., Superintendent of Schools, Monona County, Onawa
 Quintard, A. M., Superintendent of Schools, Kosuth County, Algona
 Ralston, Frank, Superintendent of Schools, Muscatine County, Muscatine
 Reed, Lula B., Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Red Oak
 Reid, L. W., Superintendent of Schools, Elwood
 Rendleman, Flora S., Elementary Supervisor, Humboldt County, Dakota City
 Ringold, R. C., Superintendent of Schools, Marshall County, Marshalltown
 Ritter, E. L., Director, Extension Service, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
 Robinson, J. Clare, Superintendent of Schools, Webster County, Fort Dodge
 Rowley, K. B., Superintendent of Schools, Butler County, Allison
 Rupert, Charles L., Superintendent of Schools, Lee County, Fort Madison
 Sanders, Stanley G., Superintendent of Schools, Poweshiek County, Montezuma
 Sankey, Claude W., Superintendent of Schools, Wright County, Clarion
 Schindler, E. P., Superintendent of Schools, Storey County, Nevada
 Schuler, A. H., Superintendent of Schools, Atlantic; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Shannon, Boyd, Superintendent of Schools, Monticello
 Shephard, Lou A., Extension Service, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls

Shultz, John G., Reorganization Consultant, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines
 Shupp, Walter A., Superintendent of Schools, Linn County, Cedar Rapids
 Smith, J. E., Superintendent of Schools, Palo Alto County, Emmetaburg
 Smith, Lloyd H., Superintendent of Schools, Madison County, Winterset
 Snider, F. J., Superintendent of Schools, Johnson County, Iowa City
 Starry, W. V., Superintendent of Schools, Allerton
 Stoen, Charles G., Superintendent of Schools, Winneshiek County, Decorah
 Thomas, C. S., Superintendent of Schools, Marion County, Knoxville
 Tweed, S. T., Superintendent of Schools, Winnebago County, Forest City
 Tye, Charles H., Superintendent of Schools, Sioux County, Orange City
 Vanderlinden, J. S., Superintendent of Schools, Perry
 Voogd, A. G., Superintendent of Schools, Rock Rapids
 Watson, R. H., Superintendent of Schools, Sheffield
 Whitney, Charles S., Superintendent of Schools, Hancock County, Garner
 Woodruff, L. L., Superintendent of Schools, Des Moines County, Burlington
 Wright, J. C., Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines
 Young, (Mrs.) Frances, Superintendent of Schools, Pocahontas County, Pocahontas

KANSAS

Andrews, (Mrs.) Della, Superintendent of Schools, Pawnee County, Larned
 Arnold, LaVerne B., Superintendent of Schools, Osborne County, Osborne; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Berg, (Mrs.) Emma, Superintendent of Schools, Douglas County, Lawrence
 Bowman, Gladys, Superintendent of Schools, Coffey County, Burlington
 Brown, Minter E., Director of Professional Relations, Kansas State Teachers Association, Topeka
 Channel, (Mrs.) Margaret, Superintendent of Schools, Pottawatomie County, Westmoreland
 Clark, Lottie M., Superintendent of Schools, Pratt County, Pratt
 Click, (Mrs.) Mabel, Superintendent of Schools, Johnson County, Olathe
 Correll, Frank E., Superintendent of Schools, Dickinson County, Abilene
 DeBolt, Alma, Superintendent of Schools, Labette County, Osawego
 Eddington, (Mrs.) Olive, Superintendent of Schools, Seward County, Liberal
 Engstrand, Agnes, Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Topeka; State Director
 Epling, K. O., Superintendent of Schools, Council Grove; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Gahnstrom, Ruth, Superintendent of Schools, Saline County, Saline
 Golladay, (Mrs.) Edna, Superintendent of Schools, Bourbon County, Fort Scott
 Granger, Oia, Superintendent of Schools, Meade County, Meade
 Hamilton, (Mrs.) June, Superintendent of Schools, Greenwood County, Eureka
 Harris, Edith, Superintendent of Schools, Rooks County, Stockton

Hayden, Murel H., Superintendent of Schools, Lincoln

Herr, F. Floyd, Director, Certification and College Accreditation, State Department of Public Instruction, Topeka; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education

Holroyd, Flora E., Assistant Professor of Rural Education, State Teachers College, Pittsburg

Huff, Clifton B., Professor of Education, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia; President of the Department, 1955-56

Johnson, Homer L., Associate Professor of Education, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg

Jones, (Mrs.) Frances, Superintendent of Schools, Lyon County, Emporia

Kappelman, G. B., Superintendent of Schools, Cloud County, Concordia

Kelly, (Mrs.) Treasa, Superintendent of Schools Republic County, Belleville

Kensler, Pearl, Superintendent of Schools, Sedgewick County, Wichita

King, Eva A., Director, Elementary Education, Sedgewick County, Wichita

King, John E., President, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia

Kugler, Floyd, Superintendent of Schools, Smith County, Smith Center

Longnecker, (Mrs.) Mamie, Superintendent of Schools, Kingman County, Kingman

Luse, Eugene E., Superintendent of Schools, Coldwater

Lydick, Genevieve, Superintendent of Schools, Brown County, Hiawatha

McBride, Mollie, Superintendent of Schools, Rawlins County, Atwood

Michael, Florence A., Superintendent of Schools, Harvey County, Newton

Miller, (Mrs.) Ethel L., Superintendent of Schools, Grant County, Ulysses

Moore, (Mrs.) Edna, Superintendent of Schools, Greeley County, Tribune

Nelson, (Mrs.) Winifred M., Superintendent of Schools, Jackson County, Holton

O'Fallon, O. Kenneth, Associate Professor of School Administration, Kansas State College, Manhattan

Petty, (Mrs.) Leda, Superintendent of Schools, Clay County, Clay Center

Pope, (Mrs.) Myrtle M., Superintendent of Schools, Allen County, Iola

Roether, Jane E., Superintendent of Schools, Geary County, Junction City

Rosel, (Mrs.) Leora, Superintendent of Schools, Stevens County, Hugoton

Roth, Anthony E., Superintendent of Schools, Ellis County, Hays

Serrent, (Mrs.) Madge L., Superintendent of Schools, Riley County, Manhattan

Sexton, (Mrs.) Ruth Flory, Superintendent of Schools, Elk County, Howard

Simmons, Hazel Lee, Elementary Principal, Lawrence Public Schools, Lawrence

Snell, (Mrs.) Mabel M., Superintendent of Schools, Wichita County, Leoti

Stevens, (Mrs.) Nalle H., Superintendent of Schools, Nemko County, Erie

Stonecipher, E. E., Life Member, 1914 S. Locust, Pittsburg

Stucky, Milo, Principal, Buhler Schools, Buhler

Sturges, (Mrs.) Catharine, Superintendent of Schools, Chautaugus County, Sedan

Therkelsen, Marie, Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Independence

Throckmorton, Adel F., Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Topeka

Vinson, (Mrs.) Ida M., Superintendent of Schools, Chase County, Cottonwood Falls

Young, Orville C., Superintendent of Schools, Rush County, La Crosse; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Kansas State College, Manhattan
Porter Library, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg

KENTUCKY

Ambrose, Luther M., Chairman, Department of Education, Berea College, Berea; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene

Archer, M. L., Superintendent, Scott County Schools, Georgetown

Bell, Ira, Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Monticello

Brown, E. D., Superintendent, Breckinridge County Schools, Painsburg

Burkhead, G. C., Superintendent, Hardin County Schools, Elizabethtown

Burns, T. F., Superintendent, Daviess County Schools, Owensboro

Carly, D. J., Director, Public Relations, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond

Caywood, J. A., Superintendent, Kenton County Schools, Independence

Chambers, Henry, Superintendent, McCracken County Schools, Paducah

Cole, Mary I., Associate Professor of Education, Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green

Davis, Mitchell, Superintendent, Barren County Schools, Glasgow

Dodson, J. M., Executive Secretary, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville

Elswick, Charles R., Principal, John's Creek School, Pike County Schools, Pikeville

Ferrell, D. Thomas, Head, Department of Education, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond; Planning Committee, MidSouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education

Fiser, H. Barton, Superintendent, Christian County Schools, Hopkinsville

Graham, Charles C., Professor of Education, Berea College, Berea

Haggan, Henry C., Head, Department of Agriculture, Morehead State College, Morehead

Hall, Floyd, Superintendent, Boyd County Schools, Catlettsburg

Harmon, C. D., Superintendent, McCreary County Schools, Whitley City

Henry, Victor P., President, Lindsey Wilson College, Columbia

Jagers, Richard E., Professor of Education, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond

Jesse, Mabel C., Supervisor, Rural School Improvement Project, Beattyville

Jones, Lee Fancis, Head, Department of Education, Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green

McQuire, H. H., Superintendent, Carter County Schools, Grayson

Moore, W. J., Dean, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond

Pirtle, John P., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Howeaville School, Hardin County Schools, Cecilia

Pollock, Sam B., Superintendent, Hopkins County Schools, Madisonville

Robbins, Warren, Supervisor, Bell County Schools, Pineville

Swearingen, Orville L., Superintendent, Pulaski County Schools, Somerset

Turner, (Mrs.) Marie, Superintendent, Breathitt County Schools, Jackson; Executive Committee of the Department

Turpen, N. C., Superintendent, Fayette County Schools, Lexington
 Van Hoose, Richard, Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Louisville
 Vickers, John L., Director, Division of Pupil Transportation, State Department of Education, Frankfort; Executive Committee of the Department; President of the Division of Pupil Transportation, 1954-55
 Ward, (Mrs.) Emma B., Superintendent, Anderson County Schools, Lawrenceburg; State Director, Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Ward, E. R., Assistant Superintendent, Fayette County Schools, Lexington
 Wear, Pat W., Professor of Education, Berea College, Berea
 Winfrey, W. R., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Cumberland County High School, Cumberland County Schools, Burkesville

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Lees Junior College, Jackson
 Library, Johnson Camden, Morehead State College, Morehead
 Library, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond

LOUISIANA

Babin, Larry J., *Life Member*, Donaldsonville
 Brunson, W. C., Principal, Dutch Town High School, Ascension Parish Schools, Dutch Town
 Daniel, J. L., Jr., Supervisor, East Baton Rouge Parish Schools, Baton Rouge
 Elsie, (Mrs.) A. M., Elementary School Supervisor, Madison Parish Schools, Tallulah
 Foote, J. M., *Life Member*, Baton Rouge
 Hanchev, K. R., Superintendent, Beauregard Parish Schools, De Ridder
 Laverne, Remi, Superintendent, West Baton Rouge Parish Schools, Port Allen
 Pearce, H. L., Supervisor of Schools, Livingston Parish Schools, Denham Springs
 Robertson, J. B., Director, Elementary and Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Baton Rouge
 Terrebonne, L. P., *Life Member*, Plaquemine
 Thatcher, Fred G., Executive Secretary, Louisiana School Boards Association, Baton Rouge
 Thomas, H. M., Superintendent, West Carroll Parish Schools, Oak Grove
 White, Roscoe H., Superintendent, Caddo Parish Schools, Shreveport; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, McNeese State College, Lake Charles
 Materials Library, Richland Parish, Rayville
 Russell Library, Northwestern State College, Natchitoches

MAINE

Alkins, Frederick H., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #16, South Windham
 Bracy, Alfred A., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #32, Canton
 Gilman, Stanwood C., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #45, Sebago Estates
 McMonagle, Edward L., Director, Division of Administration, State Department of Education, Augusta; State Director; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Quinn, (Mrs.) Villa Hayden, Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Augusta

MARYLAND

Ahalt, Arthur M., Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Education, University of Maryland, College Park
 Bennett, James M., Superintendent, Wicomico County Schools, Salisbury
 Boston, W. T., Division of Certification and Accreditation, State Department of Education, Baltimore
 Brish, William M., Superintendent, Washington County Schools, Hagerstown; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Brown, (Mr.) Lola P., Supervisor of Personnel, Queen Anne's County Schools, Centreville
 Burdette, Eunice E., Supervisor of Elementary Education, Prince George's County Schools, Hyattsville
 Busick, James G., Superintendent, Dorchester County Schools, Cambridge
 Carlson, C. Allen, Superintendent, Somerset County Schools, Princess Anne
 Claxton, P. P., *Life Member*, Silver Spring
 Cooper, Paul D., Superintendent, Worcester County Schools, Snow Hill
 Corr, Reade W., Superintendent, Kent County Schools, Chestertown
 Davis, J. Willard, Superintendent, Talbot County Schools, Easton
 Dent, Lettie M., Superintendent, St. Marys County Schools, Leonardtown
 Dunkle, Maurice A., Superintendent, Calvert County Schools, Prince Frederick
 Fitzgerald, W. Stewart, Superintendent, Caroline County Schools, Denton
 Gordon, Walter M., Supervisor of Transportation, Baltimore County Schools, Towson
 Hadesty, R. Bowen, President, Maryland State Teachers College, Frostburg
 Hauver, Herman A., Supervisor of High Schools, Calvert County Schools, Prince Frederick
 Hawkins, Elmer T., Principal, Garnett High School, Kent County Schools, Chestertown
 Hawkins, Willard L., Superintendent, Garrett County Schools, Oakland
 Hobbs, (Mrs.) Pauline V., Elementary Supervisor, Baltimore County Schools, Baltimore
 Hoffmaster, Paul L., Supervisor of Transportation, Frederick County Schools, Frederick
 Jenkins, David S., Superintendent, Anne Arundel County Schools, Annapolis
 Jenness, Samuel M., Superintendent, Carroll County Schools, Westminster
 Martin, T. C., Superintendent, Charles County Schools, La Plata
 Monk, Louis E., Principal, Lincoln Junior High School, Montgomery County Schools, Rockville
 Murray, Ray A., Associate Professor of Agricultural Education and Rural Life, University of Maryland, College Park
 Norris, Forbes H., Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Rockville
 Oliver, J. A., Maryland State College, Princess Anne
 Pruitt, Eugene W., Superintendent, Frederick County Schools, Frederick
 Rannels, Morris W., Superintendent, Cecil County Schools, Elkton
 Rhodes, Harry C., Superintendent, Queen Annes County Schools, Centreville
 Schmidt, William B., Superintendent, Prince George's County Schools, Upper Marlboro; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Stapleton, Edward G., Superintendent, Baltimore County Schools, Towson; State Direc-

tor: First Vice President of the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 1953-54
 Webster, Ralph R., Superintendent, Allegany County Schools, Cumberland
 Willis, Charles W., Superintendent, Harford County Schools, Bel Air
 Wilson, (Mrs.) Caroline, Supervisor of Elementary Schools, Garrett County Schools, Oakland
 Yingling, John E., Superintendent, Howard County Schools, Ellicott City
 INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER
 Prince Georges County Memorial Library, Hyattsville

MASSACHUSETTS

Dopp, R. Douglas, Superintendent, Ashby-Townsend School Union, Townsend
 INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER
 Education Department, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

MICHIGAN

Abbott, Beryl H., Superintendent of Schools, Benzie County, Frankfort
 Ansel, James O., Associate Professor of Education, Department of Rural Life and Education, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo
 Atkinson, Fred, M., Superintendent of Schools, Manchester
 Bacon, (Mrs.) Ruth N., Superintendent of Schools, St. Clair County, Port Huron
 Bickford, Fern E., Life Member, Coldwater
 Borst, Russell L., Superintendent of Schools, Mecosta County, Big Rapids
 Brake, Charles E., Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Detroit, Vice President of the Department, 1954-55
 Brumbaugh, Donald S., Principal, Detour High School, Detour
 Clayton, C. Wesley, Superintendent, North Branch Township Rural Agricultural School, North Branch
 Crofoot, Bess L., Elementary Supervisor of Schools, Fowlerville
 Donaldson, Harry B., Superintendent, Hemlock Rural Agricultural School, Hemlock
 Dondineau, (Mrs.) Bernice, Supervising Teacher, Wayne County Schools, Detroit; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene
 Eddy, Theo V., Superintendent of Schools, St. Clair
 Emerson, William, Superintendent of Schools, Oakland County, Pontiac; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Eng, William J., Superintendent of Schools, Midland County, Midland
 Flacher, Fred C., Life Member, Belleville
 Fox, Robert S., Principal, University Elementary School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Chairman, Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
 Francis, John R., Superintendent of Schools, Sanilac County Schools, Sandusky
 Highlund, E. C., Superintendent, Homer Community School, Homer
 Holmquist, E. O., Superintendent of Schools, Missaukee County, Lake City
 Howard, (Mrs.) Daisy E., Superintendent of Schools, Genesee County, Flint
 Jaffe, Abraham, Superintendent of Schools, St. Joseph County, Centerville
 Jakab, William, Superintendent of Schools, Cheboygan County, Cheboygan
 Jameson, Mary S., Supervising Teacher, Wayne County Schools, Dearborn

Kaufman, Jennie M., Superintendent of Schools, Ottawa County, Grand Haven
 Lathrop, Arthur W., Superintendent of Schools, Barry County, Hastings
 Le Fevre, Harold E., Superintendent of Schools, Macomb County, Mount Clemens
 Less, John, Associate Executive Secretary, State YMCA, Detroit
 McCallum, Gladys, Superintendent of Schools, Livingston County, Howell
 Nelson, Alex M., Superintendent, Hesperia Community School, Hesperia
 Owen, J. Willis, Superintendent, School District 4, Dearborn Township, Dearborn
 Potrude, Olive M., Superintendent of Schools, Wexford County, Cadillac
 Reed, (Mrs.) Alice F., Superintendent of Schools, Gratiot County, Ithaca
 Rice, C. Alfred, Superintendent of Schools, Branch County, Coldwater
 Richardson, (Mrs.) Delia, Superintendent of Schools, Ogemaw County, West Branch
 Robinson, William McKinley, Director, Department of Rural Life and Education, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo; Chairman, Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
 Rollin, Russell A., Superintendent of Schools, Iosco County, Tawas City
 Sanders, Lucille E., Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo
 Seay, Maurice F., Director, Division of Education, W. C. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek
 Simmons, W. T., Superintendent of Schools, Montcalm County, Stanton
 Sixma, S. H., Executive Secretary, Michigan Association of School Boards, Michigan State College, East Lansing
 Slaven, Opal, Rural Supervisor of Schools, Shiawassee County, Corunna
 Squire, Fred, Superintendent of Schools, Midland County, Midland
 Stearns, Troy L., Head, Department of Elementary Education, Michigan State College, East Lansing
 Stroud, Alton J., Superintendent of Schools, Ingham County, Mason
 Taylor, William H., Superintendent of Schools, Vicksburg
 Temple, Ben L., Superintendent of Schools, Huron County, Bad Axe
 Thayer, Howard C., Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Wahtenaw County, Ann Arbor; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Torrant, Lyle A., Superintendent of Schools, Jackson County, Jackson; State Director
 Whetstone, Clinton F., Superintendent of Schools, Calhoun County, Marshall; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Wooster, Glenn, Superintendent of Schools, Vermontville

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Detroit Public Library, Detroit
 Library, Central Michigan College of Education, Mount Pleasant
 Library, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti
 Library, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo

MINNESOTA

Aakhus, C. G., Superintendent of Schools, Willow River
 Andersen, Douglas, Superintendent of Schools, Koochiching County, International Falls
 Anderson, Harriette, Superintendent of Schools, Meeker County, Litchfield
 Archer, Clifford P., Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Chair-

- man, Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene
 Armstrong, Grace, Assistant Director of Professional Education, State Teachers College, Mankato
 Borken, Ben, Principal, Meadowlands School, Meadowlands
 Borneman, George H., Superintendent of Schools, Tracy
 Boyd, Esther, Superintendent of Schools, Kanabec County, Mora
 Boynton, Willia A., Superintendent of Schools, Blue Earth County, Mankato
 Chord, (Mrs.) Minnie O., Elementary Principal, Jr. High Social Studies, McGregor
 Christianson, Charles, Superintendent of Schools, Roseau County, Roseau; Advisory Council to The National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Coleman, (Mrs.) Jennie, Superintendent of Schools, Isanti County, Cambridge
 Corneliusen, Alice L., Principal, College Elementary Laboratory School, State Teachers College, Moorhead
 Cross, C. Willard, Superintendent of Schools, Faribault
 Dittes, W. H., Superintendent, Independence Consolidated District 247, New York Mills
 Douglas, Ruth, Superintendent of Schools, Mille Lacs County, Milaca
 Een, Andrew R., Superintendent of Schools, Windom
 Elke, Estelle L., High School Teacher Training, Little Falls
 Engum, T. C., Director of Rural Education, State Department of Education, St. Paul; Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society
 Erickson, (Mrs.) Mahel O., Superintendent of Schools, Douglas County, Alexandria
 Haggerty, Mitchell J., State Supervisor of School Transportation, State Department of Education, Minneapolis; Executive Committee, Division of Pupil Transportation
 Halvorson, G. R., Superintendent of Schools, Chatfield
 Hanson, (Mrs.) Norene, Superintendent of Schools, Stevens County, Morris
 Hanson, Sena, Teacher Training, East Grand Forks
 Hanson, Willard E., Consultant, School District Surveys and Reorganization, State Department of Education, St. Paul
 Horapat, F. J., Superintendent of Schools, Kenyon
 Howe, Caroline J., Superintendent of Schools, McLeod County, Glencoe
 Ingberg, Albert, Superintendent of Schools, Laporte
 James, Audrey, Superintendent of Schools, Murray County, Slayton; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents
 James, Bernard P., Superintendent of Schools, Erskine
 Johnson, S. A., Superintendent of Schools, Plainview
 Knuti Leslie A., Teacher, Esko Public Schools, Esko
 Kohlhase, J. C., Superintendent of Schools, Koochiching County, International Falls
 Lapham, Gladys H., Superintendent of Schools, Houston County, Caledonia
 Larsen, (Mrs.) Myrtle K., Superintendent of Schools, Pine County, Pine City
 Malmquist, M. L., Superintendent of Schools, Grand Rapids
 Malmrose, (Mrs.) Addie N., Superintendent of Schools, Watonwan County, St. James
 Matejka, (Mrs.) Myrtle, Superintendent of Schools, Clay County, Moorhead
 Mathews, Gladys, Superintendent of Schools, Todd County, Long Prairie
 Matson, Margaret, Superintendent of Schools, Waseca County, Waseca
 Meade, David W., Principal, Middle River School, Middle River
 Melin, (Mrs.) Nordica, Superintendent of Schools, Chisago County, Center City
 Meyer, Eugene, Director, Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, St. Paul
 Mickelson, Irwin L., Superintendent of Schools, Le Sueur
 Milbrath, Cyril M., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Proctor High School, Proctor
 Miller, Ralph E., Associate Professor, School of Agriculture, University of Minnesota, St. Paul
 Murphy, Edna I., Life Member, Grand Rapids
 Murray, Hazel G., Teacher, Austin
 Nelson, Agnes J., Superintendent of Schools, Big Stone County, Ortonville
 Nelson, Lowry, Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota, St. Paul
 Nigg, William J., Superintendent, Thomson Public Schools, Esko
 Nuernberg, W. O., Superintendent of Schools, Rice County, Faribault
 Parker, Kenneth G., Superintendent of Schools, Kimball
 Paulson, Myrtle J., Superintendent of Schools, Becker County, Detroit Lakes
 Petersen, Harold A., Superintendent of Schools, Tyler
 Peterson, Milo J., Head, Agriculture Education Department, University of Minnesota, St. Paul; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Plumb, Valworth R., University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch, Duluth
 Rippy, (Mrs.) Elizabeth, Superintendent of Schools, Lake of the Woods County, Baudette
 Salmi, W. W., Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis County, Duluth; State Director
 Schmidt, Harlan A., Superintendent of Schools, Rapidan
 Schroeder, Helen R., Superintendent of Schools, Brown County, New Ulm
 Scott, Robert F., Superintendent of Schools, Hennepin County, Minneapolis; deceased October 1954
 Skogg, Melville, Superintendent of Schools, Herman
 Smythe, W. B., Superintendent of Schools, Sherburn
 Stapleton, C. L., Superintendent of Schools, Beltrami County, Bemidji
 Swanson, Gordon I., Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education, University of Minnesota, St. Paul
 Swenson, Louise, Superintendent of Schools, Carlton County, Carlton
 Thompson, Viola, Superintendent of Schools, Hennepin County, Minneapolis
 Thorpe, Clara, Superintendent of Schools, Yellow Medicine County, Granite Falls
 Thorson, (Mrs.) Dorothy, Superintendent of Schools, Kandiyohi County, Willmar
 Thorson, Lloyd E., Superintendent of Schools, Lake Benton
 Tollefson, Dora L., Superintendent of Schools, Mower County, Austin
 Vig, A. M., Superintendent of Schools, Freeborn County, Albert Lea
 Wallien, (Mrs.) Valborg, Superintendent of Schools, Montevideo
 Webster, Jerome O., Superintendent of Schools, Winnebago
 Weitgenant, (Mrs.) Blanda C., Superintendent of Schools, Nobles County, Worthington
 Williams, Beatrice, Rural Supervisor, State Teachers College, St. Cloud

Wylie, John W., Superintendent of Schools, Frazee
 Younggren, Ruth I., Superintendent of Schools, Kittson County, Hallock
 Zieffsohn, Lawrence, Superintendent, Borup Consolidated School, Borup

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, State Teachers College, Moorhead
 Library, State Teachers College, St. Cloud
 Library, State Teachers College, Winona
 Minneapolis Public Library, Minneapolis

MISSISSIPPI

Bond, Ada, Elementary Supervisor, Jackson County, Pascagoula
 Coulter, B. L., Superintendent, East Forrest High School, Petal
 Daniel, (Mrs.) Fort, Superintendent of Schools, Marshall County, Holly Springs
 Davis, Arena Mallory, President, Delta Junior College, Lexington
 Johnson, (Mrs.) Lillian R., Jeanes Teacher, Coahoma County, Clarkdale
 Mayo, Robert M., Superintendent of Schools, Hinds County, Jackson; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 McMillan, W. W., Manager, Bus Sales, Superior Coach Corporation, Kosciusko
 Middleton, Ben F., Executive Secretary, Mississippi State Textbook Purchasing Board, Jackson
 Montgomery, (Mrs.) Annie Kelly, Jeanes Teacher, Yalobusha County, Water Valley
 Moor, Bluford L., Superintendent of Schools, Oktibbeha County, Starkville
 Rawson, E. F., Supervisor, State Department of Education, Jackson
 Rogers, L. S., Superintendent of Schools, Leflore County, Greenwood
 Travis, J. A., Assistant Secretary in Charge of Field Service, State Education Association, Jackson; Planning Committee, Mid-south Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education

MISSOURI

Atkinson, J. L., Superintendent of Schools, Lafayette County, Lexington
 Beck, J. Abner, Superintendent of Schools, Mississippi County, Charleston
 Blah, (Mrs.) Josephine, Superintendent of Schools, Osage County, Linn
 Brand, J. H., Superintendent of Schools, Crawford County, Steelville
 Brandt, Viola, Supervisor of Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, Jefferson City
 Bucher, Vincent W., Shennandale Community House, Gladwin
 Burnside, J. A., Superintendent of Schools, Carroll County, Carrollton; deceased November 1954
 Campbell, Bernard C., Superintendent of Schools, Lee's Summit; Planning Committee, Midwest Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Capps, A. G., Professor of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia
 Clements, Homer M., Superintendent of Schools, Jackson County, Independence
 Dillinger, (Mrs.) Hinda J., Hazelwood School District R-1, St. Louis County, St. Louis
 Eubanks, (Mrs.) Don L., Superintendent of Schools, Bates County, Butler
 Evans, Ray T., Elementary School Supervisor, Osceola
 Graves, Mary F., Superintendent of Schools, Macon County, Macon

Guth, (Mrs.) Ora N., Superintendent of Schools, Perry County, Perryville
 Hamlett, Floyd E., Superintendent of Schools, Pemiscot County, Caruthersville
 Henry, W. R., Superintendent of Schools, Camden County, Camdenton
 Hill, Robert R., Professor of Education, Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau
 Hills, (Mrs.) Stella, Superintendent of Schools, Adair County, Kirksville
 Hinote, Edgar A., Superintendent of Schools, St. Clair County, Osceola
 Hudson, Bessie, Superintendent of Schools, Knox County, Edina
 Jinkens, (Mrs.) Nannie, Superintendent of Schools, Hickory County, Hermitage
 Jones, Leonard, Superintendent of Schools, Buchanan County, St. Joseph
 Lloyd, Alfred W., Superintendent of Schools, Moniteau County, California
 Mallory, D. A., Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo
 McDonald, Moss, Superintendent of Schools, Morgan County, Versailles; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Mittler, E. F., Head, Division of Extended Service, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville
 Myers, (Mrs.) W. Leslie, Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Plattaburg
 Oliver, Stanley C., Professor of Education, Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield
 Owen, John, Superintendent of Schools, Benton County, Warsaw
 Pattinson, Sallie, Assistant Professor of Rural Education, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville
 Riddings, G. H., Superintendent of Schools, Dunklin County, Kennett
 Riley, George A., Superintendent, Reorganized School District 1, Moniteau County, California
 Rinehart, (Mrs.) Vera, Superintendent of Schools, Linn County, Brookfield
 Roberts, Raymond A., Director of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Jefferson City
 Scheer, (Mrs.) Chao L., Superintendent of Schools, Lincoln County, Troy
 Scotten, C. F., Superintendent of Schools, Pettis County, Sedalia
 Shults, Lewis W., Superintendent of Schools, Hickman Mills
 Skelton, S. W., Superintendent of Schools, Atchison County, Rockport
 Smart, John R., Jr., Superintendent of Schools, Glasgow
 Smith, (Mrs.) Callie C., Superintendent of Schools, Scotland County, Memphis
 Snarr, (Mrs.) Ruth G., Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Montgomery City
 Summers, Arthur L., Director of Reorganization of School Districts, State Department of Education, Jefferson City; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Wells, Nellie F., Superintendent of Schools, Johnson County, Warrensburg
 Winder, Lester C., Director of Transportation, Normandy Consolidated School, St. Louis
 Wright, John A., Superintendent of Schools, Stoddard County, Bloomfield
 Young, Gertrude, Superintendent of Schools, Mercer County, Princeton

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Inman E. Page Library, Lincoln University, Jefferson City
 Kent Library, Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau

Library, Central Missouri State College,
Warrensburg
Library, Drury College, Springfield

MONTANA

Barnard, Lulu, Superintendent of Schools,
Flathead County, Kallispell; Committee on
Publications and Constructive Studies; Ad-
visory Council to the National Commission
on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Bartron, (Mrs.) Adeline, Superintendent of
Schools, Missoula County, Missoula
Bay, (Mrs.) Theo E., Superintendent of
Schools, Beaverhead County, Dillon
Campbell, Elsie, Superintendent of Schools,
Pondera County, Conrad
Cole, Arden B., Superintendent of Schools,
Missoula County, Missoula
Condon, Mary M., Superintendent of Public
Instruction, State Department of Public
Instruction, Helena; Executive Committee
of the Department
Cooper, (Mrs.) Agnes Hannon, Superintendent
of Schools, Ravalli County, Hamilton
Fossen, (Mrs.) Alice, Superintendent of
Schools, Roosevelt County, Wolf Point
Green, Elizabeth F. Barness, Superintendent
of Schools, Fergus County, Lewistown
Haight, (Mrs.) Sylvia, Director, State Cor-
respondence School, State Department of
Public Instruction, Missoula; State Director
Hamman, Muriel, Superintendent of Schools,
Lake County, Polson
Haynes, (Mrs.) Martha, Superintendent of
Schools, Gallatin County, Bozeman
Herigstad, Audrey, Superintendent of Schools,
Custer County, Miles City
Hill, Florence, Superintendent of Schools,
Powell County, Deer Lodge
Hopkins, Albert, Head, Department of Educa-
tion and Psychology, Northern Montana
College, Havre
Konzack, Wallace W., Superintendent of
Schools, Clinton
McLean, (Mrs.) Marie, Teacher, Garrison
Mikkelsen, (Mrs.) Agnes, Superintendent of
Schools, Jefferson City, Boulder
Moore, (Mrs.) Winnaforn H., Supervisor of
Rural Schools, State Department of Public
Instruction, Helena
Murphy, (Mrs.) Anna J., Superintendent of
Schools, Mineral County, Superior
Naugle, C. E., Superintendent of Schools,
Bigfork
Paterson, Hilfred B., Superintendent of
Schools, Park County, Livingston
Peterson, (Mrs.) Lillian L., *Life Member*,
Kallispell
Roseau, Florence, Superintendent of Schools,
Stillwater County, Columbus
Sherie, (Mrs.) Opal, Superintendent of
Schools, Hill County, Havre
Spearin, (Mrs.) May Y., Superintendent of
Schools, Golden Valley County, Ryegate
Squires, Genevieve, Deputy Superintendent,
State Department of Public Instruction,
Helena
Taft, Laura Jane, Superintendent of Schools,
Glacier County, Cut Bank
Ternstrom, Alice H., Superintendent of Schools,
Liberty County, Chester
Thoresen, Mildred, Superintendent of Schools,
Richland County, Sidney
Turner, (Mrs.) Thelma B., Superintendent of
Schools, Blaine County, Chinook
Wright, (Mrs.) Margaret M., Superintendent
of Schools, Dawson County, Glendive

NEBRASKA

Andersen, Olga, Superintendent of Schools,
Sargey County, Papillion

Baldrige, Chleo C., Lincoln
Bennett, Jennie, Superintendent of Schools,
Sheridan County, Rushville
Bigelow, Doris, Superintendent of Schools,
Gosper County, Elwood; State Director
Boone, G. T., Superintendent of Schools,
Jefferson County, Fairbury
Bratten, (Mrs.) Edna, Superintendent of
Schools, Red Willow County, McCook
Bugbee, H. D., Superintendent of Schools,
Nemaha County, Auburn
Calvert, A. B., Superintendent of Schools,
Saline County, Wilber
Canaday, Golda, Superintendent of Schools,
Kearney County, Minden
Comstock, (Mrs.) Hazel, Superintendent of
Schools, York County, York
Cunningham, Eldon, P., Superintendent of
Schools, Hall County, Grand Island
Day, (Mrs.) Myrtle V., Superintendent of
Schools, Dixon County, Ponca
Dutton, (Mrs.) Margaret H., Superintendent
of Schools, Deuel County, Chappell
Eckard, Bessie F., Superintendent of Schools,
Pawnee County, Pawnee City
Ellison, (Mrs.) Elizabeth A., Superintendent
of Schools, Saunders County, Wahoo
Extrom, Paul E., Superintendent of Schools,
Lincoln County, North Platte
Farley, Rosalie W., Coordinator, In-Service
Education, Teachers College, University of
Nebraska, Lincoln
French, Alice L., Superintendent of Schools,
Holt County, O'Neill
Gilman, (Mrs.) Musetta, Superintendent of
Schools, Madison County, Madison
Gilmore, Mary, Superintendent of Schools,
Custer County, Broken Bow
Gorman, Frank H., Dean, College of Educa-
tion, University of Omaha, Omaha; Com-
mittee on Recruitment and Preparation of
Rural Teachers
Groshans, (Mrs.) Irma, Superintendent of
Schools, Kimball County, Kimball
Gugelman, Emma H., Superintendent of
Schools, Frontier County, Stockville
Hamaker, (Mrs.) Grace A., Superintendent of
Schools, Brown County, Ainsworth
Hanika, (Mrs.) R. A., Superintendent of
Schools, Richardson County, Falls City
Hanley, (Mrs.) Ada, Superintendent of
Schools, Hayes County, Hayes Center
Harris, Wenona, Superintendent of Schools,
Adams County, Hastings
Hauser, W. J., Wellington Hotel, Omaha
Hayward, (Mrs.) Willard, Superintendent of
Schools, Grant County, Hyannis
Jesser, David L., Superintendent of Schools,
Sioux County, Harrison
Konegri, (Mrs.) Virginia, Superintendent of
Schools, Dakota County, Dakota City
Kreidler, Jessie G., Superintendent of Schools,
Nance County, Fullerton
Larson, Lillian, Supervisor of Elementary
Education, Fremont
Lawson, (Mrs.) Minnie D., Superintendent of
Schools, Wheeler County, Bartlett
McBeth, Olive M., Superintendent of Schools,
Polk County, Osceola
Oldershaw, Edith, Superintendent of Schools,
Cheyenne County, Slacey
Otteman, Clara, Superintendent of Schools,
Thurston County, Pender
Phillips, Joe, Superintendent of Schools, Dodge
County, Fremont
Quick, Robert A., Superintendent of Schools,
Platte County, Columbus; Advisory Council
to the National Commission on the Inter-
mediate Administrative Unit
Renken, Emma, Superintendent of Schools,
Fillmore County, Geneva

Ripa, Evelyn D., Principal and Business Education Teacher, Wilber High School, Wilber
 RippetEAU, (Mrs.) Mary W., Superintendent of Schools, Clay County, Clay Center
 Stoneman, Merle A., Professor of School Administration, Teachers College, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Smith, Leon O., Superintendent of Schools, Douglas County, Omaha
 Tate, Zetta C., Superintendent of Schools, Cherry County, Valentine
 Theiss, H. Jeannette, Assistant Professor of Rural Education, Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron
 Vig, A. Clarence, Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Blair
 Waite, Evangeline, Loup City; formerly Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln
 Waring, (Mrs.) Bess J., Superintendent of Schools, Stanton County, Stanton
 Warp, Paul A., Warp Publishing Company, Minden
 Whitten, Merritt, Superintendent of Schools, Otoe County, Nebraska City

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Midland College, Fremont
 Library, Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron
 Library, Nebraska State Teachers College, Kearney
 Library, Nebraska State Teachers College, Wayne
 Library, University of Omaha, Omaha

NEVADA

Gaw, Robert B., Teacher, Tahoe School District, Douglas County, Zephyr Cove; State Director

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Appleton, David, Superintendent, Supervisory Union #3, Conway; State Director; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Badger, Lester B., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #47, Peterborough
 Bennett, Phil A., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #23, Woodville
 Doe, Chester W., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #44, Northwood
 Hastings, Henry J., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #27, Hudson
 Osgood, Jonathan A., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #55, Salem
 Toll, Arthur E., Superintendent, Supervisory Union #56, Somersworth

NEW JERSEY

Atwood, Will G., Superintendent of Schools, Warren County, Belvidere
 Bair, Carl M., Superintendent of Schools, Ocean County, Toms River
 Bakken, E. H., National Director, Rural Scouting, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick
 Bean, Albert M., Superintendent of Schools, Camden County, Camden
 Eby, Harry K., National Director, School Relations, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick
 Everett, Marcia A., Life Member, Belvidere
 Hoppeck, Anne, Assistant in Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Trenton
 Knipe, (Mrs.) Edythe M., Helping Teacher, Gloucester County, Pitman

Lawrence, Clifton, Superintendent, Water Consolidated School, Sussex
 Matthews, W. B., Superintendent of Schools, Cape May County, Cape May Court House
 Matzner, G. C., Assistant Professor of Education, School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 Miller, Fannie B., Helping Teacher, Salem County, Elmer
 Mongon, John, Superintendent of Schools, Burlington County, Mt. Holly
 Morris, Howard, Jr., Superintendent of Schools, Salem County, Salem
 Portius, Harry M., Director of Safety, Farm Bureau Insurance Company, Columbus
 Ransohoff, (Mrs.) Priscilla B., Director of Rehabilitation, Monmouth Memorial Hospital, Long Branch
 Robinson, Thomas E., President, New Jersey State Teachers College, Glassboro; Executive Committee of the Department
 Rodgers, J. Harvey, Superintendent of Schools, Gloucester County, Woodbury; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; deceased December 1954
 Slekler, Edna F., Helping Teacher, Gloucester County, Pitman
 Smith, Sampson G., Superintendent of Schools, Somerset County, Somerville; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; Committee to Work with CPEA; Planning Committee, North Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Stratton, Mason A., Superintendent of Schools, Atlantic County, Mays Landing; State Director
 Straub, J. Harold, Superintendent of Schools, Passaic County, Paterson
 Washington, (Mrs.) A. C., Plainfield; formerly Elementary Supervisor, Culpeper, Virginia

NEW MEXICO

DeVargas, Diego, Coordinator, Spanish Program, Carlsbad Public Schools, Carlsbad
 Digneo, (Mrs.) Ellen Hartnett, Director, Elementary and Adult Education, State Department of Education, Santa Fe
 Doran, (Mrs.) Ruby, Superintendent, Curry County Schools, Clovis
 Espinosa, A. G., Supervisor, Rio Arriba County Schools, Tierra Amarilla
 Foster, Fred W., Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Silver City
 Haile, George T., Superintendent, Otero County Schools, Alamogordo
 Hughes, (Mrs.) J. R., Superintendent, Union County Schools, Clayton
 Kosko, Stephen, Superintendent, Catron County Schools, Reserve
 Lucero, (Mrs.) Mary B., Superintendent, Guadalupe County Schools, Santa Rosa
 McWhirter, Corona, Superintendent, Torrance County Schools, Estancia
 Melendez, Canuto, Superintendent, Mora County Schools, Mora
 Nunn, Earl, Superintendent of Schools, Springer; Planning Committee, Southwest Regional Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Ortiz, Romeo A., Superintendent, Bernalillo County Schools, Bernalillo
 Owen, Wayne, Superintendent, Roosevelt County Schools, Portales
 Pierson, Claude, Supervisor, Curry County Schools, Clovis
 Samuelson, (Mrs.) Lorine, Superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, Hollywood
 Singinger, W. H., Director, Teacher Education, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas

Smith, Haskell B., Superintendent, Cobre Consolidated School, Bayard; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Sotei, (Mrs.) Lillian, Supervisor, Sandoval County Schools, Bernalillo
 Tunnell, Hall, Superintendent of Schools, Estancia
 Watson, (Mrs.) Mary R., Supervisor, Cobre Consolidated School, Bayard; State Director; Planning Committee, Rocky Mountain Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 White, George F., Director of Instruction, Artesia
 Wood, (Mrs.) Alice C., Superintendent of Schools, Wagon Mound

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Eastern New Mexico University, Portales
 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

NEW YORK

Allen, Everett T., District Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Peru
 Baker, Leonard, District Superintendent of Schools, St. Lawrence County, Star Lake
 Barber, George A., District Superintendent of Schools, Genesee County, Batavia
 Bartholomew, (Mrs.) Helen B., District Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Whiteshall
 Belknap, B. H., *Life Member*, Pupil Transportation Consultant, Delmar
 Bilderback, Naomi B., District Superintendent of Schools, Otsego County, Hartwick
 Blom, Victor H., District Superintendent of Schools, Wyoming County, Attica
 Bouek, Olin, District Superintendent of Schools, Albany County, Delmar
 Bowerman, H. G., District Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Fort Plain
 Brown, Clayton H., District Superintendent of Schools, Saratoga County, Greenfield Center
 Brunner, Edmund deS., Professor of Rural Sociology, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
 Bryan, Bernard L., Director, Board of Co-operative Educational Service, White Plains
 Buell, W. R., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, East Aurora
 Bush, (Mrs.) Pauline G., District Superintendent of Schools, Chemung County, Horseheads
 Buttersworth, J. E., *Life Member*, Professor of Educational Administration, Emeritus, Cornell University, Ithaca; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Carter, G. J., District Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Avoca
 Chapman, Mernette L., District Superintendent of Schools, Seneca County, Ovid
 Clark, Claude R., District Superintendent of Schools, Essex County, Bloomingdale
 Clark, F. B., District Superintendent of Schools, Greene County, Athens
 Codding, James W., District Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Chazy
 Craib, (Mrs.) Mildred Hull, District Superintendent of Schools, Rensselaer County, Berlin
 Crist, (Mrs.) Amy Bull, District Superintendent of Schools, Orange County, Montgomery
 Cyr, Frank W., Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
 Daulton, George R., District Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Bath
 Donnan, E. Craig, District Superintendent of Schools, Tompkins County, Newfield
 Durlach, (Mrs.) Theresa, 875 Park Avenue, New York City
 Elliott, Lloyd H., Associate Professor of Rural Education, Cornell University, Ithaca
 Fahrenholz, Francis J., District Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Argyle
 Fennell, Edward G., Supervising Principal, Newfield Central School, Newfield
 Ford, (Mrs.) Thomas J., Director of School Relations, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York City
 Foreman, Lester B., District Superintendent of Schools, Monroe County, Pittsford
 Foster, Fred P., District Superintendent of Schools, Chenango County, Afton
 French, Harold, *Life Member*, Loudonville
 Gibbin, Kenneth E., District Superintendent of Schools, Cattaraugus County, East Randolph
 Green, Edward T., Supervising Principal, New Berlin Central School, New Berlin
 Griffin, Francis E., Chief, Bureau of Rural Administrative Services, State Education Department, Albany; State Director; Planning Committee, North Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Gross, Harry W., District Superintendent of Schools, Nassau County, Mineola
 Hakes, Elton J., District Superintendent of Schools, Rensselaer County, Troy
 Hakes, W. Gaylord, District Superintendent of Schools, Dutchess County, Poughkeepsie
 Hamilton, Leon W., District Superintendent of Schools, Madison County, Morrisville
 Harkness, Archie W., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, Williamsville
 Harold, John W., District Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Ellenburg Depot
 Hausner, Harold S., District Superintendent of Schools, Herkimer County, Mohawk
 Hayes, Dale K., Director of Research, American School Publishing Corporation, New York City
 Hirst, Eric A., Principal, Wyandanch #2, Suffolk County, Wyandanch
 Hitchcock, Elwood, District Superintendent of Schools, Greene County, East Jewett
 Hodgdon, Evelyn R., Professor of Education, State Teachers College, Oneonta; Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
 Hoeldtke, Ernest H., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, Buffalo
 Hoffman, M. Gazelle, District Superintendent of Schools, Niagara County, Lewiston
 Hoffmann, Stanley B., District Superintendent of Schools, Putnam County, Carmel
 Holmes, Harold W., District Superintendent of Schools, Columbia County, Copake
 Hopf, John F., Jr., District Superintendent of Schools, Rockland County, New City
 Hutchins, Margaret, Professor of Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca
 Jackson, Carlton J., District Superintendent of Schools, Chemung County, Elmira
 Johnson, Howard R., District Superintendent of Schools, Broome County, Deposit
 Johnson, Ralph H., District Superintendent of Schools, Ulster County, New Paltz
 Keenan, Joseph M., District Superintendent of Schools, Warren County, Bolton Landing
 Kreutziger, A. C., President, Coach and Equipment Sales Corporation, Penn Yan
 Lacy, C. A., District Superintendent of Schools, Cortland County, Marathon
 Livingston, M. J., District Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Williamson
 Loveless, John E., District Superintendent of Schools, Ontario County, Chilton Springs

McWhorter, (Mrs.) M. C., *Life Member*, Pine City

May, Charles G., District Superintendent of Schools, Livingston County, Livonia

Miller, Marian V., Chairman, Rural School Health Service Committee, American Heart Association, New York City

Morey, Julia M., State Teachers College, Oneonta

Morse, Frances C., Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York City

Muehe, C. C., District Superintendent of Schools, Ontario County, Stanley

Munson, J. Paul, District Superintendent of Schools, Tompkins County, Groton

Murphy, John F., Principal, Woodhull High School, Woodhull

Myers, F. Donald, District Superintendent of Schools, Saratoga County, Wilton

Olds, Leon A., District Superintendent of Schools, Tompkins County, Ithaca

Ormsby, Wallace D., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, North Collins

Pryor, John J., Teacher, Sewanhaha High School, Floral Park

Osborn, Harold R., District Superintendent of Schools, Orleans County, Kendall

Prince, J. E., District State Health Officer, Jamestown

Radley, Arthur A., District Superintendent of Schools, Oneida County, Waterville

Rathbun, (Mrs.) Roy E., District Superintendent of Schools, Cortland County, Cincinnatus

Rodger, (Mrs.) Mabelle L., District Superintendent of Schools, Cayuga County, Horava

Rossa, Lester J., District Superintendent of Schools, Ulster County, Stone Ridge

Sackett, Howard G., District Superintendent of Schools, Lewis County, Port Leyden; Executive Committee of the Department

Saunders, Richard F., President, Save the Children Federation, New York City

Schmidt, A. W., Assistant Commissioner, Finance and School Administration Services, State Education Department, Albany

Sears, Clinton T., District Superintendent of Schools, Ontario County, Horseoye

Shoemaker, Elwin S., District Superintendent of Schools, Oneida County, Yorkville; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

Slater, Glenn A., District Superintendent of Schools, Broome County, Binghamton

Sloan, De Villos, District Superintendent of Schools, Onondaga County, Elbridge

Smith, Calvin U., District Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Painted Post

Smith, De Alton, District Superintendent of Schools, Onondaga County, Manlius

Smith, Dorothy D., The Judson, New York City

Smith, J. E., District Superintendent of Schools, Delaware County, Deposit

Smith, Orrin M., District Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Wolcott

Southworth, Nathan C., District Superintendent of Schools, Oswego County, East Springfield

Strang, Ruth, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Tyson, Harold Canfield, District Superintendent of Schools, Otsego County, Unadilla

Underwood, Stephen L., District Superintendent of Schools, Yates County, Branchport

Vannatter, Harold H., Director of Instruction, Oswego County Board of Cooperative Services, Pulaski

Vrooman, Raymond C., District Superintendent of Schools, Oneida County, Camden

Walrath, Grant, District Superintendent of Schools, Cattaraugus County, Salamanca

Ward, Harry B., District Superintendent of Schools, Suffolk County, Riverhead

Wileux, John, Supervising Principal, Candor Central School, Candor; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies

Wilson, E. J., Supervising Principal, Spencerport Central School, Spencerport

Winans, Rodney Olin, District Superintendent of Schools, Saratoga County, Round Lake

Winch, Ruth B., District Superintendent of Schools, Chautauqua County, Westfield

Winchester, Milo F., District Superintendent of Schools, Dutchess County, Millerton

Younsans, Ernest G., District Superintendent of Schools, Chenango County, Sherburne

Zeller, Alfred G., District Superintendent of Schools, Madison County, Oneida

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, New York City

Eutler Library, New York State College for Teachers, Buffalo

Glass Dome Tours, Inc., New York City

Library, New York State College for Teachers, Cortland

Library, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Library, New York University, Washington Square, New York City

Library, New York State College for Teachers, Oswego

Turkish Educational Attache, Turkish Embassy, Empire State Building, New York City

NORTH CAROLINA

Brimley, Ralph F. W., Superintendent, Forsyth County Schools, Hanes

Chewning, Charles H., Superintendent, Durham County Schools, Durham

Cooke, Anna M., Supervisor of Elementary Schools, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh

Duncan, E. E., Supervisor of High Schools, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh

Erwin, Charles C., Superintendent, Rowan County Schools, Salisbury; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

Evans, Paul F., Superintendent, Davidson County Schools, Lexington

Furr, C. A., Superintendent, Cabarrus County Schools, Concord

Gug, T. Ward, Superintendent, Columbus County Schools, Whiteville

Incoe, L. S., Superintendent, Nash County Schools, Nashville

Lents, J. J., Superintendent, Lee County Schools, Sanford

Mitchell, H. L., Minister-County Agent, Gatesville

Morrill, Maurice B., Associate Professor of Education, Western Carolina College, Cullowhee

Proctor, R. S., Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Goldsboro

Robertson, Glenn, Principal, Beulah High School, Surry County Schools, Mount Airy

Ryan, W. Carson, Professor of Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Shelton, Nollie W., Superintendent, Hyde County Schools, Swan Quarter

Tomberlin, R. A., District Superintendent of Schools, Buncombe County, Weaverville

Turner, N. L., Superintendent, Northampton County Schools, Jackson

Yount, M. E., Superintendent, Alamance County Schools, Graham; State Director; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

D. H. Hill Library, North Carolina State College, Raleigh
Library, North Carolina College at Durham, Durham

NORTH DAKOTA

Barnes, James A., Professor of Elementary Education, State Teachers College, Mayville
Benson, (Mrs.) Alice G., Superintendent of Schools, Bowman County, Bowman
Bishop, R. S., Superintendent of Schools, Hebron; Planning Committee, Midwest Conference on Administrative Leadership Service Community Schools
Bjork, A. J., Associate Professor, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
Bly, (Mrs.) Gladia Wade, Superintendent of Schools, Burke County, Bowbells
Brown, (Mrs.) Clara D., Superintendent of Schools, Slope County, Amidon
Cushman, M. L., Dean, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks; Executive Committee of the Department
Dalager, Paul A., Executive Secretary, North Dakota Education Association, Bismarck
Danicourt, (Mrs.) John, Teacher, Mooreton District #1, Mooreton
Evanson, (Mrs.) Lulu, Director of Education, North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown
Evingaon, Caroline J., Superintendent of Schools, Cass County, Fargo
Ewen, Leila C., State Teachers College, Minot; Executive Committee of the Department
Johnson, Charles A., Rural Supervisor of Schools, Dickinson
Johnson, (Mrs.) Luba E., Superintendent of Schools, Rolette County, Rolla; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Kramer, Elsie M., Superintendent of Schools, McHenry County, Towner
Lynne, Helen G., Superintendent of Schools, McLean County, Washburn
Miller, (Mrs.) Esther A., Superintendent of Schools, Traill County, Hillsboro
Nordrum, G. B., Director, School Construction Fund, State Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck
Payne, Frank B., Superintendent of Schools, Ward County, Minot
Peterson, M. F., Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Schmoker, Jessie R., Superintendent of Schools, La Moure County, La Moure
Thompson, Julia M., Superintendent of Schools, McKenzie County, Watford City
Wallace, (Mrs.) Ruth, Superintendent of Schools, Eddy County, New Rockford
Well, Alice C., Superintendent of Schools, Pembina County, Cavalier

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, State Teachers College, Mayville
Library, State Teachers College, Minot

OHIO

Barnes, Vernon W., Superintendent of Schools, Jackson County, Jackson

Beery, George C., Superintendent of Schools, Franklin County, Columbus; State Director; Committee to Work with CPEA
Bell, A. C., Superintendent of Schools, Paulding County, Paulding
Bixler, Melvin R., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Stark County, Louisville
Bodle, Bessie B., Teacher, Toledo
Brand, R. G., Superintendent of Schools, Van Wert County, Van Wert
Coblentz, C. R., Superintendent of Schools, Preble County, Eaton
Coffeen, Carl, Superintendent of Schools, Summit County, Cuyahoga Falls
Crouch, Charles B., Superintendent of Schools, Hamilton County, Cincinnati
Dillon, Samuel H., Superintendent of Schools, Hocking County, Logan
Driscoll, W. A., Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Dayton
Ely, Ralph, Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Wooster
Eyman, R. M., Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Columbus; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Finley, L. M., Superintendent of Schools, Ashland County, Jefferson
Gantz, T. A., Superintendent of Schools, Morrow County, Mt. Gilead
Gibbens, C. A., Superintendent of Schools, Lorain County, Elyria
Goodrich, Ivam, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Huron County, Norwalk
Hanes, Glen M., Superintendent of Schools, Knox County, Mt. Vernon
Hatfield, Raymon F., Superintendent of Schools, Warren County, Lebanon
Hawke, Oscar T., Superintendent of Schools, Clark County, Springfield
Humphreys, Phila A., Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Columbus
Joseph, E. J., Superintendent of Schools, Hancock County, Findley
Kinney, Dale B., Superintendent of Schools, Richland County, Mansfield
Kirkpatrick, Ellis L., Professor of Sociology, Marietta College, Marietta
Knapp, T. C., Superintendent of Schools, Stark County, Canton; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Lautenschlager, J. F., Superintendent of Schools, Coshocton County, Coshocton; Executive Committee of the Department; President, Division of Pupil Transportation, 1955-56
Laws, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Tuscarawas County, New Philadelphia
Loudenback, H. M., Superintendent of Schools, Champaign County, Urbana
Martin, Samuel E., Superintendent of Schools, Seneca County, Tiffin
McBride, James L., Superintendent of Schools, Columbiana County, Lisbon
McCowen, E. V., Superintendent of Schools, Scioto County, Portsmouth
McKibben, R. M., Superintendent of Schools, Putnam County, Ottawa
Neeley, (Mrs.) Ida Marie, Teacher, Lancaster High School, Millersport
Oman, D. W., Superintendent of Schools, Wyandot County, Upper Sandusky
Pullock, Frank J., Superintendent of Schools, Monroe County, Woodfield
Ransdell, Frank C., Superintendent of Schools, Hardin County, Kenton
Rasor, Floyd, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Dayton

Rausch, Calvin, Superintendent of Schools, Portage County, Ravenna
 Redman, George E., Superintendent of Schools, Harrison County, Cadiz
 Roshon, Ray E., Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson County, Steubenville
 Ryder, H. E., Superintendent of Schools, Lucas County, Toledo
 Sanders, Hershel W., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Preble County, Eaton
 Schlegel, E. C., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Stark County, East Sparta
 Sebold, Harold, Superintendent of Schools, Licking County, Newark
 Shaman, W. L., Superintendent of Schools, Cuyahoga County, Cleveland
 Smith, W. C., Superintendent of Schools, Mahoning County, Youngstown
 Sollars, S. K., Superintendent of Schools, Crawford County, Bucyrus
 Specht, Clarence W., Superintendent of Schools, Fort Jennings
 Stanfield, John M., Superintendent of Schools, Logan County, Bellefontaine
 Thompson, C. V., Superintendent of Schools, Miami County, Troy
 Wakefield, Howard E., Project Coordinator, CPEA, Ohio State University, Columbus
 Way, J. E., Superintendent of Schools, Pike County, Waverly
 Weakly, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, Sandusky
 Welshimer, Earl C., Director of Research, Carpenter Body Company, Worthington
 West, Glen C., Superintendent of Schools, Mercer County, Celina
 White, H. A., Superintendent of Schools, Medina County, Medina
 Whitman, William A., Superintendent of Schools, Sandusky County, Fremont

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Miami University, Oxford

OKLAHOMA

Abshier, (Mrs.) Leona, Superintendent of Schools, Okfuskee County, Okemah
 Boyer, D. L., Superintendent of Schools, Balco Camp, Wesley L., Director of Transportation, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City
 Ferguson, Leslie Guy, Superintendent of Schools, Tulsa County, Tulsa
 Fitzgerald, J. C., Assistant Director of College Extension, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater; State Director; Executive Committee of the Department; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Foster, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Craig County, Vinita
 Franklin, W. A., Superintendent of Schools, Kay County, Newkirk
 Golden, Neal V., Superintendent of Schools, Canadian County, El Reno
 Good, Charles, Superintendent of Schools, Lincoln County, Chandler
 Grady, C. E., Superintendent of Schools, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma City
 Hester, (Mrs.) Angie, Superintendent of Schools, McClain County, Purcell
 Jimerson, Fred, Superintendent of Schools, Ottawa County, Miami
 McCollom, Walter W., Superintendent of Schools, Glencoe
 Morgan, G. G., Assistant Director, Rural and Elementary Education, Muskogee
 Mustain, C. T., Superintendent of Schools, Choctaw
 Obuch, W. A., Superintendent of Schools, Antlers

Pritchard, Guy M., Principal, Hillside Consolidated Schools, Cushing
 Rowe, Omer, Superintendent of Schools, Carter County, Ardmore
 Sadler, Steve, Superintendent, Straight School, District #80, Guymon
 Shoop, William E., Superintendent of Schools, Noble County, Perry
 Smart, Jake, Director, Rural and Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City
 Sorenson, Helmer E., Associate Dean, College of Education, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater
 Tarver, James D., Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Rural Life, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater
 Wallace, Morris B., Professor of Education, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater
 Vaught, Charles E., Superintendent of Schools, Spiro
 Yarbrough, Theo, Superintendent of Schools, Texas County, Guymon

OREGON

Baker, (Mrs.) Helen P., Superintendent of Schools, Benton County, Corvallis
 Barneburg, Kenneth F., Superintendent of Schools, Douglas County, Roseburg
 Beardsley, Florence E., Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Salem
 Booth, (Mrs.) Agnes C., Superintendent of Schools, Marion County, Salem
 Boyer, (Mrs.) Estella C., Superintendent of Schools, Grant County, Canyon City
 Buckingham, (Mrs.) Veima G., Superintendent of Schools, Deschutes County, Bend
 Casiday, (Mrs.) Lois S., 6036 S. E. Reedway, Portland
 Clem, (Mrs.) Beryl E., Supervising Teacher, Eastern Oregon College of Education, La Grande
 Corwin, George A., Superintendent of Schools, Hood River County, Hood River
 Couzens, (Mrs.) Eda E., Superintendent of Schools, Union County, La Grande
 Eaton, Asa T., Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson County, Madras
 Farley, Lillian, Superintendent of Schools, Coos County, Coquille
 Fleming, Elmer W., Superintendent of Schools, Josephine County, Grants Pass
 Flug, Jack C., Superintendent of Schools, Morrow County, Heppner
 George, (Mrs.) Frances L., Principal, Howard School, Mitchell Star Route, Prineville
 Gould, (Mrs.) Ruth, Elementary Consultant, Lane County, Eugene
 Grant, Leslie E., Superintendent, Morrow Rural School District, Heppner
 Gubser, Lynn, Superintendent of Schools, Yamhill County, McMinnville
 Kent, (Mrs.) Lois D., Superintendent of Schools, Columbia County, St. Helens
 Klinge, (Mrs.) Lucille L., Superintendent of Schools, Lane County, Eugene; President, Department of Rural Education, 1954-55; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Committee to Work with CPEA
 Knighten, Willy W., Superintendent of Schools, Sherman County, Moro
 Langton, T. J., Superintendent of Schools, Tillamook County, Tillamook; deceased January 1955
 Lee, (Mrs.) Myrtle E., Superintendent of Schools, Baker County, Baker
 Longfellow, J. T., District Superintendent of Schools, Lincoln County, Newport
 Mekvold, Alf B., Superintendent of Schools, Jackson County, Medford; State Director

Miller, John M., Director of Teacher Education, Eastern Oregon College of Education, La Grande
 Mohr, L. C., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Springfield
 Posey, C. W., Executive Secretary, Oregon Education Association, Portland
 Putnam, Rex, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Salem
 Rees, Errol C., Superintendent of Schools, Multnomah County, Portland
 Schweppe, Erma, Elementary Consultant, Lane County, Eugene
 Shold, Walter O., Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Salem
 Sly, Cecil M., Superintendent of Schools, Crook County, Prineville
 Sprague, (Mrs.) Anne, Superintendent of Schools, Lake County, Lakeview
 Towler, E. D., Superintendent of Schools, Clatsop County, Astoria
 Voelker, Cliff H., Superintendent of Schools, Curry County, Gold Beach
 Withycombe, Florence, Supervisor of Elementary Schools, Washington County, Hillsboro
 Woodcock, Richard W., Director of Special Education, Coos County, Coquille
 Woodworth, E. A., Superintendent of Schools, Clackamas County, Oregon City

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Eastern Oregon College of Education, La Grande
 Library, Oregon College of Education, Monmouth
 Oregon Association of County School Superintendents, Salem
 Oregon State Library, Salem

PENNSYLVANIA

Akeley, A. P., Superintendent of Schools, Potter County, Coudersport
 Ammerman, H. H., Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Honesdale
 App, I. D., Superintendent of Schools, Dauphin County, Harrisburg
 Barnett, Ralph E., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Somerset County, Somerset
 Beattie, Alfred W., Superintendent of Schools, Allegheny County, Pittsburgh
 Boehm, Charles R., Superintendent of Schools, Bucks County, Doylestown; Planning Committee, North Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education; Co-Chairman, National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Bowman, Douglas J., Supervisor of Special Education, Washington County, Washington
 Burkhardt, J. Paul, Superintendent of Schools, Cumberland County, Carlisle
 Burkholder, W. Clay, Superintendent of Schools, Mifflin County, Lewisport
 Butts, James E., Superintendent of Schools, Blair County, Hollidaysburg; State Director; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents
 Conway, R. F., Superintendent of Schools, Lawrence County, New Castle
 Corbett, Thomas E., Cherry Tree
 Donaldson, W. H., Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Washington
 Eastman, Wesley C., Teacher, Honesdale
 Faust, Beaver S., Superintendent of Schools, Juniata County, Mifflintown
 Felt, C. F., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, McKean County, Smethport
 Fink, Lyall J., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Dauphin County, Harrisburg

Francis, Thomas, Superintendent of Schools, Lackawanna County, Scranton
 Geiss, Newton W., Superintendent of Schools, Berks County, Reading
 Gideon, (Mrs.) Sara R., Teacher, East Berlin High School, East Berlin
 Gledhill, Richard E., Supervisor of Special Education, Snyder County, Middleburg
 Hess, Walter L., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Slippery Rock
 Kolpien, Maurice E., Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, Erie
 Kurtz, Paul, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Blair County, Bellwood
 Maxwell, Charles F., Life Member, Greensburg
 McConnel, Clarence H., Superintendent of Schools, Lycoming County, Williamsport
 McKelvey, Eugene M., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Westmoreland County, Greensburg
 Meyer, Nathan G., Head, Department of Education, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg
 Moon, Allen R., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Crawford County, Meadville
 Raffensperger, Charles I., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Adams County, Gettysburg
 Robinson, Raymond W., Chief, Consolidation and Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg
 Shaw, (Mrs.) Genevieve Bowen, Pebble Hills Acres, Doylestown; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene
 Small, Thelma E., Training Teacher, State Teachers College, Shippensburg
 Sollenberger, D. Raymond, Supervising Principal, Williamsburg Community Schools, Williamsburg
 Stevens, Glenn Z., Associate Professor of Agriculture Education, Pennsylvania State University, University Park
 Spidel, Harold O., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Schuylkill County, Pine Grove
 Stock, Earl K., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Centre County, Bellefonte; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Swarts, H. E., Superintendent of Schools, York County, York
 Ulrich, Foster G., Superintendent of Schools, Lebanon County, Lebanon
 Weader, W. Michael, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Snyder County, McClure
 Wetzel, Jacob F., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Centre County, Centre Hall
 Wills, M. Vincent, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Westmoreland County, Greensburg
 Wise, Wilmer E., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Oxford Area Schools, Oxford
 Yeager, William A., Professor of Educational Administration, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh
 Zetler, (Mrs.) Paul A., Unit President, Congress of Parents and Teachers, Altoona

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Free Library of Philadelphia, Middle City West District, Philadelphia
 State Teachers College, West Chester

RHODE ISLAND

Noble, Mark C. S., Jr., College of Arts and Sciences, University of Rhode Island, Kingston; State Director; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Potter, Ivy E., Teacher, Saylesville
 Pratt, Edward S., Principal, High School, Wickford

SOUTH CAROLINA

Bruce, W. T., Principal, Greenville School, Greenville County Schools, Greenville
 Chastain, W. H., Supervising Principal, Mauldin High School, Mauldin
 Dunn, W. R., Superintendent of Schools, Greenwood County, Greenwood
 Edwards, Katharine, Consultant, School Health, Greenville County Schools, Greenville
 Green, Albert, Superintendent of Schools, Georgetown County, Georgetown
 Loggins, W. F., Superintendent, Greenville County Schools, Greenville
 Myler, Joe C., Superintendent of Schools, Lancaster County, Lancaster
 Rawlinson, Lin W., Supervisor of Transportation, State Department of Education, Georgetown
 Rowland, Minnie Lee, Supervisor of Primary and Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Columbia
 Rutland, A. J., Superintendent of Schools, Aiken County, Aiken; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Verdin, T. M., Jr., Director of Rural Service, Greenville County Schools, Greenville; Executive Committee of the Department; State Director; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Ward, W. H., Director, Extension Division, University of South Carolina, Columbia

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Clemson College, Cornelia A. Graham, Librarian, Clemson

SOUTH DAKOTA

Broadwine, (Mrs.) Doris, Superintendent of Schools, Hamlin County, Hayti
 Bohri, Florence, Superintendent of Schools, Clark County, Clark
 Bymers, (Mrs.) Gladys, Superintendent of Schools, Spink County, Redfield
 Delzell, Mark W., Dean, School of Education, University of South Dakota, Vermillion; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Fraser, (Mrs.) Pearl L., Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo County, Gann Valley
 Gehring, (Mrs.) Ada, Superintendent of Schools, Miner County, Howard
 Grothe, Amos, Superintendent of Schools, Pennington County, Rapid City
 Hervig, O. Edgar, Superintendent of Schools, Minnehaha County, Sioux Falls; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Hodges, Harry, Lake Preston
 Johnson, Ruth V., Superintendent of Schools, Brown County, Aberdeen
 Jydstrup, (Mrs.) Helen, Superintendent of Schools, Grant County, Milbank
 Koehne, Norma, Superintendent of Schools, Kingsbury County, De Smet
 Lee, Mabel, Superintendent of Schools, Roberts County, Sisseton
 Long, Margaret, Superintendent of Schools, Beadle County, Huron; State Director
 Lorentson, (Mrs.) Winifred, Superintendent of Schools, Hand County, Miller
 McGinnis, (Mrs.) Irene G., Superintendent of Schools, Perkins County, Bison
 Martin, (Mrs.) June, Superintendent of Schools, Fall River County, Hot Springs
 Middlebrook, (Mrs.) Marion, Superintendent of Schools, Meade County, Sturgis
 Opilker, E. C., Superintendent of Schools, Day County, Webster

Rajewich, (Mrs.) Zona, Superintendent of Schools, Mellette County, White River
 Simmons, (Mrs.) Helen, Superintendent of Schools, Brookings County, Brookings
 Strobel, Otto, Superintendent of Schools, McPherson County, Leola
 Titus, Edna M., Superintendent of Schools, Sanborn County, Woonsocket
 Weiszarr, Nellie, Superintendent of Schools, Edmunds County, Ipswich
 Wells, (Mrs.) Hilda, Superintendent of Schools, Lawrence County, Deadwood
 White, C. E., Superintendent of Schools, Canton; Planning Committee, Midwest Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Woodall, F. C., Superintendent of Schools, Aurora County, Plankinton

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, General Beadle State Teachers College, Madison
 Library, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen

TENNESSEE

Armour, Quinnie, Bolivar
 Avery, C. R., Principal, Central School, Montgomery County Schools, Cunningham
 Barnes, George H., Superintendent, Shelby County Schools, Memphis
 Black, R. E., Superintendent, Crockett County Schools, Alamo
 Bragg, William, Superintendent, Cannon County Schools, Woodbury
 Brown, Glennon C., Superintendent, Greene County Schools, Greenville
 Connolly, W. M., Superintendent, Marshall County Schools, Lewisburg
 Dailey, B. C., Principal, Parsons High School, Decatur County Schools, Parsons
 Dossett, Burgin E., President, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
 Doyle, Mildred E., Superintendent, Knox County Schools, Knoxville
 Faulkner, Shannon D., Superintendent, Tipton County Schools, Covington
 Fitzgerald, N. E., Dean, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Frost, Norman, Life Member, Rural Education, American Institute of Cooperation, Nashville
 Gray, E. A., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Sumner County Schools, Gallatin
 Human, W. D., Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Warburg
 Hyder, Gretchen, Director of Field Service, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
 Moore, H. Claude, Superintendent, Dyer County Schools, Dyersburg; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Moss, J. E., Superintendent, Davidson County Schools, Nashville
 Pesse, Clarke D., Route 2, Fairview
 Perkins, Billy M., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Dyer County Schools, Newbern
 Pichel, T. Wesley, Co-Director, Division of Schoolhouse Planning and Transportation, State Department of Education, Nashville; Executive Committee, Division of School Transportation
 Pickens, H. D., Professor, Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City
 Pierce, Truman M., Professor of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
 Powers, Sue, Life Member, The Gilmores, Memphis

Smotherman, Bealer, Assistant Professor of Education, Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro
 Southall, Maycie, Professor of Elementary Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
 Stevens, Jack, Superintendent, Perry County Schools, Linden
 Thomas, R. Lee, Director of Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, Nashville
 Turner, W. E., Director, Division of Negro Education, State Department of Education, Nashville
 Williamson, D. C., Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Gainesboro

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
 Library, Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro
 Library, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville

TEXAS

Alves, H. F., Director, Southwestern Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, University of Texas, Austin
 Bailey, Walker, Superintendent of Schools, Howard County, Big Spring
 Beane, R. D., Superintendent of Schools, Hidalgo County, Edinburg
 Boyd, Roy, Superintendent of Schools, Lubbock County, Lubbock; Planning Committee, Southwest Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Bright, J. B., Superintendent of Schools, Johnson County, Cleburne
 Brockett, M. L., Superintendent of Schools, Hillsboro
 Bunting, W. D., Superintendent of Schools, Brazos County, Bryan
 Campbell, Leoma, Superintendent of Schools, Coryell County, Gatesville
 Carlile, Shelia, Supervisor of Elementary Education, Lubbock County, Lubbock
 Carney, N. L., Field Representative, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Dallas
 Carroll, John S., Head, Department of Education, Texas Technological College, Lubbock; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene
 Chalmers, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Cooke County, Gainesville
 Conoley, Gilbert, Superintendent of Schools, Williamson County, Georgetown
 Crawley, W. C., Superintendent of Schools, Liberty County, Liberty
 Dean, Guy D., Superintendent of Schools, Uvalde County, Uvalde
 Dean, Maud, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Lubbock County, Lubbock
 Elkins, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Runnels County, Ballenger
 Foreman, Mary, Superintendent of Schools, Hall County, Memphis
 Fort, Ben, Superintendent of Schools, Bowie County, Boston
 Gaston, (Mrs.) Elizabeth A., Supervisor of Rural Schools, Tom Green County, San Angelo
 Hathcock, (Mrs.) Willie M., Superintendent of Schools, Hale County, Plainview
 Hancock, W. F., Superintendent of Schools, Dewitt County, Cuero
 Harris, R. E., Superintendent of Schools, Caldwell County, Lockhart; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; Planning Committee, Mid-

south Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education; Committee to Work with CPEA
 Herndon, (Mrs.) Ellen O., Elementary Teacher, San Angelo
 Hughes, (Mrs.) Roy, Superintendent of Schools, Wilbarger County, Vernon
 Jackson, Frank M., Superintendent of Schools, Tom Green County, San Angelo; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Johnson, R. H., Superintendent of Schools, Anderson County, Palestine
 Malish, William, Superintendent of Schools, Thrall
 Martinez, Arnulfo S., Superintendent of Schools, Starr County, Rio Grande City
 Mason, J. Marcus, Superintendent of Schools, Houston County, Crockett
 McIntyre, Kenneth E., Associate Professor, Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Texas, Austin; Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society
 Neal, Connally, Superintendent of Schools, Bell County, Belton
 Nuckols, B. R., Superintendent of Schools, Gray County, Pampa
 Ramsey, John C., Superintendent of Schools, Hill County, Hillsboro
 Rherson, Ruth M., Superintendent of Schools, Donley County, Clarendon
 Roberts, L. A., Superintendent of Schools, Dallas County, Dallas; Executive Committee of the Department
 Sanders, Mary Shipp, Life Member, Cleburne
 Smith, Curtis W., Principal, Twin Mountain School, Tankersley
 Smith, Morton, Superintendent of Schools, Harrison County, Marshall
 Stoepler, George, Principal, Blackwell Rural High School, Blackwell
 Stowe, O. H., Superintendent of Schools, Tarrant County, Fort Worth
 Watson, J. C., Superintendent of Schools, Navarro County, Corsicana
 Wents, George, Superintendent of Schools, Hays County, San Marcos
 Whittington, Charles W., Superintendent of Schools, Potter County, Amarillo
 Wilroy, T. J., Superintendent of Schools, Angelina County, Lufkin
 Wynn, Guy N., Superintendent of Schools, Fort Bend County, Richmond

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Estill Library, Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville
 Library, Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches
 Library, University of Houston, Houston
 Library, University of Texas, Austin
 Library, West Texas State College, Canyon
 Walker Memorial Library, Howard Payne College, Brownwood

UTAH

Chipman, R. S., Superintendent, North Summit School District, Coalville
 Frye, Clifford L., Superintendent, Emery County School District, Huntington
 Gourley, David, Superintendent, Granite School District, Salt Lake City
 Nicholas, Mark, Director of Vocational and Agricultural Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Salt Lake City; Planning Committee, Rocky Mountain Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Theurer, Lloyd M., Superintendent, Cache County School District, Logan; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Com-

mission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City

VERMONT

Butler, N. Richard, Superintendent of Schools, Rockingham-Westminster District, Windham County, Bellows Falls
 Coddling, Ernest M., Superintendent of Schools, Northeast District, Addison County, Bristol; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Holden, A. John, Jr., Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Montpelier
 Keniston, Harry, Superintendent of Schools, Central District, Orleans County, Barton
 Maynard, Addie, E., Helping Teacher, State Department of Education, Fair Haven
 Russell, Karlene Verna, Helping Teacher, State Department of Education, Barton
 Sawyer, Charles D., Superintendent of Schools, Northeast District, Washington County, Montpelier
 White, Thomas H., Superintendent of Schools, Grand Isle County, All Arg

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

State Teachers College, Lyndon Center

VIRGINIA

Beverley, (Mrs.) F. C., Danville; retired, formerly Principal, Whitwell Farm Life School, Whitwell
 Bradley, C. M., Division Superintendent, Fauquier County Schools, Warrenton
 Buckland, Roscoe V., Division Superintendent, Highland County Schools, Monterey
 Burton, George W., Division Superintendent, Clarke County Schools, Berryville
 Cassell, H. K., Division Superintendent, Augusta County Schools, Staunton; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; State Director
 Chittum, Edwin W., Division Superintendent, Norfolk County Schools, Norfolk; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Collins, Paul W., Division Superintendent, Scott County Schools, Gate City
 Critzer, Frank J., Division Superintendent, Pulaski County Schools, Pulaski
 Duncan, James A., Rural Youth Specialist, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg
 Ezz, Kenneth P., Principal, Lunenburg County High School, Lunenburg County Schools, Victoria
 Fulcher, Tyler, Division Superintendent, Amherst County Schools, Madison Heights
 Gasque, Q. D., Division Superintendent, Warren-Rappahannock County Schools, Front Royal
 Haga, Alonzo B., Division Superintendent, Mecklenburg County Schools, Boydton
 Hounshell, Paul, Division Superintendent, Culpeper County Schools, Culpeper
 Indorf, Frederick A., President, Loudon Community College, Leesburg
 Kay, Floyd S., Division Superintendent, Rockbridge County Schools, Lexington
 Kyle, Roy E., Division Superintendent, Bedford County Schools, Bedford
 Lloyd, Herman B., Principal, Boyce School, Clarke County Schools, Boyce
 Mauck, J. Leonard, Division Superintendent, Smyth County Schools, Marlon

Mellswine, T. J., Division Superintendent, Prince Edward and Cumberland County Schools, Farmville
 Monroe, Charles N., Principal, Leesburg Elementary School, Loudoun County Schools, Leesburg
 Quinley, (Mrs.) Hattie G., 8th Grade Coordinator, Alexandria Schools, Alexandria
 Rhody, Burt C., Division Superintendent, Grayson County Schools, Independence
 Rutter, T. Edward, Division Superintendent, Arlington County Schools, Arlington
 Thweatt, Theodore O., Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Disputanta Training School, Prince Georges County Schools, Disputanta
 Vaughan, W. A., Division Superintendent, Caroline County Schools, Bowlin, Green
 Warburton, (Mrs.) Amber Athun, Executive Secretary, Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth, McLean
 Will, Edwin E., Division Superintendent, Bath County Schools, Warm Springs

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State College, Petersburg
 Library, Radford College, Radford

WASHINGTON

Allen, A. W., Superintendent of Schools, Yakima County, Yakima
 Baker, (Mrs.) Helen A., Superintendent of Schools, Island County, Coupeville
 Bennett, (Mrs.) Dorothy J., Superintendent of Schools, Snohomish County, Everett
 Bethel, (Mrs.) Ruth, Superintendent of Schools, Pierce County, Tacoma
 Cramblitt, De Fore, Superintendent of Schools, Kitsap County, Port Orchard
 Cross, (Mrs.) Lydia F., Superintendent of Schools, Cowlitz County, Kelso
 Dahlke, Florence, Superintendent of Schools, Douglas County, Waterville
 Dubois, (Mrs.) Ruby K., Superintendent of Schools, Stevens County, Colville
 Hussey, Clifton A., Superintendent of Schools, Mead
 Kinkade, H. J., Superintendent of Schools, Chelan County, Wenatchee
 Loree, G. Ira, Superintendent of Schools, Skagit County, Mount Vernon; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Miles, J. E., Superintendent of Schools, Kittitas County, Ellensburg
 Pierce, (Mrs.) Mary C., Superintendent of Schools, Adams County, Ritzville

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg
 Library, State College of Washington, Pullman

WEST VIRGINIA

Baldwin, Robert D., Professor of Educational Administration, West Virginia University, Morgantown
 Crawford, Robert T., Superintendent, Lewis County Schools, Weston
 Creasy, James L., Superintendent, Berkeley County Schools, Martinsburg; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Darnell, William Earl, Supervisor of Transportation, Greenbrier County Schools, Lewisburg; Vice President, Division of Pupil Transportation, 1955-56
 Fields, Earl W., Assistant Superintendent, Kanawha County Schools, Charleston

Hugo, James L., Dean, West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon
 Ideman, H. L., Superintendent, Mineral County Schools, Keyser
 Jones, Daniel M., Assistant Superintendent, Berkeley County Schools, Martinsburg
 Lambert, Mrs. Audra G., Supervisor, Barbours County Schools, Bellington
 McGuffee, Jeannette, General Supervisor, Mineral County Schools, Keyser
 Marple, Clara, Reading Supervisor, Braxton County Schools, Flatwoods
 Montgomery, John F., President, Greenbrier Junior College, Lewisburg, Committee on Rural Life and Education in the World Series, Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Oates, H. Brown, Morgantown
 Thompson, (Mrs.) Juanita B., Director of Rural Education, Kanawha County Schools, Charleston; State Director
 Trussler, L. Brown, Superintendent, Upshur County Schools, Buckhannon
 Upson, Arthur V. G., Superintendent, Harrison County Schools, Clarksburg
 Watson, Paul W., Superintendent, Preston County Schools, Kingwood
 Wells, Nelson, Glenville State College, Glenville
 Willard, (Mrs.) Margaret, Elementary Supervisor, Fairmont State College, Morgantown

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

James E. Morrow Library, Marshall College, Huntington

WISCONSIN

Allen, Berwena L., Superintendent of Schools, Portage County, Stevens Point
 Barnard, C. M., Superintendent of Schools, Columbia County, Portage
 Berg, Mabel L., Supervising Teacher, Bangor
 Brown, Winston D., Superintendent of Schools, Waushara County, Waushara
 Burns, Lewis B., Superintendent of Schools, Pick County, Balsam Lake
 Corrigan, Ed., Principal, Wood County Normal School, Wisconsin Rapids
 Diehl, Margaret, Superintendent of Schools, Kenosha County, Kenosha
 Drake, Alice, Director, Rural Education, Wisconsin State College, La Crosse
 Dunn, Elizabeth, Superintendent of Schools, Price County, Phillips
 Edmund, Harold R., Superintendent of Schools, Lincoln County, Merrill
 Ellsworth, Sheridan, Superintendent of Schools, Walworth County, Elkhorn
 Erickson, N. S., Principal, Polk County Normal School, Saint Croix Falls
 Fowler, F. Robert, Superintendent of Schools, Winnebago County, Oshkosh
 Garnett, R. L., Director, Rural Education, Wisconsin State College, River Falls
 Gray, Russell T., Professor of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 Hale, F. E., Superintendent, Barron County Normal School, Rice Lake
 Hanson, Harry M., Superintendent of Schools, Dane County, Sun Prairie
 Hornback, Charles A., Director of Rural Education, Wisconsin State College, East Chaire
 Ihlenfeldt, R. S., Supervisor of Secondary Schools, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison
 Johnson, Robert L., Supervising Teacher, St. Croix County, Baldwin
 Jones, Alex. M., Superintendent of Schools, Grant County, Lancaster
 Jungck, F. W., Principal, Dunn County Normal School, Menomonie

Kaiser, Paul L., Superintendent of Schools, Dodge County, Juneau
 Kenosky, Marie E., Superintendent of Schools, Washburn County, Still Lake
 Kies, Michael S., Superintendent of Schools, Milwaukee County, Milwaukee; Vice President of the Department, 1966-68; Committee to Work with CPSEA; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Kneble, Matt C., Superintendent of Schools, Wood County, Wisconsin Rapids
 Kretlow, Burton W., Associate Professor of Rural Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
 Landberg, Arnold A., Supervising Principal, Joint District #11, Holcombe
 Leicht, (Mrs.) Hazel, Superintendent of Schools, La Crosse County, La Crosse
 Lightfoot, Ray B., Superintendent of Schools, Sheboygan County, Sheboygan
 Lindus, Thomas S., Supervising Principal, Gillet School, Gillet
 Longbottom, G. T., Principal, Lincoln County Normal School, Merrill
 Lowinski, Blanche, Superintendent of Schools, Dane County, Mount Horeb
 Moore, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Marathon County, Wausau
 Moser, Robert P., Superintendent, Joint School District #1, Columbus
 Nelson, Gordon L., Superintendent of Schools, Maple
 Ottum, Olga M., Principal, Rockdale School, Rockdale
 Pierce, Milton, Supervisor of Teachers, Milwaukee County, Milwaukee
 Pils, Jane, Principal, Demonstration School, Wood County Normal School, Wisconsin Rapids
 Powers, (Mrs.) Irene Corgan, Superintendent of Schools, Green County, Monroe
 Ritter, (Mrs.) Phyllis, Principal, Dodge County Normal School, Mayville
 Rohling, Ingvar M., Superintendent, Central School District #1, Phillips
 Rudie, N. H., Superintendent of Schools, Vernon County, Viroqua
 Schoenoff, Kurt R., Superintendent of Schools, Sauk County, Baraboo
 Shortz, Elsie, Superintendent of Schools, Pierce County, Ellsworth
 Shewki, Harry, Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, West Bend
 Stier, Woodrow J., Superintendent of Schools, Marvile
 Schreweide, O. J., Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo County, Alma
 Sorenson, Theo A., Director of Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Stewart, May L., Director of Curriculum for Rural School Teachers, Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh
 Thompson, Marie, Supervisor, Woods County, Wisconsin Rapids
 Timm, Lester A., Superintendent of Schools, Fond du Lac County, Fond du Lac
 Tannell, Edith M., Elementary Supervisor, Douglas County, Poplar
 Twigg, Laura May, Rural Supervising Teacher, Fond du Lac County, Fond du Lac
 Varvenick, Aleta Olson, Rural Supervising Teacher, Buffalo County, Alma
 Webster, Jennie L., Superintendent of Schools, Eau Claire County, Eau Claire
 Weinlich, H. C., Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Education Association, Madison

Weix, Frank, Principal, Bonduel Community School, Bonduel
 Wilhelmine, Sister M., Saint Rose Convent, La Crosse
 Winther, Adolph L., Director, Rural and Elementary Education, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater; State Director

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Wisconsin State College, La Crosse
 Library, Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point
 Library, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater
 Public Library, Milwaukee
 Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire
 Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee
 Wisconsin State College, Superior

WYOMING

Aaker, (Mrs.) Violet M., Teacher, Sheridan School, Sheridan
 Aleman, (Mrs.) Effie, Superintendent of Schools, Lincoln County, Kemmerer
 Carson, (Mrs.) Rosella, Superintendent of Schools, Laramie County, Cheyenne
 Emmett, E. T., Superintendent of Schools, Washakie County, Worland
 Linford, Velma, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Cheyenne
 McCort, (Mrs.) Jennie Chipp, Superintendent of Schools, Sweetwater County, Rock Springs
 Nelson, Helen J., Superintendent of Schools, Albany County, Laramie; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Reusser, Walter C., Dean, Division of Adult Education and Community Service, University of Wyoming, Laramie; State Director
 Sander, Dorris L., Director, Elementary Education and Education for Handicapped Children, State Department of Education, Cheyenne
 Warlow, (Mrs.) Viola W., Superintendent of Schools, Campbell County, Gillette
 Wagonman, (Mrs.) Florence E., Superintendent of Schools, Park County, Cody

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, University of Wyoming, Laramie

ALASKA

Murey, Lois M., Education Supervisor, Department of Education, Juneau

BOLIVIA

Olson, Hazel, Education Division, USOM, American Embassy, La Paz

CANADA

MacLeod, Nelson E., Inspector of Schools, Colchester County, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia
 Flower, G. E., Director, CEA-Kellogg Project, Toronto, Ontario
 Eamer, Gilbert D., Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

EGYPT

Scott, Donald E., USOM, American Embassy, Cairo; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene

NICARAGUA

Cree, Everett M., Educationist, FOA, American Embassy, Managua

PHILIPPINES

Bogtoren, T. N., Baguio City
 De Castro, Umanado G., Division Superintendent of Schools, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila
 Philippine Women's University, Manila

PUERTO RICO

Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce

NAME INDEX

(through Chapter 17)

- Alexander, Frank D., xi
 Ambrose, Luther, 199, 200
 Archer, Clifford P., xi, 193, 201
 Armstrong, W. Earl, 21, 22
 Barnard, Lulu, xii
 Bathurst, Effie, xii
 Beale, Calvin L., ix
 Bennett, Charles Dana, 177, 178
 Benson, Ezra Taft, viii, 184, 200
 Bertrand, Alvin L., ix, 37
 Brown, Muriel, 195
 Brownell, Samuel M., viii, 106
 Butterworth, Julian E., xii, 77, 80, 83, 87, 121
 Caldwell, Oliver J., 190
 Chase, Francis S., viii, 20, 24, 25, 26, 30, 66, 71, 81, 83, 86, 87
 Chisholm, Leslie L., 123, 126
 Clark, Lois M., xi, 160
 Cole, Earl L., 22
 Cooper, Shirley, 30, 129, 130, 203, 204, 207, 208
 Cox, John K., viii, 28
 Cushman, Martelle L., ix, 122, 123
 Cyr, Frank W., viii, 27, 28, 29, 124, 168
 Davis, John H., viii, 66, 67
 Dawson, Howard A., vi, viii, xi, 77, 80, 83, 87, 119, 120, 121, 122, 131, 133
 Deag, Francis L., 85, 77, 197
 Duncan, Otis D., ix
 Dunn, Fannie W., 11, 27, 43, 70, 73
 Ellena, William J., ix, xi, 119, 120, 121, 131, 133
 Ensminger, Douglas, 80
 Essert, Paul L., 126
 Exton, Elaine, xii
 Fitzwater, Charles O., 38, 120
 Foster, Ellery, 194
 Foster, Emery M., 105
 Fox, Robert S., xii
 Fransech, Jane, xi
 Frye, Kenneth, xii
 Fuller, Walter D., viii, 186
 Gittler, Joseph N., 186
 Goslin, Willard E., viii, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 183
 Greene, Shirley E., 89, 90
 Gregory, Raymond W., 24
 Griffin, Francis E., ix, 127
 Grove, Ernest W., ix
 Heath, Vernon L., viii, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 94, 95, 96
 Heckman, John H., 60
 Heyl, Helen Hay, xi
 Hobby, Mrs. Oveta Culp, 106
 Hobson, Carol Joy, 105
 Huppock, Anne S., ix, 44, 45, 48
 Howard, Robert West, 126
 Hummel, B. I., 197
 Hutchens, Jens H., 99
 Isenberg, Robert M., xi, 12, 60, 149
 Jagers, Richard E., xi
 Jensen, Theodore J., ix, 29, 111
 Johns, Roe L., 123
 Jones, Lewis W., 81, 82, 88
 Kendall, Glenn, viii, 20, 21, 23, 97, 98
 Kneenewich, Steve J., 129, 130, 131
 Kretlow, Burton W., ix, xii, 39, 126
 Lawler, Eugene, xi
 Lincoln, Murray D., 204
 Lindman, Erick L., ix, 169, 172
 McClurken, W. D., 114
 McIntyre, Kenneth E., xi
 Mackie, Romaine P., 25
 MacRae, Douglas G., ix, 182
 Martin, Mrs. Mary McCollom, 82, 83, 86
 Miller, Leonard M., 101, 102
 Moore, Arthur, 81, 82
 Mooney, Julia M., 96, 97
 Morgan, Griscorn, viii, 33, 36, 40, 41
 Morphet, Edgar L., 123
 Newell, Clarence A., 102, 103
 Norris, Forbes H., 136
 O'Brien, Mrs. Ruth, xi

Philpot, Frank, xii
Pond, Millard Z., 34

Reckwerth, Rex K., xii
Reeves, Floyd W., 122
Reuther, Victor G., viii, 185
Roberts, Wayne C., ix, 68
Roosevelt, Mrs. Eleanor, viii

Scott, Grace, 100, 101
Sensenbaugh, James A., xii
Smith, Mrs. Haven, viii, 95, 96
Stinnert, T. M., ix, 16, 18, 19, 30, 91, 93,
94

Stockm, Jesse D., 90
Stout, Ruth, 18

Taylor, Carl C., 80
Thaden, John F., 122, 125
Turner, Mrs. Marie, 158

Walker, Waurine, viii
Warburton, Amber Arthur, 7, 90
Wess, Mrs. Gertrude S., 61
Wilcox, John, xii
Williams, Charl O., ix
Williams, Robin M. Jr., 36
Yates, Howard O., xii

SUBJECT INDEX

(through Chapter 17)

- Administration, educational (*see* Educational administration)
- Administrative organization (*see* Educational administration)
- Administrative structure (*see* Educational administration)
- Administrative unit, 105
(*See also* School districts)
- Administrators, 22-23, 91, 99, 105-104, 150, 158-159
educational leadership of, 22-23, 91, 105
internship experience, 103-104
preparation of, 105
preservice education of, 105-104
selection of, 103-104, 150, 158-159
- Adult education, 12, 24, 39, 55, 58, 66, 67-68, 69, 113
services for, 66
- Adult needs (*see* Educational needs)
- Africa, 187, 191
- Agricultural cooperatives (*see* Farmer cooperatives)
- Agricultural Extension Agents (*see* U. S. Department of Agriculture)
- Agricultural migrants, 6, 50, 81, 82, 85-86, 90
education of, 30, 82, 84-86, 90
seasonal migration, impact of, 85-86
(*See also* Disadvantaged groups)
- Agriculture, viewpoint on education (*see* Organizations and agencies)
- Aims (*see* Educational goals)
- Alabama, 129
- Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth, 7, 90
- American Association of School Administrators (*see* National Education Association)
- American Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., 96, 178
Associated Women of, 96
Youth Department, 178
- American Indians, 91, 87
(*See also* Disadvantaged groups)
- American institutions, analysis of, 36
- American Red Cross, 178
- American Society, 36
- Arizona, 82, 85, 94
- Arkansas, 8, 85
- Asia, 187, 191
- Attendance, school (*see* School attendance)
- Attendance unit, 109
(*See also* School districts)
- Attendance worker, 102 (*See also* Guidance workers)
- Berea College, 200
- Boards of Education, 88-89, 103, 150, 156-157, 157
- Boy Scouts of America, 178
- Buildings, 6, 10, 29, 105-115
abandonment of, 109-110
adaptation of existing, 110
additions to, 110
causes of shortage, 107
characteristics of good, 115
design of, 109, 110, 115
determining community need, 109-110
effect of increased enrollments on, 107
effect of reorganization on, 107
estimated expenditures for, 105
factors determining community use, 111
federal aid for, 108
financial resources for, 108
financing, factors affecting, 111-115
flexibility, need for, 115
multiple use of space, 112-113
need for, 105-106
obsolescence of, 107, 109
planning new buildings, factors in, 111-115
pre-planning for community use, 6, 29, 110-111
priority in use of, 111
state aid for, 108, 109
(*See also* School site)
- Bus drivers, selection, training and licensing of, 116
(*See also* School personnel)
- Business, viewpoint of (*see* Organizations and agencies)

- California, 6, 21, 65, 90, 97, 98, 99, 149, 197
- Canada, 80
- Chamber of Commerce of the U. S., 185
- Change, implications for education (*see* Social and economic change)
- Charter of Education for Rural Children (*see* White House Conference on Rural Education)
- Chico State College, 21, 97, 98
- Child development, influence of rural environment on, 43-45, 47-49, 51, 53
- Child in the Rural Environment*, 27
- Citizenship, education, 26, 32, 49, 56, 68, 75-76, 91, 189
- advantages of rural school for, 32
- "Civic responsibility" (*see* Citizenship education; Educational goals)
- College, availability to rural youth, 24, 72, 75, 77
- College teachers, education of, 21
- Colorado, 129, 199
- Communication (*see* Cultural change; Rural education on the world scene)
- Community, 33-38, 73
- changes in, 36-37
- effect of school organization on, 33-34, 37-38
- meaning of, 35-37
- meaningful community of the individual, 73
- significance of, 33
- (*See also* Community school; School and community)
- Community school, 28-30, 39-41, 97-98, 123-124, 148-150
- adaptation to small community, 28-30
- and sociological community, 123, 124
- concept of, 39-41, 97-98
- intermediate unit and, 99, 148-150
- nature of program, 39-40
- on world scene, 193-199
- providing services to, 148-150
- (*See also* Community; Educational program; School and community)
- Community School and the Intermediate Unit*, 12, 60, 149
- Community school district (*see* School district)
- Community Services, Inc., 33, 36
- Committee for Economic Development, 185
- Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers (*see* Department of Rural Education, NEA)
- Congress of Industrial Organizations, 185
- Congress of the United States, 99
- House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, 106
- Consolidation, school, 97, 180
- (*See also* School district reorganization; School districts)
- Consumer education, 69, 75
- Cooperatives (*see* Farmer cooperatives)
- Cornell University, 121
- Counselor (*see* Guidance workers)
- County Agricultural Agents (*see* U. S. Department of Agriculture)
- County services (*see* Intermediate unit)
- County superintendents (*see* Superintendents, county)
- County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*, 129
- County unit, 129-140, 157
- advantages of, 131-134
- differences among, 129-131
- disadvantages of, 135-137
- fiscal policy, 130
- history of, 129
- special problems of, 138-139
- successful operation of, 139-140
- types of, 129-130
- (*See also* Administrators; Boards of education; Intermediate unit; School districts; Small schools)
- Cultural change, 68-70, 74-75
- and human adjustment, 68-70
- consumer orientation to, 69, 74-75
- impairment of communication, 69
- productive orientation and, 74
- relation to natural environment, 68-69
- Curriculum, 26-27, 31-33, 49-50, 54, 66, 97-98, 99, 149, 161
- implications of rural living for, 26-27, 31-33, 49-50, 54, 66, 161
- of community school, 97-98
- services for development of, 99, 149
- (*See also* Educational program)
- Curtis Publishing Company, 186

- Custodian, 91
(*See also* School personnel)
- Dental hygienist, 102
(*See also* School personnel)
- Department of Rural Education, NEA, xvi, xvi, 7, 12, 22, 150-151, 152, 172
Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers, 7, 22
Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, 12, 156
National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit, 63, 78, 150-151, 152, 172
Rural Education News, 22
Yearbooks, 12, 22, 27, 60, 77, 129, 130, 163
- Diplomatic officials, xvi
- Disadvantaged groups, 6-7, 46-47, 56, 71, 79-90, 179, 199-200
experimental programs for, 89-90
factors affecting status, 90, 81-84
identification of, 6, 7, 56, 80-81, 179
limitations of educational opportunity, 46-47, 82-87, 199-200
nature of disadvantages, 446-47, 90, 81-87
needed educational program, 88-89
providing needed opportunities, 83-84, 90-90
school attendance of, 83-84
- Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents, (*see* Department of Rural Education, NEA)
- Economic change (*see* Social and economic change)
- "Economic efficiency" (*see* Educational goals)
- Education for rural living (*see* Educational program)
- Education of Migrant Children*, 89
- Educational administration, 16, 27-30, 157, 206
adapted to community, 28-30
continual readjustment, 27-206
democratic control, 28-30
"federation principle", 29, 124
guides to desirable action, 28-30
improvements in, 27-30
of small schools, 157
tasks ahead in, 27-30
(*See also* Leadership, educational)
- Educational attainment of rural people, 10
- Educational Change in Reorganized School Districts*, 120
- Educational goals, 31, 34, 63-64, 70-76, 88
for disadvantaged children, 88
guides for determining, 64
- Educational leadership (*see* Leadership, educational)
- Educational needs, 24-27, 33, 43, 49-51, 54-61, 64-70, 71-76, 87, 90, 186-187
arising from industrialization and decentralization, 50, 54, 58-59
influenced by rural environment, 25-27, 64-65
of adults, 33, 58, 67-68, 72, 76, 186-187
of disadvantaged groups, 24-25, 87, 90
of exceptional children, 25, 71
of rural children and youth, 25-27, 33, 43, 49-50, 72, 187
of the talented, 25, 71
related to change, 54-61, 66-67, 68-70
- Educational opportunities, 87-90, 207-208
factors in providing, 87
principles for improving, 207-208
- Educational Planning by Neighborhoods in Centralized Districts*, 126
- Educational Policies Commission (*see* National Education Association)
- Educational program, 4, 11-12, 24, 26-27, 31-33, 39, 49-51, 56-57, 61, 63-78, 88-89, 99, 143-145, 182-188, 200, 205-206
adequate program, specifications of, 78-77, 143-145
changing, 143-145
direction for, 186-188
establishing specifications for, 70-76
for disadvantaged groups, 88-89
implications of social-economic change for, 53-62
importance of broad approach to, 56-57, 73-74, 182-186, 200, 205-206
problems of present living as basis, 26-27, 31-33, 39, 49-51, 61, 67-68, 182-183
scope and quality of, 11-12, 24, 63-78
specialized help to provide, 12, 99, 163

- (*See also* Curriculum; Educational goals; Intermediate unit; Leadership, educational; Small schools; various special fields)
- Egypt, 193, 195-197
rural community schools of, 195-197
- Egyptian-American Joint Education Committee, 196
- Environment (*see* Rural environment)
- Equality of opportunity (*see* Student; Disadvantaged groups)
- Exceptional children, 12, 25, 71, 99, 134, 144, 145
- Fair Labor Standards Act, 83-84
- Family living, changes affecting, 48, 61, 71, 80
- Farm Film Foundation, 178
- Farm organization (*see* Organizations and agencies)
- Farm policy-making, educational implications of, 67-68
- Farmer cooperatives, 59-61
cultural significance, 59
economic importance, 59-60
implications for education, 60
- Federal aid to education, 175-176, 206
fear of, 175
justice of, 175-176, 206
(*See also*, Buildings; School finance)
- Federal court decisions, 6, 86
- Finance (*see* School finance)
- Financial ability (*see* School finance)
- Finnish War Debt (*see* Technical assistance programs)
- Florida, 6, 81, 90, 129, 131
- Foreign Operations Administration, 192
- 4-H Club Agents (*see* U. S. Department of Agriculture)
- 4-H Clubs, 49, 80, 177, 178
- Fringe areas (*see* Suburban development)
- Fulbright Act (*see* Technical assistance programs)
- Future Farmers of America, 177, 178
- Future Homemakers of America, 178
- George Peabody College for Teachers, 31, 56, 169, 183
- Georgia, 6, 10, 100, 129, 130, 131, 181, 182
- Goals (*see* Educational goals)
- Grumbling College, 22
- Guidance in a Rural Community—Green Sea*, 7, 90
- Guidance in a Rural Industrial Community—Harlan County*, 7, 90
- Guidance workers, 102-103
classroom teacher, role of, 102
preparation of, 102
selection of, 102
specialists, types of, 102
- Guide to Planning School Plants*, 114
- Harvard University, 66
- Health, physical education, and recreation services, 12, 72, 80, 87, 99, 134, 144
- High school (*see* Small schools)
- Home Demonstration Agents (*see* U. S. Department of Agriculture)
- Homemaking education, 11, 56, 61, 144
- "Human relationships" (*see* Educational goals)
- Idaho, 129
- Illinois, 8, 17, 28, 90, 120, 129
- Illinois Agricultural Association, 28
- Illinois Chamber of Commerce, 17, 95
- Implementation of program (*see* Building; County unit; Educational administration; Intermediate unit; School districts; School finance)
- Income changes, 6, 56
- Indiana, 129
- Indians (*see* American Indians)
- Instructional materials service (*see* Intermediate unit)
- Intergroup relations, 186
- Intermediate unit, 12, 13, 60, 99, 123, 141-153, 165, 171-172
administration of, 13
cooperative educational service, 60
county service program, 99
effect of institutional change on, 145-146, 149
emerging concept of, 141, 145-147
financing, 171-172
illustrations of services through, 148-150
leadership needed for, 13
legal framework for, 150-151

- need for, 123
 operational processes and procedures, 150-153
 present setting, 141-143
 purpose and function, 141-142
 recommendations for, 151
 role of, 151-153, 165
 services of, 12, 148-150, 165
 structural adjustment, 146
 structure needed, 147-148
 relationships with school districts, 151-153
 relationships with state education departments, 151-152
 (See also School finance; Small schools)
- Iowa, 8, 13, 120, 129, 186
 Iowa State College, 186
 Iran, 191
 Iranian Trust Fund (see Technical assistance programs)
- Kansas, 8, 94
 Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 18
 Kentucky, 90, 129, 158, 189, 200
 Kindergarten, 11, 24, 149
 Korea, 193, 197
 reconstruction of education system, 197
- Labor, viewpoint of (see Organizations and agencies)
- Latin America, 187
- Lay leadership (see Leadership, educational)
- Leadership, educational, 13, 30, 34, 38-39, 77-78, 94-96, 134, 180
 by local groups, 34
 citizen leadership, 34, 94-96
 desirable qualities of, 30
 for adequate educational opportunities, 77-78, 134
 organizational, 180
 role of the school, 38-39
 (See also School and community)
- Library service, school and community, 12, 72, 80, 99, 134, 145
- Louisiana, 6, 22, 37, 129
 Louisiana State University, 37
- Low income groups, 7, 56, 80, 91
 (See also Disadvantaged groups)
- Lunch workers, 91
 (See also School personnel)
- Maine, 90
- Maintenance workers, 91
 (See also School personnel)
- Marshall College, 101
- Maryland, 10, 103, 129, 130, 131, 132, 136
- Mechanics, 91
 (See also School personnel)
- Mexico, 90
- Michigan, 6, 8, 13
- Migrant Research Project Board, 90
- Migrants (see Agricultural migrants)
- "Minimum program" (see School finance)
- Minnesota, 8, 120, 129
- Mississippi, 6, 8
- Missouri, 9, 120
- Modern Rural School, 77, 80, 83, 87
- Montana, 199
- National Association of Manufacturers, 185
- National Commission on School District Reorganization, 122
- National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (see National Education Association)
- National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, 125
- National Conference on Rural Education, xv, xvii, xviii, 9, 13, 23, 30, 63, 66, 91, 141, 155, 159, 181, 186, 187, 203, 204
 advisory council, xvii
 sponsorship, xvi
 state committees, xvii
- National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education, 21
- National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, 89
- National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, 114
- National Education Association, xvi, xvii, 10, 166
 American Association of School Administrators, 12, 30, 204

- Educational Policies Commission, 70
Journal, 18, 90
- National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 19, 20, 92, 93; *Journal of Teacher Education*, 92
- Research Division, 10, 92, 158, 160
 (See also Department of Rural Education, NEA)
- National Farmers Union, 178
- National Grange, 49, 177, 178
 Grange Youth Department, 178
 Juvenile Grange, 177
- Nebraska, 8, 92, 120, 171
- Needs (see Educational needs)
- Negroes, 6, 80, 81, 86, 199
 (See also Disadvantaged groups)
- Nevada, 171
- New Hampshire, 171
- New Jersey, 6, 45, 129
- New York, 6, 8, 10, 44, 96, 97, 127, 147
- North Carolina, 6, 10, 129
- North Dakota, 92, 120, 123
- Nurse, school, 102
 (See also School personnel)
- Objectives (see Educational goals)
- Occupational change, 5, 55-56, 57-59, 179-180
 commercialized agriculture, 55, 57-59
 part-time farming, 55, 58
- Ohio, 34, 204
- Ohio State University, 34
 Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, 34
- One-teacher school (see Small schools)
- Oneonta State Teachers College, 96, 97
- Oregon, 129
- Organization, administrative (see Administrative organization)
- Organizations and agencies, educational programs of, 178-188
 changing emphasis, 178-182
 organizational leadership, 94, 180
 relationship with schools, 38-39, 178
 to meet adult needs, 186-187, 188
 to meet youth needs, 187-188
 viewpoint of agriculture, 183-184; business, 185-186; education, 182-183; labor, 184-185
- Pakistan, 193
- Personnel for rural schools (see School personnel)
- Piri Datta Kappan*, 160, 193
- Philippines, 193, 187-199
 community schools of, 187-199
- Physical facilities (see Building)
- Physician, school, 102
 (See also School personnel)
- Point Four (see Technical assistance programs)
- Population, rural, 4-5, 45-46, 47, 54-55, 179, 180
 changes in 4-5, 45-46, 54-55, 179, 180; educational implications, 47, 54-55
 school age, 5
 (See also Building, need for)
- President of the United States, xvi
- Problems and Issues in Public School Finance*, 123
- Progress of Literacy in Various Countries*, 190
- Psychiatrist, 102
 (See also School personnel)
- Psychologist, 102
 (See also School personnel)
- Public school system (see Educational administration)
- Puerto Rico, 193, 194
 community educational program, 194
- Pupil transportation, 9, 79, 33-34, 113-114, 115, 116, 117, 133, 138, 169, 171
 accessibility of, 113-114, 117
 adequacy of, 29, 117
 dependability of, 116
 economy of, 29
 educational value of, 9
 expansion of, 9, 115-116
 financing, 115, 116, 169, 171
 impact on educational program, 117, 138
 in county unit, 133
 legislative action affecting, 116
 purpose of, 117
 safety of, 29, 116, 117
 school bus, 115

- social implications of, 33-34
state support for, 116
(See also School finance)
Purposes (see Educational goals)
"Quality revolution in education", 26, 29
Reading specialist, 102
(See also School personnel)
Red Cross (see American Red Cross)
Reorganization (see School district reorganization)
Rural Community (see Community)
Rural education, 4, 13, 15-16, 23-24, 43, 63, 70-76, 111, 167-169, 203-208
accomplishments in, 203-204
concept of, 4
distinctive nature of, 43, 51, 70, 111, 167-169
purposes of, 4, 70-76
scope of, 13, 15-16, 23-24, 63
the next decade, 203-208
(See also Educational goals; Educational needs; Educational program; School districts reorganization; Small schools)
Rural Education: Community Backgrounds, 59
Rural education on the world scene, 189-201
communication, necessity of, 189-190
community education programs, 194-199
functional education, 200
illiteracy, 190-191
implication for education in U. S., 199-201
progress in, 192-199
retardation of, 193
role of women, 193
(See also Egypt, Korea, Philippines, Puerto Rico)
Rural environment, 26-27, 31-33, 43-51, 53, 65, 72, 74, 77
active experience as method of learning in, 74
conservation of, 74
differences in, 44, 65
effect of, 44-45
impact on children, 43-51, 53
implications for curriculum, 26-27, 31-33, 49-50
lacks in, 72
nature of, 44-45
resources in, 31-33, 72, 77
teacher preparation for use of, 20-21
uniqueness of, 48-49, 61
Rural life, 33, 47, 61, 64, 65, 178-180, 200-201
problems of, 33, 61
rural-urban relationships, 61, 64, 178-180, 200-201
standards of living, 47, 61
uniqueness of, 65
(See also Social and economic change)
Rural Life in the United States, 90
Rural population (see Population, rural)
Rural Sociology, 122
Rural teachers (see Teachers)
Rural Teachers in 1951-52, 10, 92, 158, 160
Rural-urban relationships (see Rural Life)
Rural Youth of the U. S. A., 179
School administrators (see Administrators)
School and community, 16, 30-41, 65, 69, 76, 112-113, 178, 182-183
citizen participation in school activities, 69
leadership role of school, 38-39
relatedness of, 31, 39
relationships with other organizations, 39, 178
resources for enrichment of learning, 31-33, 65, 76, 182-183
school as a community institution, 35-41
use of school facilities, 112-113
(See also Community; Community school; Rural environment)
School attendance, 5, 83-84
(See also Disadvantaged groups; Student)
School buildings (see Buildings)
School district reorganization, 37-38, 119-121, 121-125, 127
characteristics of, 120
criteria for, 120, 121-125
effect on community, 37-38
financial deterrents, 127

- principles for attaining, 125-127
- history of, 119
- institutional lag in, 121
- legislation, effect on, 127
- obstacles to, 124-125
- policy, desirable for, 127
- principles for attaining, 125-127
- purpose of, 122
- sociological change in, 123
- state leadership, role of, 127
- status and progress in, 119-121
- undesirable outcomes of, 124
- (*See also* Leadership, educational; School districts; School finance)
- School districts, 28, 38, 108, 119-121, 121-125, 131, 133, 136, 146, 158-159
 - consolidation of, 133, 136
 - county unit, 38
 - criteria of excellence, 121-125
 - decentralization of city, 125
 - financial efficiency of, 122
 - financial resources of, 146
 - measuring progress, 119-121
 - natural sociological community, 38, 119, 121, 123-125
 - not operating a school, 120
 - number of, 28, 119, 131
 - operating elementary and secondary schools, 120
 - operating only elementary schools, 120, 158-159
 - operating only secondary schools, 120
 - purposes of, 122, 146
 - special services, provision of, 123
 - types of, 38, 109
 - (*See also* Intermediate unit; School district reorganization; School finance; Small schools)
- School Executive, 120, 131
- School Facilities Survey, 106
- School finance, 7, 8, 50, 54, 57, 68, 108, 123, 159, 164, 165, 166, 167-176
 - apportioning state funds, 8, 170
 - assessment practices, 108, 172-173
 - citizen responsibility for, 165
 - constitutional and statutory restrictions, 108
 - complexity of, 173
 - equalization of, 8, 170
 - equalization of assessments, 172-173
 - federal aid, 175-178
 - for physical facilities, 7, 168
 - for transportation, 8, 169, 171
 - inequalities of, 108
 - "minimum program", 173
 - need for increased expenditures, 50
 - needed reorganization of, 108, 168
 - of intermediate units, 171-172
 - per pupil costs, 166
 - small schools, 170-171
 - special services, 169
 - state support, 68, 108, 123, 169-170
 - tax base, 54, 57, 159, 164, 168
 - taxpaying ability, 8, 108
 - uniquely rural problems of, 167-169
 - (*See also* Buildings; Intermediate unit; School districts)
- School in the community (*see* Community school; School and community)
- School Life, 105
- School, organization for teaching and learning (*see* Small schools)
- School personnel, 91-104
 - qualified, progress in securing, 95-104
 - special problems in providing, 91
 - specialized, identification of, 91, 99, 102-103
 - status of needs, 91-95
 - (*See also* Administrators; Guidance workers; Supervisors; Teachers)
- School site, 114-115
 - factors affecting size of, 114-115
 - minimum recommended standards for, 114
- Selected Characteristics of Reorganized School Districts, 38, 120
- "Self realization" (*see* Educational goals)
- Small community (*see* Community)
- Small schools, 9, 26, 49, 92, 121, 155-156
 - administration of, 155-166
 - buildings and equipment, 158, 163, 165
 - community resources, 156, 161-162
 - definition of, 155
 - educational programs of, 69, 156-157, 162, 163
 - enrollments, 155-156, 158
 - financing, 158, 159, 162, 166
 - future need for, 156

- improving the, 64, 164-166
- instructional materials, 183, 185
- one-teacher schools, 9, 92, 121, 157-162
- organization for instruction, 26, 69, 72, 159-162, 163-164
- pupil participation in, 181
- small high school, 9, 69, 162-166
- special services needed by, 165
- status of, 9, 121, 155-157, 162-164, 166
- teachers in, 92, 158, 164, 165
- unique problems of, 156, 157-160
- values of, 156
- (*See also* School finance)
- Smith-Mundt Act (*see* Technical assistance program)
- Social and economic change, 56-57, 53-62, 66, 178-182
 - implications for education, 53-62
 - organizational programs and, 178-182
 - rural and urban cultures, 56
 - social structure and patterns, 56-57
 - (*See also* Cultural change; Income changes; Occupational change; Population, rural)
- Social worker, 102
 - (*See also* School personnel)
- Sociological community, 38, 119, 121, 123-125
 - (*See also* School districts)
- Sociologists, 33
- South Carolina, 6, 10, 90
- South Dakota, 8, 120
- Southern Appalachians, 6, 80, 199
 - (*See also* Disadvantaged groups)
- Southern Mountains (*see* Southern Appalachians)
- Spanish Americans, 6, 81, 87
 - (*See also* Disadvantaged groups)
- Speech specialist, 103
 - (*See also* School Personnel)
- State departments of education, 19, 29, 89, 101, 127, 141, 146, 151-152
 - appropriate role of, 29
 - disadvantaged groups, recommendations for action in behalf of, 89
 - expanding services of, 146
 - intermediate units, relationships with, 141, 151-152
 - leadership in school district reorganization, New York, 127
 - "qualified teacher", responsibility to define, 19
 - role in provision of supervisors, Georgia and West Virginia, 101
- State support (*see* Building School finance)
- State University of Iowa, 129
- Student, 15-16, 23-27, 28, 50, 66, 72, 79, 138
 - adequacy of opportunity as a goal, 26, 29, 66
 - equality of educational opportunity, 13, 23-26, 28, 50
 - needs of, 25-27
 - "rights of the rural child", 15, 22, 23, 79
 - school dropouts, 72, 163
 - transported pupils, 138
 - who shall be included? 23-24
 - (*See also* College, availability)
- Suburban development, 55, 125
- Superintendents, county, 12-13, 124, 136, 204
 - elimination of, 124
 - national activities, 12-13, 136
- Supervision as a county service (*see* Intermediate unit)
- Supervisors, 22-23, 91, 99, 100-101
 - educational leadership of, 22, 91
 - preparation of, 100-101
 - qualities of good, 100
 - selection and placement of, 100-101
- Tax assessments (*see* School finance)
- Teacher (*see* Teachers)
- Teacher education, 7-8, 20-22, 34, 57, 92, 96-98, 170
 - community studies in, 97-98
 - curriculum of, 7, 97, 98
 - for effective use of environment, 20-21
 - inservice, 98
 - preservice, 96-98
 - quality of, for rural teachers, 92
 - specialized nature of, 7-8, 20-22, 98
 - student teaching, 97, 98
- Teacher preparation (*see* Teacher education)

- Teachers, 7-8, 89, 16-23, 91-98, 134, 138, 158, 162, 164, 165
 and the profession, 10-11, 20
 certification, 9, 18, 19-20, 94
 citizen responsibilities toward, 17-18, 20, 9, 17-18, 92-93, 165
 factors affecting status and welfare, 6, 7, 9, 17-18, 92, 92, 165
 in small schools and isolated areas, 134, 138, 158, 162, 165
 present status, 7, 91-93, 94, 158
 qualifications, 7, 18, 20-21
 "qualified" to be defined, 19, 20, 96-97
 recruitment and retention in teaching, 17-19, 96
 supply and demand, 8-9, 16, 19, 94-95
 (See also Guidance workers; School personnel; Teacher education)
- Teachers College, Columbia University, 27, 124, 126, 168
- Technical assistance programs, 191-192, 194, 196, 200
 Finnish War Debt, 191
 Fulbright Act, 191
 Iranian Trust Fund, 191
 Smith-Mundt Act, 191
- Tennessee, 80, 129, 150
- Texas, 8, 85, 90
- Transportation (see Pupil transportation)
- Tuskegee Institute, 81
- Underdeveloped areas in the U. S., 199-200
 (See also Disadvantaged groups)
- Underemployment in American Agriculture*, 82
- UNESCO, 190
 mission to Korea, 197
- U. S. Department of Agriculture, 60, 61, 184, 200
- U. S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service, 55, 58, 177, 178, 186
 Agricultural Extension Agents, 80
 County Agricultural Agents, 177;
 Agency, 44
- 4-H Club Agents, 177
- Home Demonstration Agents, 80
- U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 45, 85, 84
- U. S. Department of Defense, 192
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, xvi, 106, 178
 Office of Education, xvi, 24, 25, 105, 105, 106, 190, 195
- U. S. Department of State, 192
- U. S. Office of Education (see U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)
- U. S. Supreme Court (see Federal court decisions)
- University of Chicago, 20, 71, 81
- University of Maryland, 68, 103-104
- University of North Dakota, 123
- University of West Virginia, 101
- University of Wisconsin, 126
- Utah, 129
- Values in rural living, 27, 47, 48-49, 51, 57, 61, 67, 68, 73, 77
- Virginia, 6, 10, 80, 90, 129, 130, 197
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 197
- Visiting teacher, 102
 (See also School personnel)
- Vocational education, 11-12, 50, 54, 55, 58-59, 74-75, 83, 93, 144
 need for broader offerings, 50, 54, 55, 58-59
- Vocational opportunities, availability to rural youth, 73-74
- Washington, 10
- West Virginia, 100, 101, 129, 157
- White House Conference on Rural Education, xv, xvi, xvii, 3, 6, 8, 11, 43, 79, 141
- Charter of Education for Rural Children, xv, 15, 22, 23, 79
- Wisconsin, 8, 44, 90, 111, 126
- Young Cooperators, 178
- Year School District*, 122
- Youth organizations, 49, 177-178