

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

William DeWayne Honey, Jr. for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Education presented on August 6, 1987 .

Title: The Use of the Ethnographic Method in Evaluating
Nontraditional Continuing Education Programs.

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: _____
Tom E. Grigsby

The purpose of this research was to test the effectiveness of the ethnographic method as a tool for evaluating nontraditional adult and continuing education programs. The program evaluated was the Oregon Heritage Festival, a four-week Summer Term activity designed to eclectically draw upon the arts, humanities, and science to illustrate and explore Oregon's technological, social, and ideological history.

Specific research techniques for data collection were a three-year participant observation process, in-depth interviews of university administrators and community leaders, and a survey questionnaire administered to a nonrandom group of persons attending festival events. Analysis procedures entailed qualitative and

quantitative observations, or triangulation. Cross-tabulation, a type of frequency distribution, was used for statistical analysis.

Due to the time and expense involved in this study, a modified research design would probably be needed in order to conduct an evaluation on a similar scale. Less detailed interviewing and less time for participant observation most likely would be required for other nontraditional continuing education program evaluations. However, information was discovered through the ethnographic process that might not have been determined through the use of other methods. A clear potential exists for the ethnographic method to be used in evaluating many types of adult and continuing education programs; however, further research is needed to better understand the application of ethnography to the evaluation of adult and continuing education programs.

The Use of the Ethnographic Method
In Evaluating Nontraditional Continuing Education Programs

by

William DeWayne Honey, Jr.

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed August 6, 1987

Commencement June 1988

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Tom E. Grigsby, Professor of Adult Education in Charge of Major

Redacted for privacy

Glen A. Klein, Department Chair of Post Secondary Education

Redacted for privacy

Robert D. Barr, Dean, OSU/WOSC School of Education

Redacted for privacy

Dean, Graduate School

Date thesis is presented August 6, 1987

Typed by C. Younger for William DeWayne Honey, Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the collective efforts of those scholars who comprised my graduate committee. I am especially grateful to Professor Tom Grigsby, who directed the research. Dr. Grigsby gave countless hours of his time to insure that I conduct the best possible study. His suggestions and constructive criticism were invaluable for the successful completion of this work.

Other members of the committee who deserve special recognition are professors Mary Lee Nolan and John Young. Indeed, I am indebted for their assistance during the course of this research. Their attention to scientific detail made this study better than I realized.

Then, my gratitude to Claire Younger, who typed the numerous drafts and revisions under impossible deadlines. Claire always kept her composure when I lost mine.

The conduct of inquiry in the social sciences could not be possible without those persons who participate in the research. My thanks to those university administrators, community leaders, and individuals attending festival events for their time and energy necessary to complete this study.

Thomas C. Hogg, founder of the Oregon Heritage Festival and former Professor of Anthropology at Oregon State University, deserves the most credit. As my mentor and friend, he had the greatest influence on my intellectual development. I am most

fortunate to have had the pleasure of his association, and what he taught me will last forever.

My son Robert, to whom this thesis is dedicated, has been the real inspiration in the completion of my doctoral work. There is no possible way that I can adequately thank him for his patience and understanding during my absence. He has an incredible wisdom for his fourteen years of age.

To Barbara, my closest friend, mate, and "sounding board," I cannot begin to thank you enough. She tolerated my emotional ups and downs during this process, and provided the shoulder I needed to lean on. Unselfishly, she gave her energy to me when she had none to spare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Objectives	3
Background and Rationale	4
Research Setting	17
Definition of Terms	19
Limitations of the Research	21
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	23
Nontraditional Evaluation Studies	24
General Applications of Ethnographic Techniques	37
Program Evaluation Ethnography	42
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN	56
Research Population	57
Community Leaders	57
University Administrators	59
Festival Attendees	60
Description of Sample Procedures	65
Description of Research Techniques	67
Description of Analysis Procedures	70
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH	74
Attitudes of University Administrators	74
Evaluation Policies and Procedures	75
Expectations of the University	78
Interfacing with Other Programs	80
Retention and Recruitment Aspects	81
Specific Attitudes Toward the Festival	83
Public Relations	85
Attitudes of Community Leaders	86
Role of the Festival in Community Relations	86
Program Satisfaction	90
Effects of the Festival on University Image	93
Attitudes and Self-Report Behaviors of Respondents	97
General Attitudes Toward Summer Term	97
Local Area Residents	98
Sunbirds and Other Tourists	99
Foreign Visitors	101
Students	103

Attitudes Toward the Oregon Heritage Festival	104
Advertising and Frequency of Attendance	105
Evening Lecture Series	110
Films	111
Tours	112
Exhibits/Displays	113
5K Walk	113
Liar's Contest	114
Concerts	115
Festival Improvements	116
Selected Attitudes Toward the Festival	117
Educational Value	118
Academic Credit	120
Program Expansion	121
Festival Length	122
Recommending the Festival	122
Willingness to Pay	123
University Image	124
Summary of Attitudes	125
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	128
Summary	128
Conclusions	136
Recommendations for Future Research	141
Recommendations for University-Community Nontraditional Programs	142
BIBLIOGRAPHY	144
APPENDIX 1: UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE	153
APPENDIX 2: COMMUNITY LEADERS QUESTIONNAIRE	155
APPENDIX 3: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	157
APPENDIX 4: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS	162

Attitudes Toward the Oregon Heritage Festival	104
Advertising and Frequency of Attendance	105
Evening Lecture Series	110
Films	111
Tours	112
Exhibits/Displays	113
5K Walk	113
Liar's Contest	114
Concerts	115
Festival Improvements	116
Selected Attitudes Toward the Festival	117
Educational Value	118
Academic Credit	120
Program Expansion	121
Festival Length	122
Recommending the Festival	122
Willingness to Pay	123
University Image	124
Summary of Attitudes	125
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	128
Summary	128
Conclusions	136
Recommendations for Future Research	141
Recommendations for University-Community	142
Nontraditional Programs	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	144
APPENDIX 1: Interview Format for University Administrators	153
APPENDIX 2: Interview Format for Community Leaders	155
APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire for Festival Attenders	157
APPENDIX 4: Profile of Questionnaire Responses	162

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Evaluation models from most to least objective	5
2. Ingredients for successful programming, in order of importance	78
3. Festival criticism by community leaders, in order of importance	92

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Age of Respondents, in Percentages	61
2. Sex of Respondents, in Percentages	61
3. Occupation of Respondents, in Percentages	62
4. Residence of Respondents, in Percentages	63
5. Age-Sex Correlation of Respondents, in Percentages	65
6. Age Groups and Frequency of Attendance, in Percentages	107
7. Frequency of Attendance, in Percentages	108
8. Previous Festival Attendance, in Percentages	109
9. Rating of Events, in Percentages	109
10. Age Groups and Festival Improvements, in Percentages	116
11. Selected Attitudes Toward the Festival, in Percentages	118
12. Attitudes Toward Recommending the Festival, by Sex, in Percentage	123
13. Previous Festival Attendance	163
14. Best Form of Advertising	164
15. Frequency of Attendance	165
16. Rating of Evening Lecture Series	166
17. Rating of Film	167
18. Rating of Tours	167
19. Rating of Exhibits	169
20. Rating of 5K Walk	170
21. Rating of Liar's Contest	171
22. Rating of Concerts	172

23. Entertainment vs Educational Value of Festival	173
24. Academic Credit Offering	174
25. Offering More Activities	175
26. Festival Length	176
27. Recommending Festival to Others	177
28. Willingness to Pay for Events	178
29. Improving the Image of Oregon State University	179

THE USE OF THE ETHNOGRAPHIC METHOD
IN EVALUATING NONTRADITIONAL CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of educational programs has developed in many different directions in the past few decades. Many methodologies are available to assist researchers in the evaluation of both traditional and nontraditional programs. In fact, the literature is overflowing with ways of conducting program evaluation research. Yet, this proliferation of methods is not a deleterious advancement. As Stufflebeam and Webster (1980) suggest, alternative approaches aid in developing better insights into the overall evaluation process, as well as providing a rethinking of existing approaches to program evaluation.

Adult and continuing education programs, like all educational programs, must be periodically evaluated so that the programs can maintain an effectiveness for their constituents. However, the standard criterion for evaluating adult and continuing educational programs has been the extent of participation in such programs (Houle 1980; Kinsey 1981; Goldin and Thomas 1984; Coate 1985). The extent of participation, or head count, is not sufficient in terms

of assessing the total ramifications of any educational program. Houle (1980), who establishes the tone for this research, suggests that evaluators of adult and continuing educational programs must examine all available evidence and appraise how much the program has accomplished in terms of the realities of the situation. Houle (1980:184) further discusses the nature of such an evaluation effort as applied to adult and continuing education:

the basic questions . . . are simple and direct. How well was each objective achieved? If I did better than expected, why? Was the goal too high or was the design poorly planned and executed? If the latter, what specifics were wrong? If the objective was reached would I have done better if I had set higher levels of accomplishments? . . . What additional criteria of evaluation should have been used? Such questions call for judgmental answers, but are the only kinds on which appraisals can be made and the process of evaluation completed.

Holt and Courtenay (1984) suggest that in the future, participant attendance as an indicator of program satisfaction, will have less credibility as a measure of actual program value. Kinsey (1981), like Houle, recommends for the evaluation of adult and continuing education programs to be conducted at the broadest level.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The central problem of this research was to test the effectiveness of the ethnographic process as a tool for evaluating nontraditional adult and continuing education programs.

This research specifically pursued the following objectives:

1. Review the existing literature regarding the use of the ethnographic method in adult and continuing education program evaluation.
2. Develop a research protocol utilizing the ethnographic process as a basic structure for the protocol.
3. Utilize this protocol to examine the effectiveness of a nontraditional adult and continuing education program--the Oregon Heritage Festival at Oregon State University.
4. Assess the range of attitudes and degree of acceptance from university administrators, community leaders, and individuals attending festival events in a case study format.
5. Report the strengths and weaknesses of the ethnographic process as determined through its application in evaluating the Oregon Heritage Festival.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Evaluation is a process that determines the worth of a program, procedure, product, or other specified objective (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield 1985, Sanders and Pinhey 1983, Stufflebeam and Webster 1980, van Willigen 1986). Gaining understanding is paramount to any evaluation research, as specified by Meyers (1981) and Fetterman (1984). Thus, the primary aim of evaluation is to gain an understanding of the effects of programs or policies upon people. These effects may be either positive or negative: there are always unintended consequences of programs and projects (van Willigen 1986).

For the most part, evaluation is similar to general social science research since sound research design is imperative for the reliability and validity of findings. Simon and Burstien (1969) suggest that evaluation is a distinctive feature of all scientific research activities, regardless of the topic. Nevertheless, what has become clear in evaluation, like general social science, is that no single best method can fit all situations, and program evaluators need to acquaint themselves with various approaches (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield 1985).

There are currently eight major models used in educational program evaluations. These eight models are illustrated in Figure 1.

<u>Evaluation Model</u>	<u>Method</u>
Systems analysis	Experimental design
Behavioral objectives	Testing
Decision making	Questionnaires, Interviews
Goal free	Questionnaires, Interviews
Art criticism	Critical expert review
Accreditation	On site panel visits
Adversary	Jury panel
Transactional	Case study

(after House 1978)

Figure 1. Evaluation models from most to least objective.

Each of these major models has strengths and weaknesses as reported by educational evaluators (cf. Guba and Lincoln 1981, 1982; House 1987; Scriven 1967; Stufflebeam and Webster 1980; and Stufflebeam and Shinkfield 1985).

Generally, the systems analysis approach is a totally quantitative based research activity which attempts to relate program success or failure to program participant test scores. This design is used to determine causal relationships between specified independent and dependent variables. The major strength of the systems analysis model is that it serves to isolate causal relationships between effects and treatments; however, the model does not usually work in field research situations. Systems analysis also provides a narrow range of information which makes it a poor program evaluation tool. As Stufflebeam and Webster

(1983:29) explain, "experimental studies tend to provide terminal information that is not useable for guiding the developmental process."

Behavioral objectives, or standardized testing, attempts to provide valid information on student performance as performance relates to the educational curricula. However, data only relate to specific student performance and the data cannot be considered indicative of program or teaching quality. As Stake (1967) and Guba and Lincoln (1980) have noted, other variables which may effect student scores are not considered.

Decision making is primarily a management information type of model. This model is designed to supply program managers with information they need to better conduct their programs. House (1978) notes that this approach is more industrial oriented and there are considerable methodological difficulties when attempting to apply decision making to evaluating educational programs. Moreover, Stufflebeam and Webster (1983) report the decision making approach does not possess sufficient scope to determine the worth of an educational program.

As a consumer oriented approach, goal free evaluation is designed to enlighten individuals so that they may judge the relative merits of educational goods and services. Hence, the goal free model is designed to assist the taxpayer to make better choices in the purchase of educational goods and services. The principle merit of this approach, of course, is accountability. Its primary shortcoming is described as a method which is too expensive to

conduct. Also, the model is unable to afford educational practitioners information on how they might better perform their teaching tasks (Stake 1967).

Connoisseur-based studies, such as art criticism and the adversary approach, are based upon expert opinion and sensitivity. The system uses perception, experience and refined insights as techniques for evaluation. Often this type of approach is too narrow to assess the full worth of an educational program (Stake 1967; House 1978).

Most educational institutions are subject to accreditation, and most educators must meet certain certification requirements for the positions they hold. A typical technique used in an accreditation study is referred to as self-study or self-reporting by the institution. Panels of experts are assigned to visit the institution to verify the program or persons being investigated. The primary strength of the model is that it allows laypersons to make informed judgments about the quality of any given institution; however, this approach usually emphasizes intrinsic rather than outcome criteria of education (Stufflebeam and Webster 1983).

Finally, transactional studies usually concentrate on the education process to include the classroom, the school, and the program under evaluation. This model normally employs the case study method which is considered by many researchers to be too

subjective. While detailed information is provided by transactional studies, it is a very costly and time consuming approach (Stufflebeam and Webster 1983; House 1978).

The use of the variety of research models, as previously described, in the evaluation of traditional and nontraditional adult and continuing education programs has been limited. In fact, research activities, per se, in the adult and continuing education field must be considered as incipient. Several reasons for this lack of research have been discussed by a number of scholars (Houle 1974, 1980; Lowe 1975; Boyd and Rice 1985; Lawson 1985; and Long 1980).

One important reason for the lack of adequate research in adult and continuing education has been discussed by Lawson (1985). Lawson suggests that the task of defining adult education as an area of research possesses certain problems because there is an inherent ambiguity to the term adult education. Regardless of the nature of the ambiguity, the formulation of clearly defined research problems are thus prevented.

Boyd and Rice (1985) suggest that while the amount and quality of research in adult and continuing education is on the increase, such research has not matured. According to the authors, one continual problem has been that adult educators are practitioners, not researchers, and they must rely upon the work of others. Yet, research findings which bear upon the practice of adult education

have not provided a clear link to the practitioner, and therefore such research is perceived by the practitioner as having little or no value. Perhaps Lowe (1975:184) best describes this problem:

Up to the present, research in adult education has commonly but erroneously been identified with esoteric activities carried on in universities. Some of the research undertaken in universities may well be useless to either man or beast, as some adult educators contemptuously maintain, but much of it has been strictly relevant to operational practice. It is a question, therefore, not of channelling research into entirely new directions but of conducting more research on the same lines as at present and ensuring that it is applied to the design and conduct of programmes and not lost in libraries. For small though the amount of research has been, very little of it has influenced practice.

Lowe continues by noting that there has been insufficient communication between researchers and adult and continuing education practitioners. This lack of communication, then, serves to contribute to the resistance of incorporating the findings of other researchers into the practice of adult and continuing education.

Several topics related to adult and continuing education have been pursued by researchers. Principle topics are adult learning, teaching methods, group dynamics, administration and organization policy and practice, and evaluation (Lowe 1975). Evaluation research is one area which has not shown broadbased efforts. Rather, evaluation of adult and continuing education programs has been primarily quantitative-based studies measuring the extent of participation.

No one evaluation model is best in all research situations. Each model has its strengths and weaknesses, and affords a certain range of knowledge needed in particular evaluation contexts. As

suggested by Smith (1981), most models do not adequately explain the success or failure of educational programs, or determine the worth of an educational program. The ethnographic method, as a heuristic device, may provide adequate description of social, political, and educational factors which bear upon the ultimate worth of a program. To date, only the decision making model is similar to the ethnographic method; however, the decision making model does not employ participant observation.

The ethnographic approach, the selected method of this study, is one typically used by anthropologists to study the traditional cultures of the world (Spradley and McCurdy 1980). Ethnographic research in the traditional sense took place cross-culturally whereby the individual in the field painstakingly recorded as much information as possible about the study culture. Pioneers of this method (Boaz 1943; Sapir 1916; Malinowski 1922; and others) have contributed to shaping and refining this method. Clearly, in the early development of the approach, emphasis was given to nonwestern, small-scale societies.

Contemporary or modern ethnographers, however, use the method increasingly to study community, city, state, national, and even global problems. Examples include Kaiser (1969), who investigated urban subgroups or gangs, Friedland and Nelkins' (1971) research concerning migrant labor camps in the northeastern United States, Roper's (1983) study of family impacts of land acquisition and relocation in association with dam construction, and finally,

research by Schoepfle, Barton, and Begishe (1984) concerning the effects of accelerating energy extinction and other industrial problems on traditional populations throughout the world.

As Spradley (1979) suggests, there are many ways of doing an ethnographic study. This uncertainty is primarily due to a lack of consensus regarding procedures and techniques of ethnography. Hence, this form of research became highly individualized, where replication and even learning ethnography became extremely difficult for the study of anthropology.

In the 1950s, a movement began to improve the standards of description and analysis (Harris 1968). This movement, inspired by linguistic models, was termed ethnoscience. On the basis of phonological analysis, ethnoscience made distinctions between "emic" and "etic" approaches to cultural descriptions. Etics from the term phonetics, or the study of sounds used in the production of speech, are classes of sound, behavior, or other phenomena considered to be universal, analytic categories rather than folk categories. Emics, from the term phonemics, are categories of sounds of a particular cultural group; an emic description is based upon determining folk categories, or those which are meaningful to the native.

While approaches to ethnography may differ, most researchers agree that the discovery of categories that are meaningful to the native is the essence of understanding culture (Spradley 1979; Spradley and McCurdy 1980; Agar 1980). Therefore, rather than collect information about people, the ethnographer's task is to learn from the members of the culture, to obtain the "insider's"

point of view. Perhaps Spradley (1979:5) best describes the goal of ethnographic investigations:

The essential core of ethnography is the concern with the meaning of actions and events to the people we seek to understand. Some of these meanings are directly expressed in language; many are taken for granted and communicated only indirectly through word and action. But in every society people make constant use of these complex meaning systems to organize their behavior, to understand themselves and others, and to make sense out of the world in which they live. These systems of meaning constitute their culture. . . .

According to Burns (1976), ethnography became a popular term in educational related research in the 1960s. Studies by Wolcott (1973) and Fuchs (1969) were early works which illustrated the application of the ethnographic method, especially the participant observation component. Generally, the initial thrust of these new endeavors was to examine how values were transmitted through the educational process (Spindler 1963).

As Fetterman (1984) suggests, the ethnographic method has many conventional applications, especially regarding an understanding of social and educational problems. Basically the task of ethnography is to describe a particular culture. As Pelto (1970) notes, it is both an art and a science which tests and shapes ideas based upon various techniques. The aim of the ethnographic approach is to gain understanding by way of immersion in the daily lives of the study society. This understanding is accomplished through listening, asking questions, watching, and participating without interference in the day-to-day routines of the people.

Various techniques exist for the collection of ethnographic information. Pelto (1970) lists participant observation, key informant interviewing, collecting life histories, structured interview, questionnaires, and the use of projective devices, such as the Thematic Apperception Test as primary techniques. Spradley and McCurdy (1980) suggest participant observation, interviewing, collection of genealogies and life histories, case studies, projective testing, photography, and the use of key informants and questionnaires to be the principle techniques for collecting data. Clearly, different strategies exist, and each field situation may require the use of certain techniques while excluding others. For example, genealogies are not typically reported in research focusing upon western cultures.

These strategies, of course, are designed to elicit information that is phenomenological in the sense of revealing a world view, which is empirical and naturalistic, and holistic, involving the reporting of descriptive phenomena in their appropriate contexts (LeCompte and Goetz 1984).

For the current research three strategies were employed: participant observation, key informant interviews, and the questionnaire. Participant observation is the core technique of all ethnographic research (Spradley and McCurdy 1980; Pelto 1970; LeCompte and Goetz 1984; Fetterman 1984a and 1984 b; van Willigen 1986; Wolcott 1975, 1984). Here the researcher takes part in the daily routines without being a disruptive influence. As Spradley and McCurdy (1980) comment, the technique is based upon a model in

the physical sciences where detached observation is desired. The process is primarily a reconstructive one, where the researcher, through note taking based upon observation and discussion, records a wide variety of behaviors that emerge from peoples' daily activities and annual events.

In the pursuit of baseline information, the participant observer must "map," or become acquainted with the environment and the members of the environment (Spradley and McCurdy 1980). This mapping can be accomplished by the actual drawing of the physical layout, such as the village and its various structure, or by making a cognitive drawing. As LeCompte and Goetz (1984:43) note, the procedure should principally involve:

getting acquainted with participants, learning why they
congregate, recording demographic characteristics . . .
and creating a description of the context of the
phenomena under consideration.

Participant observation also leads to the identification of key informants. These individuals are important to the ethnographic process since they typically possess information that serves as the primary source from which the researcher gains understanding of the study culture. These individuals may occupy a unique status in the setting; they may possess specialized knowledge; they have desirable skills, traits, or attributes which shed insight toward an understanding of the culture or particular phenomena under study (Pelto 1970, van Willigen 1986). The key informants should be selected on the basis of being somewhat representative, and they are

best used where short term study is warranted. Clearly, they normally possess information not readily available to the researcher.

The final strategy is the use of a survey instrument or questionnaire. Questionnaires, as Pelto (1970) notes, are exceptionally useful devices, especially when statistical analysis is a primary consideration. Briefly, questionnaires serve the ethnographer where populations are sufficiently large and personal contact with each member cannot be made. Questionnaires are normally administered only after information from participant observation and interviewing has identified important research constructs (Spradley and McCurdy 1980). According to LeCompte and Goetz (1984:46-47), the questionnaire serves primarily to affirm representation and to "assess the extent to which participants hold similar beliefs, share specific constructs, or execute comparable behaviors."

Questionnaires, if written in the language of the researcher, usually do not afford cultural information. This does not mean, however, that information is not valid. Rather, descriptions of the population are afforded regarding necessary biographical information such as age, sex, and provenience. In addition, attitudinal information is provided regarding the phenomena under study. All in all, information is collected in questionnaires which can be used to complement that gained through interviews and observation, whether subjected to statistical analysis or simply used to supplement research findings in a more general manner.

As van Willigen (1986) notes, evaluation research requires an integrated methodology which allows the researcher to formulate research designs composed of multiple techniques. Clearly the ethnographic approach affords such possibilities, and as Wolcott (1984:177-178) writes:

Ethnography has two potential contributions to make to the practice of educational evaluation. The first of these has largely been realized: to help educators recognize the value of descriptive research conducted in natural settings rather than to rely so wholeheartedly on experimental research in contrived or controlled settings. If descriptive or 'qualitative' research, as it is fortuitiously called, is not about to unseat quantitative research as education's king of the mountain, it has at least earned a place as one of education's legitimate and important ways of knowing. . . .

Ethnography's other potential contribution to the practice of educational evaluation makes headway more slowly and less dramatically and, to some extent, makes headway at the cost of the first. That is to recognize that ethnography can serve as an alternative to rather than an alternative form of evaluation. Ethnography viewed as an alternative to evaluation suggests a descriptive and interpretive activity whose purposes are to understand rather than to judge and to examine facts of human behavior as part of larger cultural systems.

Moreover, ethnography has challenged conventional wisdom, basic assumptions, and ideological premises. It is exploratory and diverse; it is also less structured than the research methods of other sciences. But as Fetterman (1984) suggests, this application of ethnography to evaluation remains a new endeavor. By using the ethnographic method, however, those individuals who are considering the evaluation of any nontraditional program may discover a richness of information beyond the scope of many existing models.

RESEARCH SETTING

The setting for the research was Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon. Here the Oregon Heritage Festival, a nontraditional, nonacademic, program, began in the summer of 1983. This summer program was designed to make summer term more attractive to students and community alike. Through a diverse set of media, such as lectures, films, exhibits, tours, performances, and other activities, the festival sought to provide educational experiences and useful knowledge for students, tourists, foreign visitors, and the general public. The festival attempted to present an interesting and academically sound view of Oregon's cultural heritage in an entertaining and relaxed format. The Oregon Heritage Festival eclectically drew upon the arts, humanities, and sciences to illustrate and explore the state's technological, social, and ideological history.

The initial and general planning for the festival was accomplished through the efforts of a special committee comprised of both university and community representatives. Many statewide public and private agencies also cooperated in the planning and conduct of activities. Cooperating agencies included local Visitors and Conventions Center, Oregon Economic Development Council, Oregon Committee for the Humanities, Oregon Historical Society, the Governor's Office, and many others. Since both Corvallis and Oregon State University have limited populations from which to draw

participants, the planning called for cooperative efforts in order to gain wider geographical attention. Ultimate success for the festival was thought to lie in achieving statewide attention in addition to that of the community and university.

Briefly, the purpose of the festival was to provide adult educational and lifelong learning experiences for the general public, and supplemental and complementary programs for students. This aim required, then, a multifaceted and integrated program design with a wide variety of media and teaching methods.

Most of the financial support for the festival was from Oregon State University; however, many local, state, and federal agencies contributed in-kind support. Private agencies cooperated, too, and contributed program dollars.

Other nontraditional, nonacademic programs similar to the Oregon Heritage Festival have concentrated on topics such as public relations, student recruitment, curriculum development, school to college matriculation process, and even cultural preservation. Examples of these types of nontraditional educational programs are a social science fair conducted at Chesapeake College in Maryland where the program attempts to fulfill a public relations and a student recruitment function by involving the community, faculty, and students in that program. Information on a college fair in Washington, D.C., shows how a nontraditional educational program is used to improve a student's adjustment to college life and to the rigors of college study. In this Washington, D.C., program, students are assisted by the content of the program in making a

smooth transition to academics. Other colleges and universities use festivals and other types of nontraditional programming to enrich existing curricula. The Kansas Folklife Festival at Kansas State University uses cultural enrichment and preservation as a public relations device, while the Western Heritage Festival at Colorado State University concentrates on learning through fun.

These nontraditional, nonacademic, educational programs employ different activities to meet their objectives. Yet each shares one common feature--they have not been formally evaluated. This is probably not an unusual circumstance since each of these programs is more than likely judged upon rate of attendance as well as participant enthusiasm.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of continuity, terms frequently used in this study are defined as follows:

1. Accidental or convenience sampling: a nonprobability/nonrandom technique in order to gain understanding of a specific research population.

2. Ethnographic method: an inquiry process which contains all or part of the following techniques: participant observation, interviewing, collection of life histories and genealogies, projective testing, case study, photography, and surveys.
3. Ethnography: a descriptive process to discover cultural meaning from the "insider's" perspective.
4. Evaluation: a study designed to assess and/or determine the worth of a program.
5. Group survey: where questionnaires are administered to a population in the same locale at the same time. Instructions are given to respondents prior to filling out the instrument. The researcher remains at the scene to clarify any ambiguities.
6. Key informants: persons who possess unique understanding, knowledge, insights, or skills concerning a particular phenomenon.
7. Method: the process of inquiry entailing description, explanation, and justification of techniques.
8. Nonprobability/nonrandom design: a sample drawn where the probability of the individual being selected is unknown.
9. Nontraditional: an innovative or unusual mode of programming to achieve institutional goals.

10. Participant observation: participating and observing in the activities of a human population to gain understanding of that society.
11. Research design: the complete research plan containing one or more methods, data collection techniques, concepts, data categories, description of data sources, and plan for analysis.
12. Techniques: specific procedures used in particular context of inquiry, such as statistical techniques.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The research may be limited in the following fashion, thereby affecting the ability to generalize findings.

1. Group survey increases the probability that some questions may be misunderstood or answered incorrectly.
2. A nonprobability design, using accidental sampling, is limiting since sample error cannot be calculated and generalization cannot be attempted beyond the immediate population.

3. Misinterpretation or misunderstanding of response from all interviews.
4. Errors in questionnaire coding.
5. The research was conducted by the former director of the Oregon Heritage Festival.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The search for literature related to the use of the ethnographic method in evaluating nontraditional adult and continuing education programs did not prove fruitful. In fact, evaluation studies of programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival were not found in the published literature. Therefore, this review of related literature assumed a broader context.

A review of adult and continuing education nontraditional programs served to illustrate the range of strategies recommended for use in program evaluation, types of methods actually employed, and the type of information obtained. This review of adult and continuing nontraditional program evaluation examined research beyond the typical "headcount" method.

The review of literature pertaining to the ethnographic method as an evaluation device served to illustrate the various educational contexts where this approach has been applied, and the type of information the approach yielded. The review of literature pertaining to the ethnographic method was conducted in two areas. First, general information regarding the application of the ethnographic technique to educational related studies, and, secondly, to research which actually employed the ethnographic method in evaluating educational programs.

NONTRADITIONAL EVALUATION STUDIES

The area of nontraditional educational programming remains a broad arena. In fact, attempts to even define the term nontraditional education can only be done tangentially (cf. Cross and Valley 1974). Regardless of problems with defining the term nontraditional education, the evaluation of these programs has been extremely narrow and limited in scope. In most cases, as suggested by Houle (1980), adult and continuing educators have applied the extent of participation, or head count, method as a primary means of evaluating nontraditional programs.

As Houle (1980), further notes, the most common techniques employed in evaluating traditional adult and continuing educational programs have been based upon extent of participation, or counting program hours. While there are several systems for counting program hours, two systems of counting are most common. Under one system, an individual is simply required to spend a certain number of hours in a professionalizing program until the amount of hours for certification or credentialing is completed. Program completion serves as a basis for relicensure in a professional association. In the second commonly used system, called the continuing education unit, an individual is required to spend a certain number of contact hours (1 contact hour is 10 credits) in an accredited continuing education program of high standards. This continuing education unit program was designed by higher education associations and

representatives from government agencies. Both of these systems, of course, are not effective measures of the value of the adult or continuing education program, as they are based on "clock hours." As Houle (1980:242) writes, "they [the systems of counting] carry no assurance that desired changes in the competence of performance of participants has occurred."

Like the evaluation of traditional adult and continuing educational programs, the evaluation of nontraditional programs experience certain problems, too. As Kimmel (1972) suggests, the evaluation of nontraditional programs, such as experiential learning, requires even greater breadth if the evaluation is to be responsive. To date, however, the evaluation of nontraditional programs has principally been confined to those certification programs where some type of credential is awarded upon the completion of certain requirements. In this context, evaluation has remained a quantitative activity where examination or tests are administered to participants to assess the success or failure of the program.

Valentine (1980) discusses the need for the evaluation of nontraditional learning to go beyond those methods traditionally employed which equate program value with participant outcomes. However, he cites recommendations established by the cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning, which promotes the development of "a set of materials that describe and document what the individual has done" (Valentine 1980:220). Once again, the individual's performance becomes the basic criterion used to

determine the worth of a program. The narrow view of evaluation cannot establish the worth of a program

Hammett (1972) also calls for an additional breadth of information in evaluating nontraditional programs. Here, he suggests that nontraditional programs, unlike traditional programs, also must establish a credibility. Although Hammett relies upon standardized testing as a chief device for measuring program success or failure, he at least recognizes that attitudes of participants are important in determining the overall quality and effectiveness of a nontraditional program.

Seemingly, the concept of evaluation has not been important to adult and continuing educators involved in program planning and design. Sork and Buskey (1986) review adult and continuing education program planning literature from 1950 through 1983, and one aspect of their research indicated an apathy toward evaluation as an integral part of program design. Their review constituted an analysis of 51 planning documents which were intended for use in six different educational program contexts. These program contexts were adult basic education, continuing education in the professions, cooperative extension, general adult education, and training in business, industry, and government.

Sork and Buskey (1986) found that program designers did not typically afford evaluation of programs any credence. For example only four of the 51 program designers gave evaluation a high priority as an integral part of their plan. Two planners did not

even include evaluation in their program proposals, and the remaining writers judged evaluation as having a low or medium program priority.

Holt and Courtenay (1985) discussed the overall weakness of commonly used methods used in evaluating adult and continuing education programs. These authors suggested participant attendance and self-reports of participant satisfaction were not good indicators of overall program value. One common practice, highly criticized by the authors, was the enclosure of an evaluation form in a packet of materials given to program participants at the onset. Then, at the end of the program, participants completed the evaluation form. Of course, this practice was not effective because "such factors as fatigue, anxiousness to go home, and sense of satisfaction or dissatisfaction" all influence the reporting process (Holt and Courtenay 1985:25).

In a more general discussion, Holt and Courtenay (1985) listed many of the typical techniques used to evaluate adult and continuing education programs. These techniques were: questionnaires, personal interviews, telephone interviews, written reports, performance observations, tests, audit ratings, and case studies. The authors concluded by noting that regardless of the approach used to determine program worth, the primary objective of adult and continuing education programs must be to assure that learning will be transferred from instructor to participant to workplace. This transfer of learning, then remained the best measure of the value of a program.

In another approach to evaluating adult and continuing education programs, Legare (1980) discussed four major problems in evaluation. These problems were:

1. Ambiguous goals or objectives of the program.
2. Inadequate financial assistance for evaluation from the funding source of the program.
3. Program evaluation was not given enough credibility by program designers.
4. Lack of adequate control groups for comparative research findings.

Legare further commented on these four general problem areas concerning evaluation of educational programs. For example, where programs were not designed to achieve some specificity, then in reality an evaluation could not determine any success or failure. According to Legare (1980), program designers were more concerned with general program directions than with specific goals or objectives.

Another problem, as reported by Legare (1980), has been the lack of authority or desire by funding agencies to impose evaluation upon many educational institutions. Project Head Start, a federally funded program, was but one example of this lack of authority or interest to impose evaluation. Head Start administrators were free to spend money as they wished; however, they were not held responsible to determine the worth of the federal program.

According to Legare (1980), a third problem area concerning evaluation was that program designers as well as education administrators did not view evaluation as a central feature to education. The author explained that different role orientations may best explain this phenomenon concerning different perceptions of evaluation.

Finally, because of the near impossibility of isolating an uncontaminated control group in an educational setting, the use of experimental design was deemed as an inappropriate evaluation method under most circumstances. Therefore, valid information concerning the worth of an adult and continuing education program could not be ascertained using the experimental design approach.

In order to compensate for these general problems in evaluation, Legare (1980) proposed a quantitative approach designed to incorporate the program participants' own behaviors and perceptions. In Legare's study, an evaluation was conducted to determine changes in social service employees' job behavior as a result of Title XX education program training. A sample of students, instructors, and program supervisors were selected for his research, and questionnaires mailed to each of these populations. After statistical analysis, the author concluded "that each of these three groups did not significantly differ with respect to the effects of courses on improving skills" (Legare 1980:45).

While some subtle differences did appear among the research populations, Legare (1980) noted two general problems with the study. First, any differences which appear among the populations of

students, instructors, and supervisors cannot be totally explained based upon statistical analysis. And, secondly, actual work performances could not be obtained. Yet, Legare (1980) suggested this approach to be a vast improvement over the case study method.

Welch and Granvold (1979) introduced another type of evaluation approach which was implemented to assess the worth of personalized systems of instruction. Personalized systems of instruction, as used in continuing education, have demonstrated an effectiveness over the lecture-discussion method. Personalized systems of instruction consist of small groups of participants, like the seminar, who operate in a self-paced manner. The personalized system was selected for study by the authors because they wanted to determine correlation of student performance with course evaluation. In other words, those students receiving the better grade were thought to evaluate the course the highest.

In their procedure to evaluate the personalized system of instruction, Welch and Granvold (1980) had their seminar students contract with the instructors for a course grade. If a student contracted for an "A" grade, he or she must perform a certain number of tasks at a certain performance level. Examinations, workshop participation, and special research projects were used to evaluate student performance. Then, in turn, those students who were involved in the program, rated the quality of the examinations, the workshops, and the research projects. Overall, the authors concluded that the students "rated their learning experience as more

palatable than that of more traditional methods" (Welch and Granvold 1980:9). All students in the course contracted for an "A" grade.

Nontraditional education programs have been referred to by some writers as experimental programs (cf. Dagenais 1978). According to Dagenais (1978), nontraditional programs pose certain evaluation problems not encountered in the evaluation of traditional programs. The most critical problem pertained to program development. Developing programs, such as experimental programs, are not yet established and their objectives might still be vague. Dagenais (1978) suggested that the evaluation of nontraditional educational programs still in the developmental stage can be evaluated if the researcher examines only the central features of the program. The author illustrated this approach through his research in a program called Planned Variation Follow Through, located at Stanford Research Institute.

Planned Variation Follow Through, as explained by Dagenais (1978:75), was described as follows:

This particular program attempts to develop a 'responsive' environment, one in which the student is encouraged to explore freely and to develop a problem solving capacity. The program is relatively unstructured; learner action consequences are fed back immediately. Students are encouraged to learn at their own pace and a great deal of attention is given to individual needs. The classroom environment is designed to foster self-concept, to stress student self-worth through positive actions on the part of classroom adults.

The intent of the author was to illustrate how developing

nontraditional, or experimental, programs can be evaluated. Through his research, Dagenais (1978) determined that the effects of such developing programs may not be totally quantifiable.

Data for the research conducted by Dagenais (1978) were derived through the Classroom Observation Instrument, a procedure which incorporated information on the classroom setting, activities of students and instructors, and various levels of interaction which occur in the classroom. Observations on the aforementioned behaviors were recorded at five-minute intervals, four times each hour. A total of six classrooms were monitored; however, comparable classrooms were not available for monitoring in the same locale. Hence, the control group was selected in a nearby city for comparative purposes. Nearly 120 variables were isolated for statistical analysis.

Dagenais (1978) found the statistical analysis did not totally confirm any hypotheses regarding the overall differences in student achievement between the experimental and control classrooms. However, some isolated theoretical and practical information for the program was uncovered. More specifically, the evaluation revealed that program developers needed to examine program philosophy in more detail and to sharpen all program objectives.

In an effort to broaden the methodological base for adult and continuing education program evaluation, Kinsey (1981) proposed that researchers consider the participatory evaluation approach. Participatory evaluation included information collected from a broad range of participants such as policy makers, program designers,

staff personnel, learners or clients, and members of the community. Obviously, each of these participants participated at a different level; however, as Kinsey (1981) noted, their input is important to the evaluation process.

Kinsey (1981) discussed participant evaluation in its relations to adult education and developed a rationale for the approach. Participatory evaluation served to illustrate the following considerations necessary for evaluation. These considerations were increased accuracy of data, more adaptable to the unexpected, promoted learning, improved awareness, increased motivation and commitment, and developed external understanding and support for the program.

Kinsey's approach, involving a variety of techniques including questionnaires and interviews, was designed to obtain the following kinds of information:

1. A descriptive analysis of the program and program participants.
2. Opinion and behavioral analysis of individuals and groups who participate.
3. A range of problems and perceived problems from various perspectives.
4. Change in behaviors of all participants.
5. Assessment of behavioral change.
6. Program affects upon the community.

The first three categories of information involved the use of soft research designs, and the remaining categories required a quantitative or quantitative-qualitative mix design. Kinsey (1981:166) best describes the proposed value of the participatory approach:

This approach focuses on an improvement of the relationship between a program and the social or administrative context in which it occurs. . . . The potential benefits of increased participation in evaluation in adult and nonformal programs are important to consider. . . .

Finally, Goldin and Thomas (1984) recently conducted an evaluation of adult education in two penitentiaries or correctional facilities. The method employed for the evaluation was based upon four years of experience in adult education programs in Illinois state prisons, open ended interviews with prisoners, instructors, and prison and education officials, and survey data. This broad-based approach to evaluation revealed many interesting aspects about adult education in prison settings, as well as how holistic approach such as the ethnographic approach offer more potential to program evaluators.

Goldin and Thomas (1984) discovered several principle factors which directly related to the prevention of full development of adult education programs in correctional settings. In the application of their methodology, the authors determined that inmate students were concerned about a lack of educational relevance for real life application after their release. Lockdowns, or a confinement of prisoners to cells, was another concern since it

prevented prisoners from attending classes. One lockdown lasted over a year and, of course, all classes were canceled during this period.

Classroom environments were deemed inadequate for learning by educators as well as prisoners. So, too, was classroom interaction determined to be a problem. For example, in one instance only a single prisoner had completed a required reading assignment for a class. When he entered into discussion with the instructor, other inmates who had not read the assigned articles berated and threatened the student.

Social organization of prisons was another salient aspect which pertained to adult and continuing education program growth in the correctional settings. Single day-to-day routines afforded stress for students. Harassment and hazing from fellow inmates and from guards served to retard active learning.

Then, contradictory goals between inmates, instructors, and prison officials were found to be major deterrents to educational program growth and to learning, per se. According to the research, the goals of all participants differed dramatically. Prison officials were most inclined to enforce the goals of the penal institution, educators adhered to the goals of their particular institutions, instructors wanted to maintain course-required goals, and prisoners rated self-improvement and attainment of a degree as a chief goal for themselves. This contradiction is best expressed in the words of Goldin and Thomas (1984:130):

The goals of prisons have on occasion made it difficult to bring controversial topics into the classroom. For example, discussions about American values were scheduled at a regional medium security institution. Two films, Attica and a film about the training of prison guards, were proposed by the faculty and approved by prison administrators for one of the sessions. Upon learning which movies were scheduled, two corrections officers complained to their captain that they believed these films were likely to instigate unrest and even prompt riots among the viewers. The administrators acceded to the wishes of the security staff and decided that the films would not be shown. Upon learning of the decision, inmates expressed anger over the ease with which the administration could intervene to change the inmates' program. The series coordinator reported that, after this incident, the attendance at the next program was less than half that of the first session. Further, the rapport between students and faculty was considerably worse than it had been before the incident.

In review, the evaluation designs which have been employed in the evaluation of adult and continuing education programs were mostly quantitative efforts based upon extent of participation, or some other type of quantitative design which attempted to correlate learning and program value. As Houle (1974) commented, evaluation of adult and continuing education programs must be dual process. One part must objectively measure how participants have achieved the intent of the program, and another subjective process which is a judgment on how well the educational objective has been met.

GENERAL APPLICATION OF ETHNOGRAPHIC TECHNIQUES

Several authors (Britan 1978; Fetterman 1984a; Filstead 1979; Eisner 1979; LeCompte and Goetz 1984; Lincoln and Guba 1985) have discussed an increasing disillusionment, especially among administrators, with the inability of the total quantitative approach to capture the true essence of research findings. Lincoln and Guba (1985) in a similar context provide arguments to support the notion that a need for a hard scientific mode of investigation does not serve the applied social sciences as well as it does the life sciences. Cronbach (1979), a champion of quantitative analysis, has also expressed the need for broader and softer designs.

The ethnographic method is one approach lending itself to a broader and softer design. As Wilson (1976) notes, the ethnographic approach is considered a more holistic effort: it may be used where the researcher is only interested in acquiring an understanding of a component of the whole; or, as part of an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary effort. Participant observation may be used to complement a survey as one research strategy (Lincoln and Guba 1985).

While utilizing the participant observation technique, Wolcott (1973), conducted a detailed study which afforded an understanding of the role of an administrator in the public school system. While the primary emphasis of the study focused upon the network of system

interrelationships in the school and community, methods of conflict resolution, and perceptions and attitudes toward the school system, this research was instrumental in discovering many of the indirect circumstances which operated between the school "Head Man" and the educational process in general, such as community mediation. This study was not, however, a complete description of the operating culture. Rather, it stressed the political analysis of administration, and served to clarify a common misbelief: Principals are involved directly in the education process. Rather, their involvement is more indirect.

This indirect involvement is defined by the role of mediator, between a network of relationships such as the community, staff, parents, officials in the school system, and the students. Because of this role, the time principals spend in the educational process is, indeed, minimal.

Wolcott's findings have particular application regarding the education of the public school administrator. He stresses that this education should focus upon analysis and understanding of the limitations (both real and assumed) of the bureaucratic system of which administrators are a part. Research has shown that even after years of working in an educational setting, the principal's actual knowledge of the system may be incomplete and faulty, thus leading to many errors in decision making (Sarason 1971).

Next, according to Wolcott, administrators need to obtain skills in recognizing when conflicts between the general public and the administrator's personal values are at the heart of a problem

that defies resolution. Conflicts pertaining to moral issues between the community and their own values exemplify this concern.

As Wolcott (1975:323) writes:

indeed [values] conflict itself would play a more valuable factor in school administration if principals would learn to recognize its integrative function rather than assume it to be only and always a disruptive force.

There is a unique interface between education and anthropology. The latter can be used in gaining a better understanding of education, but, as Burns (1976) cautions, simply engaging in participant observation is not the ethnographic process. There are some basic dangers involved. First, too much emphasis is given to fieldwork without considering the conceptual framework of ethnography; second, little attention is given to the design of the study; and, third, not understanding that ethnography involves several equally important components creates many problems for the untrained researcher (Burns 1976:25-26). More recently, Langness (1985) reminds us that fieldwork is not ethnography, only a part of the process.

Moreover, Wolcott (1975) emphasizes several conditions for successful ethnography in the educational setting: (1) broad-focused problems are more suitable for ethnographic design; (2) adequate training in the ethnographic method must be attained; (3) the study must fulfill adequate scope and time requirements; (4) there must be latitude to employ various techniques for data collection. One

aspect of primary importance here is appropriate training in ethnographic research. Fetterman (1984a:21) best addresses this issue:

Ethnography has become a popular buzz word in education. A number of scholars have observed that researchers with little or no background in anthropology claim to be doing ethnography. In one study, labeled 'An ethnographic study of . . .' observers were on-site at only one point in time for five days. In a national study purporting to be ethnographic, once-a-week, on-site observations were made for four months. . . .

In another study related to the application of the ethnographic method to educational studies, Koppleman (1983) proposes what he terms an "explication model." The term explication is used to avoid any perjorative aspects that are associated with the term evaluation. The model is primarily based upon participant observation, or, as he suggests, "systematic observation." In this case, teacher and students are actively involved in determining the successes or failures of an educational program; however, the coordinator of the effort spends a minimal amount of time conducting some of the observations that are primarily the responsibility of the teachers and students. While the approach may create interest, enthusiasm, and feelings of involvement for students and teachers, their ability as scientific data collectors may place limitations toward a realistic understanding of the program under "explication."

Even under the most ideal circumstances, the transfer of the ethnographic approach to new environments is not without some difficulty (Fitzsimmons 1975). Several reasons are apparent. In part, once fieldwork has begun, various forces emanating from

individuals or institutions may impose constraints upon the research which affect both progress and scope. Also, the ethnographer may feel pressures from other sources such as community interests or factions which could ultimately shape the outcome of the research. Such internal and external forces may be atypical in traditional settings where the individual researcher usually determines design, method, theory, and other aspects of inquiry; however, they are not uncommon in educational evaluation studies (cf. Hemwall 1984).

Everhart (1975:212-214) reviews several problems associated with conducting ethnographic fieldwork in educational settings. Comparative evaluation, for example, cannot be accomplished on the same dimension typical of other ethnographic studies because of uniqueness, or the absence of similar research. In addition, important persons in the research setting may be reticent in cooperating with the researcher. Everhart (1975:212) describes one experience:

I have been asked by teachers not to come into the classroom, to leave once access is gained, and I have been asked by principals to leave departmental meetings. All this despite agreement to my presence in advance as well as what I thought were painstaking efforts to explain what I would be doing at the site.

In a similar vein, Wacaster and Firestone (1978) discuss other problems associated with long-term fieldwork in the educational setting. They mention the same kinds of problems but also stress the fatigue factor and culture shock aspects of ethnographic research.

As Meyers (1981) suggests, evaluation attempts to understand a program's function and effects. Evaluation should not be thought of as a salvage process, with the underlying philosophy that collecting some information is better than collecting none at all. An evaluation should, however, attempt to be holistic; that is, understand the essence of the program by examining it in its general context rather than treating it as an isolate that stands independently.

PROGRAM EVALUATION ETHNOGRAPHY

One of the first inclusive projects using the ethnographic approach was the research that evaluated the "Experimental Schools Program" (Burns 1976; Clinton 1975; Everhart 1975; Fitzsimmons 1975; Fetterman 1984a). This federally funded, four-year study was designed to introduce both innovation and planned change in order to prepare high school graduates for a better life. Although this research was interdisciplinary in design, a major portion of the effort involved the ethnographic method which utilized participant observation, survey questionnaires, and projective testing. This research focused upon obtaining an understanding of educational change at nine selected school district sites across the country--one district in the east coast, three from the central United States, two from the midwest, one from the southeast, and two from the west coast. One portion of the research required ethnographers

to reside in the school district and community for three to five years.

"Project Rural," one aspect of the research, was essentially a monitoring effort where questionnaires, key informant interviewing, and participant observation were the principle techniques employed. This part of the study was designed to assess the attitudes and behaviors of one thousand students one year after graduation from high school. The results of the study, which shattered previous assumptions, determined that differences did not exist between rural, small town, suburban, and urban students regarding talent, preparation for adult life, and education options (Abt 1977).

The Experimental School Program evaluation closely duplicated the traditional ethnographic approach. However, as one would surmise, the design was both time-consuming and expensive. The federal government funded the evaluation of the program which involved several million dollars. This innovative study was sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, which also monitored all research activities. While this program did not succeed, qualitative social science information, particularly from the ethnographic approach, helped determine the reasons for, and the contexts of, the program's failure (Messerschmidt 1984). Most of the program's failure can be attributed to very poor program design and administration. Messerschmidt (1984) cites the following problems in design and administration: (1) the research and development process should have been managed locally rather than

federally; (2) federal funding organizations underwent massive reorganizations during the program's development, which impacted locally placed programs; (3) poor social engineering in federal planning caused several problems; (4) the program's goals were ambiguous; (5) administrators were ignorant of rural American politics and community life; (6) interface between researchers, contractors, local, and federal planners was insufficient.

Messerschmidt (1984) notes that the program design contained two parts: research and mode of funding. The funding part of the program acknowledged that discretionary funds had in the past ignored small school districts. Also, the funding component was designed to determine if planned educational change would lead to an overall improvement in schooling, as opposed to the piecemeal application of funds in the past which were primarily curriculum-oriented. Briefly, the five-year research effort required evaluations using multiple strategies to include the ethnographic method on-site. Furthermore, the research was mandated to be holistic and contextual, and to approach the study in a different fashion than typical of most educational evaluation strategies. Embodied in the funding portion of the program was the notion that systematic and carefully planned educational change would yield more satisfactory results over all previous programs, such as the fragmented programs were characteristic of the 1960s. Systematic and planned change was defined as:

simultaneous change in school curricula, staffing, use of time, space, and facilities, community involvement, evaluation, and administration as well as the organization structure throughout each school system (Messerschmidt 1984:91).

Many ethnographic works have emerged from the federally funded evaluation research (Clinton 1979; Herriot 1979; Hennigh 1981; Firestone 1980; and Messerschmidt 1979). According to Messerschmidt (1984), the best ethnographic accounts are Clinton (1979) and Firestone (1980). They are sterling examples of how the ethnographic method provides insights and understanding in evaluation studies.

Clinton's study, as already suggested by Messerschmidt (1984), best demonstrates the notion that evaluation involves the consideration of more than the local school district and federal program sponsors. Many other variables come to bear upon program implementation. Clinton's ethnography, for example, found that components formed through social networks of religion, neighboring, friendships, and kinship are significant political factors in the development and change process. As Clinton notes, these variables are intermingled as parts of a larger system of the town, school district, and federal agency. Clearly, the effects of each variable must be analyzed in order to understand the total framework of the culture.

Clinton also determined that certain individuals operating for their own self-interests, politically or economically, are most important in the process of planned change. According to Clinton's research, decisions responsible for planned change are usually the

work of one or two key individuals, each of whom represents one or more factions. In the case of Experimental School Program, a superintendent of the local school district tried to manipulate local events according to his own priorities and those of a religious group; both the superintendent and the religious group opposed the program on grounds that it was too progressive for the community. Eventually, the superintendent was exposed and forced to leave the area. Without ethnography, the work of such individuals to abstract programs might go otherwise undetected and reasons for program innovation would not be totally understood.

Conclusions raised by Clinton's study are primarily political in nature; Clinton's general theme suggests that political and developmental questions are critically linked. Clearly, the single most important conclusion reached by Clinton is that developmental programs generated at the local level are far more successful and effective than those imposed externally. In the latter case (i.e., externally imposed programs), the cultural distance between local communities and federal planners seems the dominant factor affecting program failure. Externally imposed programs, according to Clinton, have no redeeming virtues or qualities.

In another study emanating from the Experimental School Program research, Firestone (1980) describes the expectations toward planned change of a small community in the midwest. Firestone, however, deals more with organizational problems than with the influences of local community politics. Four false premises, through ethnographic

research, were revealed to be operating between the local recipients and the federal designers (Firestone 1980:8):

1. New projects designed for educational innovation and change can be designed rationally.
2. Staff resistance is the largest obstacle to planned change, but can be conquered.
3. A major force in planned change is the federal system.
4. Innovation and developmental change can be instituted in public schools.

According to the research findings, the first two premises are typically policy related statements that appear widely in planning documents. The third premise, of course, is a commonly accepted belief. The last premise was the motivating force behind the Experimental School Program, and was discovered to be the essence of most governmental thinking.

All in all, Firestone's study strongly suggests that each of these statements are fallacious to some extent, and are applicable only under very limited sets of circumstances. Firestone (1980) suggests that several options are available for consideration by local and federal persons involved in the developmental process. The first option involves the realization that the first false premise carries irrational and advocacy overtones. In Firestone's research, persons who believed in the first premise were the entrepreneur types who were well versed in grant writing activities, and could easily convince others of the ease of implementing change.

The second premise acknowledges that resistance to change will occur. This obstacle can best be handled by planners and program

designers if they anticipate and handle barriers directly, avoid conflicts, and deal straightforwardly with the relation between the program and any community apprehensions. Even though it is a commonly held belief that federal institutions are regarded as champions of change, Firestone (1980) suggests they do not live up to this reputation. He cites a clear example where less than 5 percent of the districts eligible for Experimental School Program funding actually applied for grants. This would indicate the federal government is unable to stimulate interest from the very beginning of the program. In addition, Firestone notes the philosophy of education and the geographical distance between federal planners and the rural study sites as other factors for federal failure. Overall, there seems to be a great cultural difference between local and federal personnel, a point also mentioned by Messerschmidt (1984).

The fourth premise, regarding implementing change, simply cannot happen under rushed conditions. Time and study are needed to insure that any new programs be slowly assimilated into the local culture.

The Experimental School Program failed for many reasons, and perhaps Messerschmidt (1984:104) best summarizes this failure--and its qualified success.

The ESP experiment in funding change clearly failed, but the research about it was a great success. While comprehensive change was an overly ambitious and poorly conceived goal even under the best of circumstances, the ethnographic studies of its attempted implementation have enhanced our understanding of the problems and issues

involved. . . . The ethnographic knowledge of what happened in this large social program should also assist policy makers to appreciate why to learn from the mistakes and lessons therein.

In another application of the ethnographic method in the evaluation of educational programs, Rist (1979, 1980) focuses upon the shift from high school to the work force among youth. Techniques involved participant observation, interviews, and survey questionnaires in a multi-year study of the Youthwork National Policy Program funded by the Department of Labor. This study provided information to program and policy makers regarding processes and dynamics of programs, rather than assessing behavioral outcomes of an existing program. Through a series of questionnaires and interviews, it was determined that the needs of the youth who were involved in the program were not being adequately met.

Rist (1980) found that the needs of the youths were being neglected for several reasons. First, it was determined that too many organizations were involved in youth work, and too much time was being spent by the administration in maintaining a host of program linkages. As a result, less time was given to the program participants. In addition, the cumbersome scope of the program required far too many decisions, which was found to interfere with program success.

The obstacles that most often interfered with participant needs were the overly restrictive regulations and guidelines imposed by federal agencies. In interviews with public and private sector

organizations participating in the program, people repeatedly complained that the "red tape" was simply not worth the effort.

In another research effort to incorporate the ethnographic method in educational evaluation, Fetterman (1981) studied the Career Intern Program, or CIP. This research examined program alternatives for dropouts and potential program impacts on minority populations who constituted the largest percentage of dropouts. The research design employed participant and nonparticipant observation, key informant interviews, questionnaires, and other techniques in order to collect information in a cultural framework. Of additional interest, this research employed the ethnographic approach under the limitations and constraints of contract activities.

The study must be considered a hallmark for several reasons. First, it was instrumental in illustrating that the use of experimental design, by itself, is insufficient in identifying differences in outcomes between experimental and control groups. The use of ethnography indicated that differential treatment among groups under study was an important variable, having a negative cultural effect. Secondly, the research showed the importance of triangulation, or the qualitative-quantitative mix, in analysis. By combining descriptive and statistical approaches, educational problems were given more insight. For example, a description of common inner city social forces--such as murder, theft, and prostitution--provided an insight into the influences shaping urban youth and provided explanations for the low attendance statistics in urban schools. The study also provided social and educational

information beyond the immediate findings. For example, labor conflict analysts could refer to the research findings because it explained how certain social factors can affect drop out, and hence, youth unemployment.

Another study using the ethnographic method in educational evaluation was conducted by Goldberg (1984). This research project concerned a program designed to educate and reeducate disadvantaged youth. In the study, disadvantaged was defined as "those (mostly males) who are detached from any formal framework of study or work" (Goldberg 1984:153). The study viewed the educational program in a community-wide perspective.

Youthtown, as the program was called, had been initially conceived within a state university and received financial support from a private foundation. The community chosen as the site of the program was selected by the university and the foundation without any understanding of the culture of the chosen community, which was primarily composed of immigrants from the Middle East and their subsequent descendents. People of Jewish and Arabic heritage constituted the largest percentage of the community's ethnic population.

Individuals involved in the planning process had set extremely high goals for themselves and for the program. The primary goals were "to help marginal youths integrate into society at the highest possible levels and to achieve social interaction between youths of different social backgrounds" (Goldberg 1984:155). To accomplish

this objective, two approaches were formulated. First, an on-campus environment was established to encourage the autonomy of natural street gangs by providing each group with a room and other facilities. Second, centralized services, such as counseling and remedial education, were offered to all participants. The campus location was selected in favor of outreach into the neighborhood.

Goldberg identifies several project-related problems from the beginning of this evaluation research. First, local community leaders were apprehensive about the program and feared it might evolve into an independent base of influence. While cooperation was always the norm, it was limited and reserved. In addition, Goldberg observes that the program was able to recruit professionals who excelled in their disciplines. This situation created a high level of cooperation and produced a greater meliorative effect among themselves than on program youth. Overall, the program had both positive and negative effects upon the youths, though the effects were different than had been expected.

According to Goldberg, the outcome of the program depended upon the age of the youth. Younger persons, age 12 to 14, reacted better than older ones. Also, the presence of the number of groups in the campus setting created atypical behavior not found in the streets; for example, a keener sense of territory emerged and raiding and theft became more common. The program was not prepared for this effect, and original plans needed to be revised to include outreach to the streets. This pattern, incidently, was preferred by the youths.

Goldberg's research formulated ethnographic specificity regarding certain urban and rural cultural differences not conceptualized by the planners of the program. In Youthtown, the notion of gang was a more "fluid association" without centralized leadership. Only when contact was made by an agency, did structure solidify. Also, the types of crimes in Youthtown differed from those in larger cities, where methods of theft, for example, were much more sophisticated. Street fighting among Youthtown participants was nearly nonexistent.

Perhaps the most significant ethnographic finding of the study acknowledged that the notion of "adolescence" was a new concept for most townspeople, especially those of North African descent. Here, many youths at this age are viewed as adult and are expected to share economic responsibility in the family. Thus, contrary to what many educators believed, the youth's decisions to leave school in order to work did not mean that the family did not value education, or that the youths had been labeled as poor achievers; rather, the youths were meeting their own culture norm and progressing toward adulthood.

A final account of the use of the ethnographic method in educational program evaluation is a study conducted by Wolcott (1984) on a project entitled "Thinkabout." Thinkabout was a program produced by the Agency for Instructional Television and designed for viewing by fifth and sixth grade students in the classroom. It focused on the development of problem solving skills for these elementary school children.

The evaluation of this program was designed around a modified ethnographic method where, due to time, scope, detail, and interpretation constraints, a full ethnographic study was not feasible. The research included classroom site visits, interviews with teachers, and a detailed case study of one classroom. Wolcott entitled this effort "Ethnography sans ethnography" to illustrate that under certain sets of circumstances a small-scale study may be more beneficial than a narrowly defined effects study.

Even though Wolcott involved the recipients of the television program in the analysis, their reactions are described as less revealing than the overall findings. What was important, as Wolcott (1984:203) suggests, was that "we learned more about classroom techniques than about students and their thinking as problem solvers, and this is what we discussed in our reports."

What Wolcott is suggesting pertains to what educators and students consider to be morning and afternoon activities. They considered instructional television as an afternoon activity and a "way of getting out of work" (Wolcott 1984:197). Teachers noted that if they had been required to use the program in the morning, they would not have adopted its use. Viewed in a broader context, more rigorous academic activities should be designed for the morning periods, while the afternoon is contrasted by more leisurely pursuits.

Problems also emerged pertaining to the use of instructional media, per se. In one example, an instructor did not have a follow-

up discussion after viewing a program because she was not well-versed in the subject matter. On other occasions, teachers decided that the program dealt with issues too sensitive for their students to view in class.

Information collected by Wolcott provides some insight into the use of instructional media and the evaluation of one innovation intended for the classroom. The content and the intent of the "Thinkabout" program was never fully studied. However, the ethnographic information collected probably better served planners and producers of similar programs. Wolcott's study is an example of what educational instructional designers should think about: the context in which programs are used in the educational setting.

In general, the ethnographic method has the potential to make even more valuable contributions to the area of educational evaluation. Most studies reported in this paper employ participant observation, key informant interviewing with individuals involved in the planning and conduct of the program, and a questionnaire survey among those for whom the program is intended. This three-fold approach is perhaps most culturally representative of the modern, or contemporary, application of the ethnographic method in evaluation studies. The three-fold approach, at least, affords a wide range of information for the final analysis as to why innovation works or doesn't work.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN

The current research was designed to test the effectiveness of the ethnographic method as a tool for evaluating nontraditional, nonacademic programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival. Also, the research determines the range of attitudes and behaviors of key informants from the community of Corvallis and from the Oregon State University administration toward the Oregon Heritage Festival. In addition, the research design considers the views of persons who attended festival events.

This case study report involved data acquired from interviews, participant observation, and questionnaires. Its purpose is to evaluate the Oregon Heritage Festival in order to determine the festival's success or failure as a nontraditional educational program. The research also aims at determining the range of the festival's effects upon participants.

In essence, it was an effects study as outlined by Stufflebeam (1973), and contains elements of both hard (quantitative) and soft (qualitative) design. The soft portion of the research contains information collected from interviews and from key informant testimonials. The hard portion pertains to statistical analysis derived from questionnaire responses from individuals attending festival events. There were four elements of the design:

1. Description of the research population.
2. Description of sampling procedures.
3. Description of research techniques.
4. Description of analysis procedures.

RESEARCH POPULATION

The research population was divided into three groups: (1) Corvallis community leaders, (2) university administrators, and (3) individuals attending festival events. Regardless of the population, all persons interviewed remained anonymous. If individuals were guaranteed anonymity, they were more likely to reveal detailed information regarding the study. There were also a host of ethical considerations involving the confidentiality of the human subjects (Jorgenson 1971).

Community Leaders

Community leaders selected to participate in the study were members of two subgroups. The first subgroup was composed of those individuals who were active in the planning of the festival. This group included those persons who assisted in planning and conducting various events, or those whose organizations shared activities, as well as those who contributed financially to the festival.

The remaining subgroup of community leaders was composed of individuals who have a unique understanding of community-university relations over an extended period of time. The perspective of these individuals is extremely important to the research since they represent a part of the community that interacts with the university and its various programs on a regular basis.

Community leaders included two festival organizers, three persons who direct organizations promoting community development, two political officials, and two persons representing local business interests. A total of nine persons were separately interviewed, in-depth, to gain understanding of the attitude of community leaders toward the Oregon Heritage Festival and its effectiveness in promoting good community relations. Primary concepts explored were relations between the university and the community, cooperative planning, successes and failures of the festival from the community leaders' perspective, general needs and expectations of the community, and campus-community involvements. A consistent set of open-ended questions was administered so that responses could be effectively compared in the analysis.

University Administrators

This research population was comprised of university administrators selected for their expertise or unique knowledge of special programs, including the Oregon Heritage Festival. Most of these administrators had long involvements with similar types of activities at Oregon State University, other universities or colleges, and in the private sector. The interviews were conducted at various levels in the administrative hierarchy: three vice-presidents, two program directors, three deans, and one general educator. Again, a total of nine persons were separately interviewed using a consistent set of questions for comparative analysis.

Major concepts presented to the administrators concerned general and specific policies and procedures at the university, expectations from special programs (including the ways in which these special programs interface with other university activities), retention and recruitment considerations, perceptions and attitudes toward the festival, and public relations strategies.

Festival Attendees

Festival attendees were defined as those individuals who attended festival events, such as the evening lecture series, films, tours, concerts, and other activities during the summer of 1986. In addition to a questionnaire survey, informal interviews were conducted periodically to accumulate additional information regarding attitudes and behaviors. A demographic profile based upon age, sex, occupation, and residence was obtained for this population. This descriptive presentation of findings is a typical pre-analysis procedure before the researcher leaves the field. Such information better acquaints the reader with the population under study before the presentation of findings (Pelto 1970). There were a total of 131 respondents to the questionnaire. No definite age bias existed in the population; respondents over 70 years of age constitute the same percentage of the sample as those 25 and under. Respondents in the 51 to 60 age group are only slightly more represented than all others in the sample. Respondents under 40 years of age constitute 41 percent of the sample, while those from 41 to 70 constitute 45 percent.

Table 1.
Age of Respondents in Percentages.

<u>Age Groups</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
25 and under	18	13.74
26-30	18	13.74
31-40	18	13.74
41-50	18	13.74
51-60	20	15.26
61-70	18	16.04
Over 70	18	13.74
N = 131		T = 100%

As indicated in Table 2, more females than males responded to the questionnaire. Thus, a sample bias toward females is acknowledged.

Table 2.
Sex of Respondents, in Percentages.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Male	49	37.40
Female	82	62.60
N = 131		T = 100%

Occupational categories (see Table 3) were grouped according to United States Census formats.

Table 3.
Occupation of Respondents, in Percentages.

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Professional, Technical, and Managerial	27	20.61
Self-Employed	8	6.10
Clerical/Sales	16	12.21
Farm/Forestry/ Fishery Related	12	9.17
Student	21	16.03
Service	6	4.58
Housewife	14	10.69
Retired	24	18.32
Unemployed	3	2.29
N = 131		T = 100%

Individuals in professional, technical, and managerial occupations constitute the largest portion of the population, with the retired group second in overall percentage. Students are next, followed by clerical and sales people, housewives, and farming, forestry and fishery related occupations. Of considerable interest

are the not-in-labor-force groups: unemployed, student, housewife, and retired. These four groups comprise 47% of the population attending festival events.

The majority of respondents listing their primary occupation as students were enrolled in summer term at the university on a full-time basis. Slightly over one-half of student respondents were taking more than 12 hours.

Table 4 illustrates the residence of the sample respondents. Clearly, the greatest proportion of respondents resided in the local community.

Table 4.

Residence of Respondents, in Percentages.

<u>Place of Residence</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Local Corvallis	109	83.21
Another Part of Oregon	6	4.58
Another Country	5	3.82
U.S. Tourist	7	5.34
No Response	4	3.05
N = 131		T = 100%

Collectively, only 13 percent of the respondents were from other parts of Oregon, were tourists, or were visitors from foreign countries. Respondents representing the tourist population were of a group called "Sunbirds," or retired Arizona residents who spend the summer in Oregon. They came to town in a program sponsored by a community development organization to promote the local area during the summer months. Respondents who indicated their place of residence as another country were from Japan.

Respondents indicating that they were not local residents gave several reasons for visiting the area. The most frequent responses in order include visiting Corvallis, visiting family and friends, working toward a university degree, participating in an exchange program, and making a tourist stop. The average length of stay for all nonlocals was more than ten weeks. A longer time period is typical of Sunbirds and students. The usual period of stay for all respondents ranged from one to sixteen weeks.

As indicated in Table 5, a significantly higher proportion of females than males are represented in the age 25 and under grouping. A more even distribution exists for respondents over 25, but under 40. Respondents age 41 to 50 are primarily represented by females. The age 51 to 60 group is evenly distributed. The most significant female to male ratio is in the over 70 category, where only one male is found.

Table 5.

Age-Sex Correlation of Respondents in Percentages.

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Percent Male</u>	<u>Percent Female</u>
25 and Under	3	15	2.29	11.45
26-30	11	7	8.40	5.34
31-40	10	8	7.63	6.11
41-50	5	13	3.82	9.92
51-60	9	12	6.87	9.17
Over 70	1	17	0.76	12.98
N = 131			T = 100%	

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLING PROCEDURES

As already noted, key informants from the community and the university were selected because of their expert knowledge regarding the context of this study. A significant component of the ethnographic method is getting to know the culture in which one is working; as Wolcott (1974) suggests, the educational institution and its nearby community setting are usually less difficult to study if the researcher is already familiar with them. The type of sampling strategy employed in the key informant case is referred to as purposive design, since it meets the purpose of the inquiry (Simon and Burnstien 1983).

The survey portion of the research has a nonprobability design. The advantages of this design are its lack of complication and its relatively inexpensive nature. It is most often employed by researchers who have no desire to generalize to a larger population (Sanders and Pinhey 1983). The specific sampling procedure is known as accidental or convenience sampling; it is most often used to gain an understanding of the behavior and attitudes of populations attending specific events (Pelto 1970; Sanders and Pinhey 1983; Simon and Burnstien 1983). The questionnaire was self-administered in a group situation.

Administration of the questionnaire began during the first week of Oregon Heritage Festival events. All participants were told of the importance of their contribution to this evaluation; individuals, however, were requested to complete the instrument only unless they were not attending, or did not expect to attend, future events. This was to insure that the attitudes of persons attending only periodically were also assessed. The only exception to this procedure were the tour participants, since these people did not usually take part in other program activities.

Beginning the third week of the festival, all participants were encouraged to complete the questionnaire. This was to insure the best possible information based upon at least two weeks of activities. If insufficient time existed for individuals to complete the instrument on-site, they were asked to complete it at home, then mail it to the researchers. Investigators were present

at all events in order to clarify ambiguities in the instrument, or misunderstandings on the part of the respondents.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH TECHNIQUES

Subjective assumptions and value judgments, forms of research bias, have been criticisms of the ethnographic method (Pelto 1970; Agar 1980). As Agar (1980) reminds us, ethnography co-exists with several important contradictions, or dichotomies. Contradictions such as humanity in science, involvement and detachment, breadth and depth, subordination and dominance, and friend and stranger, are all part of the complexities of ethnographic research. These contradictions also are part of the field stress experienced by the ethnographer.

Training in ethnography does not eliminate conscious or unconscious cultural bias in the researcher. However, as Pelto (1970) suggests, methodological training can assist in minimizing personal bias by means of systematic research techniques. For example, a careful definition of the focus of the research with the specification of empirical observations are most important research considerations in minimizing bias. Then, quantification or statistical analysis may serve to objectify some aspects of the ethnographic research.

Both Pelto (1970) and Agar (1980) suggest the use of a qualification-quantification approach, triangulation, or the formal-informal mix for analysis of research findings. Yet, the role of observer's intuition, from participant observation and interview, remain essential to the task of ethnography. In particular, intuition remains important for discovering patterns of behavior within a culture. From the intuitive hunch, the next step is to verify the behavior through systematized research. Pelto (1970:37) notes: "The task of ethnography is to reduce [cultural behavior] without reducing anthropology to the level of 'count'em' mechanics."

The role of bias in all behavioral science is best discussed by Kaplan (1964). Kaplan maintains that freedom from research bias simply means having an open mind, rather than an empty one. Bias, claims Kaplan, is a preprejudice, prejudgment, or a conclusion reached prior to research findings and maintained in spite of those findings. Clearly, every scientist is committed to resisting bias regardless of any methodological orientation. Kaplan (1964:376) comments:

Fortunately, science does not demand that bias be eliminated but only that our judgment take it into account. It can be treated as we are accustomed to deal with errors of observation: we insulate ourselves from them where we can, and otherwise try to cancel their effects or at any rate to discount them.

As previously discussed, techniques employed in this ethnographic approach were participant observation, interviewing, and survey research. Participant observation was conducted over a three-year period: it was periodic during the regular academic year,

and intense for an eight-week period every summer from 1984 to 1986. Participant observation was conducted at various functions, such as festival events, programming and planning meetings, and other administrative meetings. At festival events, patterns of participant behavior were observed throughout the duration of the activity. In addition, casual or informal interviews were conducted with individuals in attendance as a supplement to the primary technique. Notes were taken on the observations and interviews. A standardized instrument was not employed.

Key informant interviews were conducted in one-hour sessions. Informants were given the list of questions one week in advance so that they might have sufficient time to consider their responses. All questions were open-ended, and a final question pertained to any unsolicited comments the key informants might wish to make (see Appendices 1 and 2). The questions were based upon concepts discovered through the participant observation process. In other words, questions which were meaningful to the informants, not arbitrarily imposed by the researcher. All conversations were recorded with permission of the person being interviewed. These recordings were later transcribed, verbatim, and then returned to the interviewee for editing and approval of content.

A systematic survey of persons attending festival events was conducted during the summer of 1986. A questionnaire was designed to assess attitudes and self-reported behaviors, such as attendance, willingness to return, use of academic credits, the value of educational content versus entertainment, and likes and dislikes of

specific program features. An open-ended section for other responses concluded the questionnaire (see Appendix 3).

The questionnaire sought the customary biographic information to correlate with the attitudes of attendants. Examples included city and state of residence, age, sex, and occupation. For nonlocals, length of stay and reasons for the stay were added. Attitudes of tourists, local, and students, as well as those who attend the festival at various frequencies were all deemed important to the study. A five-point Likert Scale was used in the instrument to obtain a measure of response intensity. A pretest of the instrument among 25 respondents occurred at the first festival event: No problems were reported with the instrument.

DESCRIPTION OF ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

The general procedure employed in this study falls under the rubric of multi-instrument research, or qualitative and quantitative observations. This is also known as qualitative-quantitative mix (Pelto 1970), and triangulation (Jick 1983). Clearly, all techniques have their own set of limitations or problems of reliability. However, as Pelto (1970:149) comments, "examining cultural behavior with a variety of different approaches greatly enhances the credibility of research results." Certain results of a research activity can easily be numerically quantified and analyzed.

When responses are uniform among all individuals, for example the responses can be easily placed in numerical contexts. In addition, other behavioral phenomena can be used to interface the numerical data that are noncountable. In this context, participant observation and interviews provide a richness that is usually not present in more structured tests (Meyers 1981; Miles and Huberman 1984).

Triangulation suggests that qualitative and quantitative data should not be viewed as opposing dichotomies; rather, they are complementary. In theory, the congruence of data will be apparent (Jick 1983), and in practice there are few methods to determine congruence of qualitative and quantitative data. Clearly, there are no simple tests for qualitative significance, as exist with statistical methods, that are designed to illustrate significant differences. Rather, the researcher must use judgment and experience to show logical patterns from the results of the study. Qualitative information, for example, can add explanation, supplementation, and greater insight to numerical analysis from a quantitative procedure. In other words, interviews may add new dimensions to help explain the results of statistically analyzed data.

Jick (1983:144-146) best summarizes the advantages of qualitative analysis in congruence with quantitative data:

1. Allows more confidence of results through interview observations or intuition.
2. Helps uncover additional phenomena relating to the study.
3. Affords more holistic understanding of the research problem.

Moreover, Meyers (1981) focuses on the triangulation aspect with special reference to evaluation studies, where qualitative inquiry has special pertinence for background information, although experimental design may be the technique emphasized in primary data collection and analysis. Meyers further notes that the two approaches are really inseparable (1981:162):

Quantitative methods often cannot be fruitful unless qualitative data are used to inform the interpretation of the design and variables. The converse is also true: Quantification is often useful in ethnographic studies.

The qualitative data collected in the current research are used primarily in two ways. First, phenomenological data from the in-depth interview serve a function similar to that of a case study; the information collected is described and compared among populations of key informants. Secondly, from participant observation, descriptive categories of information are formed; these categories also are found using data from the casual interviews.

Quantitative data was subjected to a cross-tabulation analysis, or a joint frequency distribution of cases. According to Nie (1975), this is the most commonly used statistic in the social sciences. Briefly, this test establishes a strength of relationship

between variables such as age and sex in a given study. Cross-tabulation procedure was selected because of the nonrandom and nonparametric nature of the data. This procedure is also best suited for observations classified into discreet categories. The .05 level of statistical significance was adapted for this research.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

The results of the current research are reported in three primary categories. First is an analysis of key informant testimonies from university administrators and from community leaders. This information is followed by a statistical analysis of attitudes and self-reported behaviors of persons attending festival events. Information from informal interviews and from observations is integrated into the entire analysis in order to afford greater insights into all information collected. All informants' responses are treated anonymously as a research protocol. Finally, a brief summary of the significant issues generated from the findings of this research is addressed.

ATTITUDES OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

As previously noted in the Research Design, nine university administrators at Oregon State University were interviewed regarding perceptions and attitudes toward the Oregon Heritage Festival. Each individual indicated a variety of experiences with special programs at Oregon State University, other colleges or universities, or in the private sector. The level of experience ranged from small

academic programs to rather substantial activities involving large numbers of people attending programs.

Although the degree and nature of experience in programming was diverse, only two administrators indicated they had experience with a program similar to the Oregon Heritage Festival--that is, a nontraditional, nonacademic program held during the summer months which directed events toward multiple audiences.

For continuity of reporting, the following categories were used in order to make a comparative analysis of the content of the interviews. These categories were evaluation policies and procedures, expectations from special programs, interfacing of the Oregon Heritage Festival with other university programming, retention and recruitment, specific attitudes toward the festival, and finally, public relations considerations.

Evaluation Policies and Procedures

During the study period, the university did not have specific policies and procedures pertaining to the evaluation of nonacademic or other special programs. To the extent such policies existed, they were the responsibility of the college, department, or program leaders. Two unwritten policies became apparent through the administrators' testimonies: Attendance was paramount in the evaluation of nonacademic activities; achieving levels of financial

self-support was another major consideration. One administrator offered the following evaluation procedure regarding one Oregon State University sponsored program:

I think the evaluation of that (program) has really come from the public response and it is also self-supporting. If not, then it would die. If the money began to dry up, then the university would have to make a decision to scrape up the money from the departments, colleges, and so on. . . .

Well, let's put it this way. I think the evaluation is the fact that it has worked well from the beginning. It averages from 300 to 500 per week in attendance, and we leave it alone if it works. . . .

Clearly, attendance was a critical aspect of evaluation from the viewpoint of the administrators. If public enthusiasm was present, then the program was successful. Self-support through grants or user fees was also strongly equated with success. This view is exemplified in the comments of one academic dean.

We spent a lot of time, effort, and labor planning the program. The initial costs were considerable, too. No one came. It was cancelled, and there are no plans to ever revitalize it. While I still think the concept of the program was superb, we had our chance . . . and I still don't know what happened. . . . A large amount of money was spent on advertisement . . .

Another administrator made a similar observation regarding attendance of a program under his direction.

It was not a bad program. Nobody came, at least attendance was very poor. But that didn't mean we had a bad program . . . but that's how we evaluated it. And rather than make changes, we decided to cancel. Even though we did consider what the few participants said about it, we chose not to rethink it.

University programs that are nontraditional and nonacademic are evaluated primarily on costs and attendance. One such program has nearly 50,000 participants a year during the summer months; yet no official evaluation has been conducted: ". . . it was our intent to throw away what didn't work and keep what did work. . . . We know by attendance." Thus commented one administrator, involved in the initial planning and conduct of that program.

Seven out of nine administrators interviewed expressed a similar point of view, suggesting attendance as the chief means of evaluating the worth of a program. Though exceptions to this view existed, the lack of funds, time, or energy prevented any detailed evaluation process of the programs. In many instances, administrators perceived cancellation to be more efficient than continuing with program revisions. None of the administrators suggested intent of rethinking or redesigning a failing program based upon a needs assessment or an attitude survey. According to a collective response of these interviewees, program success or failure was strongly correlated to effort expended by organizers of the program. Figure 2 illustrates a ranking of ingredients for successful programming, according to university administrators.

<u>Rank of Importance</u>	<u>Necessary Ingredient</u>
1	Hard work of organizers
2	Charisma of organizers
3	External funding
4	Institutional support (financial)
5	Institutional support (other)
6	Advertising
7	A gimmick

Figure 2. Ingredients for successful programming, in order of importance.

In addition, most respondents voluntarily acknowledged that committee planning may be detrimental to a program. While the committee format may be suited for ideas or brainstorming, hard work of key persons was essential. Personality, funding, sound advertising were listed as important, too. One person, without qualification, mentioned that a "gimmick" was necessary for program success. Gimmick was defined as a controversial device which generates a positive or negative reaction in order to draw attention to a program.

Expectations of the University

Inquiries into this particular area were succinctly answered by all respondents. Creating and maintaining a positive image for the university was the chief response. As one administrator commented,

one program got off well, but something happened . . . and while the person doing it was very bright, his actions could have caused a lot of embarrassment to the university.

Furthermore, another respondent suggested that any successful program should generate both a strong and positive image for the university. Clearly, positive public relations was yet another principle expectation.

Financial considerations were also rated high on the topic of expectations. The collective attitude resembled a "dollar back for a dollar out" reasoning. For the most part university administrators did not want to see large amounts of money spent for special programming, even though they realized that there might be significant rewards in terms of enhancing the image of the university. While financial considerations were rated lower than other expectations, analysis of observations and interactions over a three-year period suggest that administrators' viewed cost as tantamount with other considerations. In an untaped interview, a respondent in the administration hierarchy offered this comment on the Oregon Heritage Festival:

. . . This program cost us over \$100,000 in the first year. The money could have been spent much more efficiently on proven programs. Especially those in the academic units. . . .

Records indicated that the Oregon Heritage Festival didn't expend the amount of money suggested. According to one person involved in the first year of planning:

The festival is the new kid on the block. No one is going to blame some other program. The truth of the matter is that the entire summer term took a nose dive. But it was administrative attempts to do something positive for a change . . . it didn't work, and it will take awhile for them to forget. . . .

In yet another dimension of program expectations, one administrator suggested that "boosting our rating" was a chief expectation from his unit. Differing from the concept of the development of a positive image, boosting a rating referred to the overcoming of competition on the part of other colleges and universities. Hence, students would make a decision to attend Oregon State University rather than somewhere else.

Interfacing with Other Programs

The Oregon Heritage Festival was perceived to generally complement the mission of the university and, in some ways, interface with both academic and other, nonacademic, programs. The following citation represents what seems to be a general administrative perception of how the festival complemented existing programs.

Anything that brings people to campus . . . complements the mission of all programming. The activity must be educational, not recreational or something else. In my opinion the more educational programming we can conduct, either on or off campus, definitely strengthens our overall mission and brings attention to our other activities.

In another interview, the following statement was made concerning the mission of the university and the festival:

We [the university] are really committed to doing several things. One is to contribute to the intellectual enrichment of individuals, and the second is to extend this offering off campus. With the festival, we had people attending from all walks of life. We had retired, layperson, professionals . . . that is exactly the kind of thing we ought to be doing at a land grant university.

We have programs in extension, and others which serve the public in many ways. Each can build upon the other. The festival is just the kind of thing we need to do . . . we can't just have football games or alumni barbeques. But all together they enrich and provide a balance in keeping with our mission . . .

One academic dean, however, expressed an essentially negative viewpoint on how the festival interfaces with other university programming.

We [our academic unit] chooses not to participate financially or otherwise. You can't complement our programs here . . . in fact, I really don't see that the Oregon Heritage Festival belongs at the university.

Overall, six out of nine administrators felt that the Oregon Heritage Festival complemented the mission of the university.

Retention and Recruitment Aspects

Retention and recruitment are not measurable concepts, according to administrators. Though all administrators indicated that retention and recruitment might be possible benefits from the festival, neither retention nor recruitment had been measured and were, therefore, not given credibility. Some insights into the

question of retention and recruitment were offered by the respondents, as in the following suggestion:

Programs like the Oregon Heritage Festival can bring an excitement and level of fun to campus. While it won't attract people to Summer Term, or even the regular academic year, it builds an excitement level or image for Summer Term. . . . Where five years down the road people will say 'it's an exciting place to go. It is not a reform school and they do interesting things' . . .

In the past Summer Term had an image of a reform school and old lady teachers. . . . Activities such as the festival serve to change the image of the summer program. . . . Retention, however, does not directly bear upon what is offered during the summer.

Eight administrators perceived programs such as the festival as incidental to retention and recruitment. As one respondent suggested, the major consideration should always be academics. In the following example this attitude becomes clear:

My sense is that most persons who go to summer term are already enrolled in the university and are trying to get some general education requirements out of the way. Factors such as the economic climate of the state and the range of courses offered are most important to retention and recruitment . . . if Education, Science, and Liberal Arts agreed over the next five years to offer certain sets of courses for returning teachers so they could go back and work on a Master's degree . . . to say we guarantee you all of these courses. . . These are the things that matter . . .

Clearly, all university administrators perceived retention and recruitment to be associated with academic programs. A wider menu of courses offered to students was the chief means to attract and retain those students year after year.

Specific Attitudes Toward the Festival

Only one of the administrators interviewed had not attended any festival events. This person offered the most criticism.

I guess the festival falls under some adult education, continuing education, or life long learning concept. I really don't know what to call it, because they change the names of these terms so often. At any rate they [the terms] are attempts at quick fixes, as is the festival, and are attempts to oversell their discipline. What I mean is that they never turn society into a learning society as they say they do.

The Oregon Heritage Festival falls in this arena, or concept. None of these programs do as they say they do . . . it's sort of a smoke screen.

Other administrators expressed more positive opinions about the festival. This was especially true in the area of creating publicity for the university. The Liar's Contest, for example, was perceived by five respondents as the most successful of any university summer program to date. One person made the following comment:

. . . when the university gets attention from any program through the newspapers of Los Angeles, St. Louis, Boston, the Stars and Stripes, and in Switzerland, it is worth thousands of dollars to us. . . . The Liar's Contest, in my opinion, was worth its weight in gold. Summer Term at OSU could use more of this.

Of particular concern to all administrators was the environment at the university during the summer months. Three persons viewed the relative peace as quite beneficial. Others, however, suggested a more lively campus was necessary. One person, for example, made a comparison to the University of California at Berkeley: "Berkeley would be active regardless of any summer academic program. Here,

not so. We need excitement, and the festival helps provide it. . . ."

Collectively, administrators at the university seemed to view the festival as a form of entertainment. None commented on any redeeming educational benefits. Many administrators were, in fact, most critical of those events (such as the evening lecture series) which did not draw larger audiences. It was suggested that the tours should become the principle focus of the festival. The following recommendation was made:

. . . continue with the Liar's Contest, 5k Walk, and the tours. Make the tours the center attraction. Jam a whole bunch into one or two weeks. In the past there has been not enough fun activities for the family.

Some administrators avoided the topic of the program's merits quite tactfully. After considerable probing, one person offered the following statement:

In the last ten years, summer programs have come and gone. People are burned out on gimmicks that do not secure their summer employment. Festivals, fairs, whatever . . . are overrated. We need only to strengthen our academic offerings and guarantee classes and Summer Term would take care of itself. Nothing personal, but these things [festivals] are too expensive and take resources that might be better used elsewhere.

Public Relations

As suggested in nearly all previous categories of response, eight university administrators perceived some public relations benefits from the festival. Only one individual was not concerned with public relations. The following statement best represents the collective expression of opinions of administrators regarding the role of the Oregon Heritage Festival in public relations activities.

. . . anytime we do a concert, sponsor a speaker, or some other public event, we assume that public relations is advanced in some way. Programs for young people, older people, and others usually never harm the university unless it [the program] is extremely controversial. But where the difficulty lies is by taking a slice out of the collective and trying to say one program does more than another. This would be difficult . . . though the festival does more than our football program.

Several individuals indicated a potential for the festival in general off-campus, noncredit activities. One person constructed a scenario in which he envisioned the festival becoming an event to serve off-campus programs. According to this individual, serving the off-campus needs of the public should be a major goal of any land grant college or university. This person continued:

Special programs and Division of Continuing Education activities should be given more consideration and funding than they do at present. One problem, of course, is competition. Another is the decentralization of Summer Term and D.C.E. Then, funding from the legislature is another problem, too. I see them [special programs and D.C.E.] as money-makers and keys to building strong public relations.

Clearly, public relations is an important consideration to university administrators. Certain administrators, however, were more sensitive than others as to the definition of public relations in the mission of the university, with no full agreement as to how programs such as the festival fulfilled the need for public relations.

ATTITUDES OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Attitudes of nine community leaders were analyzed according to the three most significant response categories: the perception of the role of the festival in community relations; attitudes toward festival satisfaction and dissatisfaction; and perceptions of the festival's effects upon the image of Oregon State University. Each category of responses was integrated with interview information and observations made over a three-year period.

Role of the Festival in Community Relations

During the planning stages of the first Oregon Heritage Festival in the winter of 1984, there was insufficient time to involve the community to any great extent. However, one person representing the Corvallis Convention and Visitors Bureau participated in a minor capacity. The individual served primarily

as liaison between the Sunbirds and university summer activities. The Corvallis Convention and Visitors Bureau assisted in advertising for the festival that first year.

At the conclusion of the first Heritage Festival, a planning strategy was designed for the 1985 festival to seek more community involvement. Those organizations sought for cooperation and support were the Mayor's Office, Benton County Commissioners, Willamette Arts Council, Chamber of Commerce, Festival Corvallis, Downtown Corvallis Association, and others from the local business community. In addition, the assistance of several state organizations was requested, the Oregon Economic Development Council, among them. Enthusiasm from the local agencies and organization was very high, and the initial level of local cooperation was greater than anticipated. Financial support from these organizations was not requested, although in-kind support to assist in publicity and cost sharing of certain events was requested. Some organizations, such as the Mayor's Office and County Commissioners, were asked only for letters of endorsement supporting the festival, as well as for planning suggestions to increase attendance from the community and nearby areas.

Several persons from the community participated on a regular basis in planning and coordination of events. While they did not attend planning or advisory meetings on the campus, their input was sought via telephone or in meetings at some convenient community locale. From the beginning, it was clear that the campus

environment was uncomfortable for many of the persons from the community participating in festival planning. As one individual suggested:

We were not necessarily made to feel welcome during his [a previous administrator] tenure at Oregon State, and it will take some time for the moat around that place to dry up. You might not be aware of this . . . it was for real. I prefer to meet downtown. . . .

Overall, though the community expressed a willingness to participate in festival activities.

For the most part, the community perceived the Oregon Heritage Festival as an activity designed for the community; or, at least, the community was thought central to the mission of the festival. The festival was interpreted as an outreach project and predominately felt to be a positive program for community relations. One organization director indicated the festival to be strongly community oriented.

. . . the festival is a neat idea. While it needs more press coverage, especially locally, it offers a lot of encouragement to the local people. There hasn't been much in the past, especially free-of-charge educational activities.

It probably isn't too realistic for the festival to go too far beyond Corvallis. It takes a lot of work to build it up, and expenses, too. And through the work done so far, we can build more and more upon the festival as a Corvallis and OSU activity. Secondary consideration should be given to other parts of the state. . . .

Local community leaders were never reticent in suggesting the university should take a greater role in community-university relations. All leaders felt the community and university relationship had been retarded due to apathy from Oregon State

University administration. During an interview, one person gave an account of how the festival was a program which had the potential to change this feeling:

The community is becoming comfortable with the idea of the festival. In the past they [university administration] have had their heads in the clouds, some still do. . . . We are only important when it's time for someone up there to ask for money . . . they come and knock on our doors. The festival, in my opinion, is a sign you are extending yourselves.

People don't come to campus because the university has made it difficult. Parking, and the general traffic pattern has intentionally been made difficult to navigate. But, given the right location, like the Stewart Center, people will begin to come. . . .

Another person, although not actively involved in the festival on a continual basis, had frequent contact with university administration regarding other planning activities involving the community. He offered the following analysis:

I know the festival, of course, but have not attended on a regular basis. Certainly the festival does no harm in the public relations arena. I attend meetings quite frequently with presidential advisors . . . and the festival is never mentioned as a university sponsored program. Do they support it?

The university has so many priorities, and the community has not been one of them, that is unless the university stands to profit in some way. I see some signs of change, though. We have never expected to have a lot of input, but programs like the festival are excellent because the community will be your primary audience.

One obvious point of view from the analysis emerged among the community leaders who were interviewed as part of this research: Although some had not attended on a frequent basis, all agreed the university sponsored festival was beginning to create an improved quality of community relations. In separate interviews, community

leaders acknowledged many more pressing problems for which the community and university might consult one another, such as the local and state economy, they still believed "the festival is important to the general public who reside here," one person suggested. "Many see it [the university] as rather aloof, and they [university administrators] should realize this is the basis of many ill feelings." In addition, one person made the following comment.

It [the festival] has provided a link for my organization and the community for the first time. I'm eager for this connection because I've not received any cooperation in the past. We can really help each other in many ways. . . .

Program Satisfaction

Community leaders unanimously perceived the Oregon Heritage Festival as an educational activity that offered a diverse menu of interesting and important topics. It was more than merely a "cultural activity." One person who had been involved with the festival for two years commented on her concept of the festival.

The educational opportunities are enormous and so far it has been centrally located, too. Feedback from people I know who are attending has been very positive. The thematic format really enhances the overall program. It helps with the cohesiveness. Naturally, all programs will need to consider a change in events from time to time, but by and large people are pleased.

A local elected official offered additional comments, expanding on the educational potential of the festival:

I've missed the first two years of the festival, but did attend several times this last summer. It was great, and a great opportunity for me to hear experts discuss economic trends for the state. The "high tech" talks were of real interest. We have HP out there, and they are major contributors to the economy. I pick up some pretty good information to better understand what's happening in their overall sales. Some others I wanted to attend, but couldn't.

One additional concept arose during an interview relating to general satisfaction with the festival among community leaders. All leaders were committed to coordination and of program activities to avoid duplication, and to maximize resources. The following was suggested by one individual:

Yeah . . . I'm a firm believer in coordinating activities between the university and our program. Not all are relevant, of course, such as academic programs or those designed for students and other university audiences. But during the summer, especially, there are programs which need greater coordination to avoid duplication. You, me, and . . . have worked closely for the last couple of years. While our programs are not totally compatible, we help each other to avoid duplication, cost, and see where we can share advertising. This helps us all.

Many communities including Albany, Corvallis, and Salem, offer summer activities to attract tourists to their towns. Concerts, food and craft fairs, and outdoor theatre are three especially popular programs being offered throughout the Willamette Valley. The Oregon Heritage Festival, according to community leaders, was not a duplication of activities, but a program which complemented other local community programs such as Festival Corvallis during the summer.

[The community has] a greater potential to attract tourists than you have. . . . You offer programming, however, that we cannot offer because you are a university. Together we are able to offer a lot of activities to the tourist . . . and a lot of room exists for more activities. In fact, the Oregon Heritage Festival provides a nice umbrella concept for summer events.

While community leaders applauded the efforts of the festival, there was also criticism. Advertising was the most frequently mentioned shortcoming of the festival, as indicated by the following statement:

Advertising, or the lack of it, is my chief concern or criticism. More people would come if you mailed your brochures to the local folk, directly . . . as to occupant or boxholder. Perhaps the university might be willing to provide more money in the future. We have helped you through our mailings, but we are geared more to those outside the area.

I feel the program is sound, especially for the third year of operation. It takes time. . . . The Disney people suggest a five-year period to make or break it. . . . If you could be more aggressive in advertising. . . .

Additional criticisms of the festival by community leaders are ranked in Figure 3.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Festival Criticism, by Importance</u>
1	Lack of Advertising
2	Insufficient Program Finances
3	Program Length [too long]
4	Slight Duplication of Effort

Figure 3. Festival criticism by community leaders, in order of importance.

Items 2, 3, and 4 were treated only in a general manner during the interviews; community leaders gave no detailed comments on these items. Program finance was a slight concern. Community leaders enquired about the current budget, and indicated that they felt programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival probably should charge a minimal fee in order to retrieve some costs. A local community festival, as mentioned by one individual, could not operate without grant monies.

Effects of the Festival on University Image

Responses in this category closely parallel responses pertaining to community and public relations. The two questions were kept as distinct categories, however, because observations over the last three years indicate community leaders seem to define these terms separately rather than interchangeably. Public relations and university image were tantamount. While community and public relations pertained more to functions and policies of the university in attempting to create favorable public opinion, image was more of a mental concept pertaining to the ideal policy or practice as perceived by the community leaders. The distinctions were quite nebulous; however, public relations and university image were distinct terms in the minds of the respondents from the community.

For the most part, community leaders did not perceive the image of the university in a positive manner. This was due primarily to a

lack of community participation in university affairs, as well as the perception of the university's lack of service to the community. The Oregon Heritage Festival was thus viewed, in part, as an initial step to correct what were perceived to be serious weaknesses in the past.

Most persons from the community leader segment of the study indicated that programs such as the festival were positive steps toward creating a more favorable image within the community the university should serve. A positive image balances upon more community-university involvement. One person was quite critical of present conditions.

Oregon State is involved in many joint efforts within the community. Research, economic improvements, and other types of committee work from which we all profit. . . . These are important. But more visible types of work are urgently needed, too. Those which filter out to more of the local residents of Corvallis, and then there is a greater portion of people who have input to the planning . . . like with the festival. . . . You did a questionnaire this last summer. It tells people you care about their suggestions. Most of the residents of the area do not get a chance to express their opinions, nor do they feel they are heard. . . . I am not naive, and realize the university does not need our input in most of its programming, but those which the community mostly supports, are a different matter. We appreciate the help with the Majestic [Theatre], and there are others, too. The festival has been so involved with many of our department . . . its depth is good for the community. . . .

Then, there is another matter while we are on the subject . . . I would like to return for a Master's in Business. I can't find any evening classes to complement a program. There are a lot of us who fall into this category . . . Oregon State will not accommodate our needs . . . they spend more time worrying about Bend than they do us. . . .

In a slightly different manner, another person offered the following comments pertinent to the image of Oregon State University:

The image of Oregon State in Corvallis is a mixed bag. . . . Though, let's not get involved in the history of politics. Some people wouldn't come to campus for anything. Others might . . . then shop at the Bookstore on a regular basis. Back to the question . . . the festival has offered an initiative for the townspeople to participate in educational functions which are mostly free. Most will come if it interests them. . . . I've talked to people who were brought to campus by the festival for the first time in their lives. Then, some might attend in the future, once they realize it doesn't hurt. But the image of the university is always improved by offering opportunities to the local folk.

The existence of two separate communities, Corvallis and the university, was a concept supported by all community leaders interviewed. The validity of this concept emerged in an interview with a local program director:

You might be aware that there are two separate communities in the area. In my estimation, Oregon State has established its own personality and government. You have a mayor, council, and departments to carry out a mission to the residents of the university. Oregon State developed its image to only serve its constituents.

There is [sic] always criticism and negative feelings from constituents. You can't escape it . . . to me, your image is Science and Technology. The festival has helped change the image for me. It's positive; it's an improvement from the past. Many programs, except the theater, and I wonder about it sometimes, are geared for your constituents. Not us. The festival is providing a different atmosphere.

In the summer of 1985, during the 5K Walk held in downtown Corvallis, an informal conversation was held with two community leaders. These leaders were both elected officials. They expressed

excitement concerning the festival as the first university-sponsored program which seemed to show an interest in Corvallis. Both commented that the festival was an excellent public and community relations program improving the image of Oregon State locally. "OSU needs improvement in both areas," they suggested, ". . . and it looks as though there is a step in the right direction with the festival."

At the end of each formal interview, community leaders were asked for additional comments not covered during the hour. Nearly all respondents indicated their hope that the festival would continue on an annual basis. In addition, they pledged their continued support. Most community leaders indicated a renewed confidence in the newly formed university administration and hoped Corvallis might play a greater role in any long-range university planning. In particular, community leaders expressed a desire for cooperation in economic development, research involving the private sector, and the development of more degree-granting programs for adult students employed full-time during the day.

In their concluding comments, the majority of the leaders suggested that the Oregon Heritage Festival had the potential to be an important bridge between the university and the Corvallis community. Collectively, they felt a need to continue this type of programming for the local residents. Each leader also felt that the festival was a program essential to preserve the state's cultural history.

ATTITUDES AND SELF-REPORTED BEHAVIORS OF RESPONDENTS

General Attitudes Toward Summer Term

In order to establish a context for this portion of the research findings, an informal survey was conducted among local area residents, Sunbirds and other tourists, foreign visitors, and students to determine how these persons perceive summer in Corvallis and the university. Clearly, how persons view the summer season in the community and university settings bears upon their responses to the survey questionnaire.

During previous Oregon Heritage Festivals, general attendance by locals, tourists, and foreign visitors was better than during the 1986 festival. Although local area residents always constituted the largest percentage of those who attended events, Sunbirds and foreign visitors were proportionally much higher than in 1986. Summer term students have never attended the Oregon Heritage Festival on a regular basis; however, in 1984 and 1985, foreign students did attend more often than other students.

Local Area Residents

Although local area residents perceived the festival as an educational activity, they did not consider the festival to be an integral part of Oregon State University Summer Term, per se. This is largely due to the nonacademic nature of the festival, as suggested by a number of individuals who attended events on a regular basis. For the most part, the festival was simply a nonacademic activity conducted on campus rather than in another locale, and sponsored by the university. The perception of the festival as a summer activity is best represented by a person living in the local area:

It [the festival] offers opportunities we have not had in previous years. I'm personally glad to see the university provide such a program that the community can participate in. In the past there were concerts, famous speakers, and so on, but nothing was ever centralized. . . .

Conferences in the summer are for those persons within the university, not for the general public. The Oregon Heritage Festival is a low-key program which offers a lot to a lot of people. . . .

Local area residents suggested the university and community to be "delightfully quiet" when students had departed at the end of Spring Term. In the majority of cases, the solitude was seen as an amenity. A few persons, however, suggested there was a real need for summer activities which were less expensive than some of the current community programs. As one individual noted:

People in Corvallis are getting used to doing nothing in the summer. Even during the regular academic year, Corvallis caters to student needs--like Mom and Dad weekends--they are real money makers for the local businessmen. In the summer we go to the Scandinavian Festival, Salem Festival, and some others in the valley [Willamette]. We do some camping. People in this area will still do these things, but given some choices, after a while they may elect to stay and take in the festival as much as possible.

Of final importance regarding attitudes toward the summer season in Corvallis and at the university as perceived by the local residents, Oregon State University was viewed by locals as having summer programming potential which could eventually bear upon local economic growth. For example, the university was seen in a position to assist in developing a more widely based academic or nonacademic program to help attract persons to campus who, in turn, would eventually spend money in the community.

Sunbirds and Other Tourists

During the first two festival seasons, the Oregon Heritage Festival succeeded in attracting large numbers of tourists, especially the Sunbirds. Attracting the tourist population was accomplished through cooperation with community organizations such as the Corvallis Convention and Visitors Bureau. Persons visiting Corvallis and the university felt the local area to have high

aesthetic attributes during the summer. However, most of these visitors suggested solitude bordered on monotony, as indicated in the following commentary:

I suppose it's nice for the college and the town when students leave. But there isn't a whole lot for us to do on a regular basis. We golf, go to the coast, and . . . we like to visit the campus and take part in as many programs as we can.

The [Corvallis Convention and Visitors] Bureau uses the university in its campaign to get us here. Our expectations aren't met, though. This summer we couldn't even get our checks cashed at the Bookstore. There seems to be a lack of coordination.

One elderly couple from Arizona, however, suggested the relative quiet of this area to be a major attraction.

We come to visit our daughter and her family. We like the quiet community. We don't come to campus very often, except for programs like yours [the festival]. Rock concerts, and loud music isn't to our liking . . . but the campus, I guess, has more concern for its students than those our age.

The Sunbirds and general tourist population were regular attenders of the festival during the 1984 and 1985 seasons. During 1986, however, the Sunbird population attending the festival declined dramatically. Interviews among the Sunbirds revealed two reasons for the decline. First, the Sunbirds, like the local area residents, were somewhat displeased with the festival because of a change in program theme. The change from the heritage theme to a program which carried more contemporary significance was not satisfactory to them. Many Sunbirds suggested the historical focus provided a unique educational supplement to their visits and the festival afforded insights into the state's history.

Another reason given for the lack of attendance by the Sunbird group was made by a three-year festival veteran from Sun City, Arizona: "This year we are a different group. They [other Sunbirds] are more inclined to play golf and have poolside parties . . . the wife and I don't fit too well this year."

The "different group" explanation cannot be fully analyzed. The Corvallis Convention and Visitors Bureau made a similar comment about the 1986 Sunbirds since all of the bureau's previous programming for the Sunbirds was less successful as well. Casual interviews among the "different group" revealed that they perceived Corvallis and the university as rather disappointing. During one of the evening lectures a small contingent of this "different group" made the following inquiry.

Do you know how to get to McDowell Creek State Park? We came to explore and sightsee, but no one is helping us. They [Corvallis Convention and Visitors Bureau] can't even tell us how to get there. They want us to stay in the local area, but there isn't much here.

Foreign Visitors

In cooperation with the English Language Institute at Oregon State University, which sponsors various foreign groups on campus during the summer months, previous Oregon Heritage Festivals had both foreign students and faculty attending events on a regular basis. During the 1984 and 1985 festivals, the foreign visitors

were primarily German. During the 1986 season, foreign visitors were represented only by Japanese.

The Germans, like the general tourist population, regarded the campus and the community as both scenic and solice. Yet, the German visitors did not view the solitude as derogatory. Foreign visitors who attended summer session during the 1984 and 1985 festivals eagerly attended events such as the evening lectures because they said it supplemented their education while attending summer classes. One German student in Home Economics noted:

The lecture on Oregon's Geologic history was fascinating . . . then I took the tour to Crater Lake . . . so much more was put into perspective for me.

My friend and I have attended your lectures and films, and our visit to Oregon State has been made even more meaningful.

During the 1986 Oregon Heritage Festival, the English Language Institute sponsored only Japanese visitors to the campus. Foreign visitor attendance was practically nonexistent. Several reasons were given for the drop in attendance by the English Language Institute; however, the primary reason suggested that the Japanese did not have a good command of English and were embarassed that they might not be able to understand the content of the festival. Two Japanese who attended evening lectures and films, like the Germans, mentioned briefly that they were provided with some additional information on Oregon.

Students

The summer student body at Oregon State University was always poorly represented at the festival. During the first year of the festival, student organizations were not fully involved in the planning process. Then, as a part of a planning strategy for the following summer, the Oregon State University Student Activities Program was integrated as part of the festival to attract more students to the program. Participation by Student Activities, or the Memorial Union Program Council, was mostly through program sharing, such as films, concerts, and outdoor food programs.

Although summer student government was incorporated into the festival planning, there was never a significant increase in student attendance. As one student leader commented:

Summer students usually attend some of our daytime functions. But evening lectures . . . why would they go when they have been lectured to all day long? In my opinion students attend summer session to make up credits for graduation, or some academic deficiency. But not for a good time. Even some of our events are not well attended. Our noon barbecues and ice cream socials are sometimes unsuccessful.

Even students such as returning public school teachers were not active festival attenders. One person, an elementary school teacher, suggested the festival offered a unique experience, but wasn't interested unless it carried academic credit. During a telephone conversation, she commented as follows.

I attend several week-long workshops to keep my credentials current. They [workshops] range from half-day to day-long classes. It's very intense . . . I have reading, papers, and reports. Who has time for anything else?

After four weeks, I return to Halsey to be with the family. I don't really want to come back to Corvallis. I have too much to do.

In general, the students who attended the festival did so because of an interest toward a specific subject matter. During the 1986 festival, several students were required as a class assignment to attend one lecture on Oregon's economy. Some even commented there wasn't much on the festival menu to interest them.

In addition, the amenities expressed by other populations toward the community and campus, were not significant to students. Most of the students interviewed were graduate students who did not leave the community during the summer. These individuals were involved in course work or thesis research and would not attend the festival unless they had a very specific interest in subject matter.

Attitudes Toward the Oregon Heritage Festival

The questionnaire analysis portion follows an issue or topical design. Primary topics are frequency of festival attendance, rating of events, suggestions for festival improvements, and attitudes toward the overall concept of the program. Each category will contain statistical analysis as well as information from observations and informal interviews. Key statistical variables

used for cross-tabulation are rate of attendance, previous festival attendance, age, sex, residence, and occupation.

Advertising and Frequency of Attendance

Poor advertising of the Oregon Heritage Festival was a chronic complaint from those who attended festival events. Comments ranged from "you need to advertise on prime time television" to "why not take out ads in professional journals?" Obviously, not all the avenues of advertising could be covered, nor could the annual budget allow for professional services to assist in the development of an effective advertising campaign. Most vocal about the truncated advertising were those who had not attended the festival in previous years. These persons felt that for a program such as the festival to be properly conducted, there must be adequate finances for advertisement.

The most effective advertising medium used by the festival, in the opinion of those attending the festival, was the newspaper. Word-of-mouth and radio were rated as less important media, though effective to a certain degree. Specialized brochures, although mailed throughout the state to libraries, schools, churches, and many other public and private agencies, did not serve as a chief device in attracting festival attendees. Since most of the persons attending festival events were from the local area, newspapers,

word-of-mouth, and the radio were obviously the effective forms of advertising. Although brochures were also distributed throughout the local area, they did not serve as a primary mechanism to advertise the festival to the local population. Those visiting the area, however, such as tourists and the Sunbirds, indicated that the brochure was their primary source of information; brochures were distributed to them in packets by local tourism-oriented agencies.

Regardless of the form of advertising, most respondents (71%) had not attended previous festivals (see Appendix 4, Table 13). Only 18% had attended the festival in either 1984 or 1985, and only 11% attended both years, consecutively. Some respondents indicated that many of their friends and acquaintances who had attended in prior years did not attend in 1986 because of a change in theme-- from an historical emphasis to an emphasis concerning the state's current economy. Those persons who had attended previous festivals and were attending again this year, acknowledged a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the change in format. They clearly preferred a more historical and thematic emphasis for the program.

Those attending the festival for the first time, however, indicated that a more contemporary topic was of greater interest. Many indicated that they found the lectures quite stimulating, especially the futuristic aspects of Oregon's business and industry. One individual made the following comment:

This is an excellent opportunity for many public and private agency personnel from the local area to participate in a program which may afford insights into economic problems in our area. Not only to identify what problems are occurring, but ways in which the experts envision these problems will be alleviated. . . . I wonder why they [more agency people from the local area] are not here?

Regardless of the level of attendance, 77% of the individuals during the 1986 program attended on an infrequent basis (see Appendix 4, Table 15). Significant differences did not occur with respect to age, sex, area of residence, or occupation. Table 6 indicates the frequency of festival attendance by age.

Table 6.

Age Groups and Frequency of Attendance, in Percentages.

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Attendance Categories</u>			
	<u>5 or less</u>	<u>6-10</u>	<u>11-15</u>	<u>more than 15</u>
25 & Under	13.0	0.8	0	0
26-30	9.2	3.1	1.5	0
31-40	9.4	2.3	1.5	1.5
41-50	11.4	1.5	0	0.7
51-60	10.7	1.5	1.5	1.5
61-70	10.7	2.3	2.3	0.8
Over 70	11.4	1.5	0.8	0

T = 100%

N = 131

Nearly 75% of the respondents attended the festival on an infrequent basis, and seemed to select carefully the events they attended. Several individuals indicated that they were interested in only one or two events throughout the summer. One small group, for example,

came to the evening lectures only during the week concerning the state's current economic problems. Other respondents selected activities such as the 5K Walk and the tours because of their nonacademic focus; these persons, however, still appreciated the educational value of the walk and the tours. Males attended more of a diversity of events than did females, even though they represented a smaller portion of the population. Professional and retired persons, as well as housewives, attended events more regularly, as might be expected.

Frequency of attendance and previous attendance of festivals are shown in tables 7 and 8.

Table 7.

Frequency of Attendance, in Percentages.

<u>Rate of Attendance</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
5 or less	101	77.1
6-10 times	17	13.0
11-15 times	10	7.6
More than 15 times	3	2.3
	N = 131	T = 100.0

Table 8.

Previous Festival Attendance, in Percentages.

<u>Attendance Category</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Have not attended previously	93	71.0
Attended in 1984	10	7.6
Attended in 1985	14	10.7
Attended both years	14	10.7
	N = 131	T = 100.0

Ratings of Events

Collectively, Table 9 reflects the attitude of respondents toward all festival events.

Table 9.

Rating of Events, in Percentage.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Event</u>						
	<u>Lecture</u>	<u>Film</u>	<u>Tour</u>	<u>Display</u>	<u>5K Walk</u>	<u>Liars</u>	<u>Concert</u>
Excellent	35.9	19.8	37.4	13.7	12.2	28.8	19.8
Good	19.1	16.0	6.1	7.6	0.8	1.5	7.6
Average	0.8	4.6	2.3	0	0	0	1.5
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Poor	0.8	0.8	0	0	0	0	0
Did Not Attend Event	43.5	58.8	54.2	78.6	87.0	69.7	71.0

T = 100%

N = 131

Table 9 reflects some interesting distinctions. First, only two persons (1.5%) rated lectures and films as very poor, and no one thought, overall, the events to be in the category of poor. All other events were rated at least average or above, with emphasis placed on good to excellent. The table seems to reflect an event popularity as well, with more people attending the lectures than any other event. This is not true, however: the Liar's Contest, the 5K Walk and the tours were most popular. This statistical anomaly is present because the Liar's Contest and 5K Walk were held toward the end of the festival after the majority of respondents had already completed questionnaires. The most popular events, based upon growth of attendance from the first two festivals and from conversations with attendants, were the Liar's Contest and the 5K Walk. Tours were also popular. In an order of ranking, the most to least popular are as follows: Liar's Contest, 5K Walk, films, tours, evening lectures, concerts, and exhibits and displays. Each of these events is discussed in more detail.

Evening Lecture Series (see Appendix 4, Table 15). This event was designed to present information concerning various aspects of Oregon's past, present, and future from invited expert speakers throughout the state. The lectures conformed to the annual theme, such as Oregon's geographical areas or its chronological history. Presentations were an hour in duration, were designed for a lay audience, and were followed by a question-and-answer period (to encourage audience participation). While the lectures were the academic integrity of the festival, their popularity diminished

during the 1986 season. As already noted, this decline in popularity was perhaps due to a radical change in festival theme.

The 55% who rated the lectures from good to excellent represented the professional and retired groups. Housewives were less inclined to rate the lectures as excellent. Ironically, females in general gave the lecture events excellent rating. Newcomers to the festival also gave the lectures higher marks than those who had attended previous festivals. One professional male visiting from out of state in the 31-40 age group rated the event as very poor.

Those who did not choose to attend the evening lecture series were from the local area, under 30 years of age, and either students or involved in farm/forestry related occupations. Sex was not a significant factor among those not attending lectures. Several other factors also come to bear upon rating the lectures. First, the lectures were held in the evening. Without a doubt, the summer evening weather kept attendance figures very low; an average of about 20 persons per lecture. Lack of interest in the theme is yet another probable cause of low attendance, as are family vacations.

Films (see Appendix 4, Table 17). Films were selected to present visual representation of the state's heritage. Shown on Friday evenings during the four-week period, the films were made in the state, based upon an Oregon author's work, or were the creation of an Oregon film maker. This event was a popular family activity over a three-year period. Although most individuals rated the event

as excellent, 16% thought the films were only good. This was due to the poor visual quality of some films. Only one person, a 26-30 year old professional male visiting the Corvallis area, rated the films as very poor.

The 59% not attending the films were local area residents over 60 years of age. They were, in addition, principally female. Unemployed persons responding to the questionnaire attended every film. Other occupational categories showed no significant correlation. Nearly 15% of the film goers attended no other festival events. Films averaged 125 persons per showing.

Tours (see Appendix 4, Table 18). The tours were conducted throughout the state, and were co-sponsored by the Horner Museum and the Student Activities Center at Oregon State University. This event was multifarious and incorporated recreation, aesthetics, history, archaeology, business, and industry. Single day and overnight trips were offered to participants. Fees to recover expenses were charged for all tours.

Individuals taking tours tended to rate the tours as excellent activities. Significant correlations did not occur regarding age, sex, area of residence, or occupation of those participating in tours. Individuals rating tours more poorly were infrequent festival attenders, had not been involved with previous festival tours, and were foreign visitors to campus. The 1986 festival was significantly different from previous festivals because foreign students and teachers verbally indicated a preference for trips around the state to supplement their education experience while

studying at Oregon State University. Those attending no tours were generally females from the local area, under the age of 50, and in clerical and sales positions.

Exhibits/Displays (see Appendix 4, Table 19). Exhibits and displays ranged from art shows to exhibits depicting the state's agricultural commodities. Exhibits were located at various places on campus. Some were temporary, while others were displayed during the entire festival. Though individuals seem to enjoy exhibits and displays, they were rated the least popular festival activity. No significant demographic differences, however, existed among those preferring or not preferring exhibits.

5K Walk (see Appendix 4, Table 20). The 5K Walk was conducted one Saturday morning during the third week of the festival. It was co-sponsored by several local businesses and the Corvallis Arts Society. More than merely a recreational walk, it was a guided tour of historic Corvallis and was designed to be an educational experience. The principle theme was the architectural history of houses, hotels, and commercial establishments.

While the majority of respondents had completed the questionnaire prior to the 5K Walk, it was verbally rated as a very popular activity for individuals, as well as for families. Ages of participants ranged from 2 to 80 years. The walk grew in attendance by over 150% in only two years. During the 1986 festival, two tour guides were hired to accommodate a crowd of 75 people.

Individuals who rated the walk higher had the following characteristics: over 40 years of age; from professional occupations or retired; had attended festivals in the past; and were from the local area. Only one female, a local area sales person, gave it a low rating. Those not participating in the walk were tourists and/or foreign visitors of all ages and occupations.

Liar's Contest (see Appendix 4, Table 21). The Liar's Contest was the most popular activity held during the third year of the Oregon Heritage Festival. It proved to be a unique blend of entertainment and education: individuals realized that the Liar's Contest helped preserve a folkloristic tradition while affording the audience and storytellers pure enjoyment. In addition, this event created the most publicity for the festival and the university. Newspaper coverage was local, regional, national, and international. The 1985 and 1986 contests received press in Switzerland and India, respectively.

Female respondents indicated they preferred the contest on a 3 to 1 margin over males. Those under the age of 40 also indicated a strong preference for the event. Traditionally, liar's contests are thought to be of greater interest to older males. Occupational groups and area of residence were not significant variables in the contest.

During the 1986 contest, over 100 individuals attended the event and 12 persons told stories. Nearly 25% of the audience were persons under 20 years of age. One young female commented that she

attended the contest for sentimental reasons: the stories were like stories her grandfather once told her when she was a young girl.

As the concluding event of the Oregon Heritage Festival, the contest became both a social and educational activity, especially for those persons who became acquainted with each other during other events (such as the lectures and tours). The atmosphere was congenial and relaxed. Due to the relaxed nature, persons have readily offered their opinions concerning the overall festival.

Concerts (see Appendix 4, Table 22). In keeping with the regular academic year tradition, concerts were held every Thursday at noontime in the Memorial Union. Performing artists were from the local community, with folk and bluegrass the predominate form of music. Only one individual indicated that the concerts were average; he was from the local area, over 60 years of age, and retired. Perhaps he did not find folk and bluegrass a satisfactory style of music.

No program, of course, endures without continual revisions, modifications, or changes directed toward improving that program. Even persons who attend programs voluntarily and cost-free have certain expectations which may or may not be met. Thirty percent of the respondents made suggestions, which are reported in the following section.

Festival Improvements

In general, older individuals attending the festival were more satisfied with the format than others. As previously noted, publicity and advertising were areas which people suggested needed more improvement. Table 10 illustrates this attitude by all age groups.

Table 10.

Age Groups and Festival Improvements, in Percentages.

<u>Type of Improvement</u>	<u>Age Group</u>						
	<u>25-Under</u>	<u>26-30</u>	<u>31-40</u>	<u>41-50</u>	<u>51-60</u>	<u>61-70</u>	<u>Over 70</u>
More Publicity	3.8	3.8	7.6	6.8	8.1	7.6	2.3
Shorter Length	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0
More Diversity	2.3	3.8	3.1	0	0	0	0
Younger Audience	8.4	5.3	0	0	0	0	0
No Improvements Necessary	0	0	3.1	6.8	5.3	9.9	11.5

T = 100%

N = 131

Persons under the age of 30 indicated a desire for the festival to be designed for a younger audience. Specificity regarding this preference was gained through interviews with a selected portion of this age group. There was a need, the younger people felt, to offer activities such as backpacking excursions, bike tours, and even camping trips to highlight aspects of the state's natural history. These more strenuous and less expensive tours would be more within

their financial budgets and would be more challenging to them as well. They also suggested other special programming needs important to their particular age group, such as the seminars on mountaineering offered the first year of the festival (1984).

For the most part, persons over 40 years of age were more accepting of the current festival design; however, some individuals suggested that the adoption of a seminar type of lecture, where several experts might discuss or debate an issue, would be preferable to a single lecturer. Persons over 50 preferred that a wider diversity of tours be offered, and that the 5K Walk be repeated several times during the summer.

Regarding other key dependent variables, females indicated more satisfaction with the current design than did males. Significant differences did not appear in the areas of occupation and residence. The 1986 festival, it should be noted, was attended by more individuals under the age of 30 than previous festivals.

Selected Attitudes Toward the Festival

The concluding portion of the survey solicited responses concerning a selected set of statements regarding the following: the perceived educational value of the festival; whether academic credit should be offered as part of the festival program; the need for more activities; festival length; and, finally, the festival's role in

creating a positive or negative image for Oregon State University. Table 11 summarizes the responses to these statements.

Table 11.

Selected Attitudes Toward the Festival, in Percentage.

<u>Selected Category</u>	<u>Response</u>				
	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
More Entertaining	5.3	16.0	24.4	34.4	6.1
Offer Credit	3.8	16.0	32.1	28.2	6.1
More Activities	5.3	33.6	32.8	13.0	0.8
Too Long	7.6	0.6	33.6	19.1	6.1
Recommend to Others	36.6	42.0	9.2	2.3	0.8
Willingness to Pay	16.8	44.3	18.3	7.6	2.3
Improves OSU Image	45.0	35.1	10.7	0.8	0

T = 100%

N = 131

Educational Value (see Appendix 4, Table 23). Generally, people indicated the festival to be an educational endeavor, and not one solely created for entertainment purposes ($p < .05$). Those who had attended previous festivals were in more agreement than those who had not attended in 1984 or 1985. Frequency of attendance, though, had no bearing on their responses. Persons over age 40 more

strongly agreed on the educational value of the festival than those under 40. No significant differences in attitudes were indicated with regard to sex, area of residence, and occupation of respondents. The lack of a significant difference regarding occupation is surprising; it was thought that professionals would perceive the festival more as an educational event.

Nearly 25% of the respondents indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed that the festival was either entertaining or educational. For the most part, these persons were local area females, under 40, who were either housewives or in clerical and sales positions.

Conversations with participants throughout the festival indicated a perceived educational thrust to the program. Even films, such as "Sometimes a Great Notion," were accepted as educational rather than a form of pure entertainment. Other activities such as tours which might have been perceived as less educational received praise regarding what people had learned. The tours, for example, afforded opportunities to expand knowledge of Oregon's natural history, environment, geology, etc.

Some 16% of the respondents, however, felt the festival to be more entertaining than educational. These individuals were mostly males, unemployed or in farming/forestry related occupations, and from the local area. Seven persons indicated that the 5K Walk and the Liar's Contest were pure entertainment, and perceived no educational value from these activities.

Academic Credit (see Appendix 4, Table 24). While the majority of respondents felt the festival should offer no academic credit as part of the program offerings, 32% indicated they were neither in agreement nor disagreement with the prospect of offering credit. Many of these persons reserved their opinion for specific academic program proposals, but offered none of their own. One individual expressed a desire to reinstate a Division of Continuing Education option where all evening lectures could be attended for undergraduate credit. This option was offered the first year of the festival, and students were required to attend, and then, in writing, summarize each week of lectures. Several people selected this option during the first year, but it was subsequently terminated for lack of sufficient participants.

Nearly 20% of respondents indicated that they favored integrating academic credit into the festival. These persons were among the local area residents who, of course, would be best able to make a time commitment over the summer. Students were not as accepting of such a proposal, but indicated that some of the lectures complemented courses they had taken in the past or were taking at present. One person commented that several lectures had afforded additional insights into a business economics course taken during the eight-week summer session. Many of the students who attended the festival lectures were required to attend as part of a class assignment; many of them did not return to any other festival events.

Overall, females expressed a greater desire for academic credit (18% more than males). Persons under age 50 also favored academic credit. Retired persons saw no need for academic credit, neither did the unemployed, clerical and sales, nor forestry/farm related. A composite of the 32% who indicated a neither positive nor negative response were mostly males, over 50, and from all occupations.

Program Expansion (see Appendix 4, Table 25). More than 40% of the respondents indicated that the festival needed expansion to include more activities. Types of activities desired were tours, films, more involvement with on-going programs from both the public and private sector, and academic courses to complement the festival. Some respondents desired moving the festival from the university into the community. The most interesting suggestion was that the Oregon Heritage Festival could act as an umbrella concept for Festival Corvallis, Riverfront Festival, and even the current musical celebration in Albany. One person even suggested cooperating with local community colleges and other universities to share costs, offer a broader program context and have more planning ideas, so that residents from several nearby communities could attend events in their local area.

Approximately one-half of those desiring program expansion were from the professional occupations. Retired and sales persons were satisfied with the 1986 agenda. Males and females were equally divided, but those under 40 were the strongest advocates of expanding the current festival. Previous festival attendance and frequency of attendance were not significant factors.

Only slightly more than 10% expressed satisfaction with the 1986 program. These respondents were over 50, retired, and from the local area. An analysis of the 33% who neither agreed nor disagreed with the need for program expansion indicates that they were generally females, in all age groups, resided locally, and attended on an infrequent basis.

Festival Length (see Appendix 4, Table 26). Nearly 34 percent of the respondents did not make a clear decision regarding the current length of the festival. These persons were mostly over 60, local residents, and female. Individuals who favored reducing the length of the festival were both female and male, local residents, equally divided by age group, and attended on an infrequent basis. Those satisfied with the current duration were retired females.

After three years of the Oregon Heritage Festivals, it was suggested that the festival be shortened to two to three weeks. Festival planners observed during each year that attendance did drop during the final week, especially at the lectures series. Several persons thought a two-week festival with a similar number of events (or more) would be more exciting, and have more value.

Recommending the Festival (see Appendix 4, Table 27). As a possible indicator of overall satisfaction with the Oregon Heritage Festival, nearly 80% of the respondents indicated they would recommend the festival to others. Only four persons would not recommend the festival to friends or family. Those who attended previous festivals were more inclined to make such a recommendation

than newcomers; the newcomers did not feel as strongly about recommending the festival to others.

Respondents over age 50 were most likely to recommend the festival, while those under age 30 were divided in their response. Persons in the 30 to 50 age groups were the most conservative in their response. Table 12 summarizes survey response to the question of festival recommendation, according to sex.

Table 12.

Attitudes Toward Recommending the Festival, by Sex, in Percentage.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree</u> <u>Nor Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Male	17.5	12.2	4.6	0.0	2.3
Female	19.1	29.7	4.6	0.8	6.9
T = 100%	36.6	41.9	9.2	0.8	9.2
N = 131					

Males and females were evenly divided in the intensity of their responses; females were in overall agreement in recommending the festival to others by the highest percentage. Occupations and other categories did not significantly correlate.

Willingness to Pay (see Appendix 4, Table 28). Over 60% indicated they would be willing to pay a fee for festival events. Rather than an event-by-event charge, the majority favored a family pass system, which would allow attendance of selected events. Regardless of past attendance or frequency of attendance,

individuals were willing to pay. Overall, the males were slightly less willing to pay than females, especially females under age 30. Retired and professional occupations were most willing to pay while unemployed persons and students were least willing.

Many individuals offered a variety of comments during the course of the festival concerning the charging of fees to attend festival events. No individual adamantly opposed such a scheme. A nominal fee, such as \$5.00 for a family festival pass, was acceptable to those attending festival events. As one person suggested, "we pay for the tours, and we give donations to the Corvallis Arts Center during the 5K Walk, why would we be opposed to the notion of paying to attend other festival events."

University Image (see Appendix 4, Table 29). The final category pertained to the degree to which the festival may or may not serve to enhance the overall image of the university. Over 80% of respondents strongly agreed that the festival was a positive factor in public relations, and that the program served to enhance the image of the university in the minds of those who attended. One local resident comments:

Oregon State University should have extended itself to the community in this way years ago. The festival shows they [the university] are willing to do something we more easily understand [less esoteric]. People, here, enjoy the festival and the longer it continues, the more [people] will come.

Sunbirds and tourists perceived the festival in a similar vein. One Sunbird did not understand the reluctance of OSU to ". . . put

their shoulder behind the festival or a similar type of program."

He added the following comment:

Every June we attend seminars in Logan, Utah. They really welcome us and we spend several hundred thousand dollars each visit. We attend almost everything they offer. This includes credit and non-credit classes, workshops, and other activities. They bring in nationally known speakers, too. Last year they had an expert on U.S. presidents' wives.

When we come to Corvallis, the university doesn't do much for us. We like the festival, but would like to see more offered. The lectures are good, the tours, too. We are willing to pay. Why doesn't OSU send someone to Arizona in the fall to talk with us?

Observations such as this were common among the Sunbirds. Such comments were especially noted during the first two years of the festival. Perhaps because the university did not respond to these suggestions the 1986 festival experienced lower Sunbird attendance than in either previous year. Poor attendance, as mentioned earlier, may also be due to another reason. One person from the Sunbirds group, who had attended all three festivals, remarked, "This is a different group this year. They are more golf course and swimming pool-party oriented."

SUMMARY OF ATTITUDES

Some definite differences existed in attitudes toward the Oregon Heritage Festival in all three research populations. University administrators perceived the festival as primarily an entertainment type of program. Some did not feel that it belonged

in a university setting. Others suggested the festival might become a revenue-producing, tour-oriented function. Most administrators, however, stressed the need for summer term to be academic only.

University administrators were diverse in their opinion regarding the role of the festival interfacing with existing programs. Overall, this group appreciated the strong public relations aspects of the festival, but felt it was hard to distinguish which university program offered the most to the community.

The most clear response concerning programming like the festival was in the area of evaluation. Chief criteria employed are attendance and costs. The university, as suggested by administrators, does not concern itself with attempting to redesign failing programs.

Community leaders perceived the festival as an educational program for the Corvallis area residents. Clearly, they envisioned the festival as a device to cement university-community relations in order for the university to correct an image which had been tarnished in the past. Cultural preservation was an additional aspect of the festival that, in their minds, was not considered by university administrators.

Overall, community leaders expressed a desire for a better working relationship with the university. Most felt they could assist in several important ways, such as advertising, limited cost sharing, and attracting tourists to campus. Finally, community

leaders indicated that the academic needs of the Corvallis community were not being met by Oregon State University, and the need to accommodate the nontraditional student was essential to meeting these academic needs.

Like the community leaders, those attending festival events perceived the festival as an educational activity. Although local area residents constituted the majority of the sample, all persons suggested that the festival was a program in which the university should be involved. Sunbirds were critical of both the university and community for not meeting their needs.

Festival survey respondents also mentioned the image of the university as an important issue. In their view, the festival built a solid image for Oregon State University on a much broader level throughout the state. Clearly, Oregon State University administrators had overlooked the importance of cultivating good relations in the Corvallis community, and thus perpetuated a feeling of social and intellectual distance perceived by the community leaders and those who attended festival events.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

Evaluation research, regardless of the methodological orientation, is intended to determine the worth of a program. The approaches to evaluation are as varied as any other social science research. No two researchers are likely to approach the same study in the same way, nor should they. Disciplinary training, a temporal hiatus for replicative research, cultural and environmental change, and other factors are important when considering any conduct of inquiry. The most important factor, however, is to properly design the study around the techniques that were chosen for the conduct of the research.

The central purpose of this study was to test the effectiveness of the ethnographic process as a tool for evaluating nontraditional adult and continuing education programs. This section summarizes the findings while reviewing the objectives.

Objective 1: Review the existing literature regarding the use of the ethnographic method in the adult and continuing education process.

Adult and continuing education nontraditional program evaluation has almost exclusively relied upon some quantitative design to assess program worth. Although a wide range of quantitative approaches exist in the literature, the extent of participation and student cognitive gains have been the principle concepts of measurement. Very few qualitative designs exist in the adult and continuing education literature; approaches which used triangulation were rare. Unfortunately, quantitative based designs have failed to provide sufficient information to evaluate the worth of adult and continuing education nontraditional programs.

A comparison of findings from the current research and other studies using the ethnographic approach was not possible due to radical differences in the context of the research. The literature revealed that all research studies involving the ethnographic method were large-scale efforts directed toward planned educational change. A literature search was made also for evaluative reports and journal articles pertaining to nontraditional, nonacademic programs--college, university, and community--that were similar to the Oregon Heritage Festival. While it was determined that similar programs do exist, formal evaluations of these programs had not been conducted.

Studies that advocate the use of the ethnographic method, or one or more ethnographic techniques, were readily available. Most were a "how to" type of design. Some articles advocating ethnography were more precautionary: that is, authors were advocating the ethnographic approach to evaluation, but only by researchers properly trained in ethnography.

Overall, studies which used the ethnographic approach in program evaluation claimed that the method yielded information which might have otherwise gone undetected. The most effective technique was participant observation where researchers were able to gain better insight and understanding through their day-to-day participation in the culture under study.

Objective 2: Develop a research protocol utilizing the ethnographic process.

The ethnographic method has been used in many different research contexts: Policy analysis, urban and rural studies, and other inquiries directed at investigating cultural phenomenon at local, regional, national and international levels. Ethnographic research ranges from large multi-disciplinary designs to small-scale individual performances. Each research setting dictates that the ethnographer may consider a variety of techniques appropriate for the specific study. Spradley and McCurdy (1980:31) state the concept clearly: "Techniques that work in one society often yield little information in another society. New strategies for gathering data are developed while doing fieldwork." The flexibility which is required of the ethnographer can be made without difficulty providing he/she has a sufficient understanding of the basic elements of the ethnographic method. As Pelto (1970:269) suggests:

On the operational, systematic data-collection side of field research, there is more in the way of standardized use of instruments, modes of sampling, and logical structuring and interrelating the data that can be built

into the working repertoire of anthropologists. There is, after all, definable 'kits of tools' by means of which anthropologists have usually collected their data. Each new cultural context may call for some modification of these basic tools, but these accommodations to the realities of field work can be made nicely if the researcher has a good grasp of the main prototypes . . .

The tools of ethnography are designed to discover folk knowledge, or that knowledge shared by members of the culture. These universal tools, or techniques, are participant observation, in-depth interviews with key informants, surveys, life histories, psychological tests, and nonverbal approaches such as photography. The ethnographer's tools differ from those traditionally employed by sociologists, educators, psychologists, and other social scientists, because the techniques are intended to obtain different kinds of information.

Objectives 3 and 4: Utilize this protocol to examine the effectiveness of the Oregon Heritage Festival, and to assess the range of attitudes and degree of acceptance from university administrators, community leaders, and those attending festival events.

Depth of evaluation, as shown by this research, emerges from objective and subjective approaches. Objective measurement from the questionnaire administered to program participants, afforded specific attitudinal and behavioral analysis. The subjective portion which emerged from observations and interviews among all participants brought a broader perspective to bear upon the

findings. Collectively, the research was holistic. The use of ethnography in evaluation demonstrates the inclusive nature of the method.

The range of attitudes and degree of acceptance among the research populations were determined through participant observation, in-depth interviewing and a survey questionnaire designed for festival attendees. Participant observation was conducted over a three-year time frame in the university, community, and festival setting. A summary of those findings are presented collectively.

Summer months in Corvallis, and at Oregon State University, were viewed in a favorable manner by local residents, tourists, foreign visitors, and students in this study. Locals, tourists and foreign visitors especially expressed a desire for summer programs sponsored by the university to supplement other activities. Only students were unconcerned about any nontraditional programs other than the traditional academic courses.

Local area residents felt that the Oregon Heritage Festival and Summer Term at Oregon State University were two distinct programs. The festival was perceived as an educational, but nonacademic program, while Summer Term was decidedly academic and solely for students.

Organizational problems in community agencies and the university were concerns of the Sunbirds. These persons felt their needs were not being met either by the community or the university. Over a three-year period, the Sunbirds were relatively pleased with

their summer stay; however, the group felt the university should play a larger role in offering a wider variety of nonacademic programs. The Sunbirds were quite willing to pay for costs of such programming.

Foreign visitors, during the 1984 and 1985 festivals, also seemed to appreciate the solitude of the community and campus; programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival were seen as desirable activities during their summer stay. To foreign visitors, the festival was regarded as a supplement to their overall educational experience.

What community leaders had perceived as a program to mend a history of ill-feelings did not match the perceptions of university administrators. University administrators were very inconsistent in acknowledging the community as an important entity. To university administrators, public relations seemed to overlook the local area and were defined as a state or regional concept. In sum, the community was thought by administrators to be a marginal factor in the university mission. In order for the community and university to work cooperatively, especially on economic or other research related problems, university administrators may need to assume a more positive stance toward the community as a community which affects and is affected by the university. University administrators did not appear to be amenable to nontraditional programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival. Even though the program experienced a deficit during the first year, administrators

were not concerned how the festival might be modified to eventually yield financial profit.

While those attending the festival indicated that the festival contained strong public relations and image building components, they were curious regarding the obvious reluctance of the university to put more effort into the program. Local residents and tourists did not fully comprehend why the Oregon Heritage Festival grew so slowly.

Overall attitudes of the respondents did not significantly differ with respect to age, sex, area of residence, or occupation. Although there was a female bias in the group, this did not create difficulties in the statistical analysis. Collectively, the attendees were favorable toward the festival and expressed a desire for a continued program. The majority professed willingness to pay for events, provided a season pass could be purchased for the entire family.

All in all, the Oregon Heritage Festival did not perform as it was designed to perform in attracting a diverse audience. Rather, the festival attracted a certain population which did not include students. When compared to other extracurricular programs, such as university football, the Oregon Heritage Festival falls short. For example, football attracts both students and those persons who are not students. Both students and nonstudents are revenue producers for the university.

Objective 5: Report the strengths and weaknesses of the ethnographic process through the evaluation of the Oregon Heritage Festival.

Application of the ethnographic method to studies involving local, nontraditional educational programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival must be given realistic appraisal. The current research covered a three-year participant observation period, and due to the time and expense involved the study would probably not have been appropriate for an external evaluation on a similar scale. Therefore, a modified study would need to be proposed, and such a proposal would probably have been restricted in the techniques available for research. Less detailed interviewing, different questionnaire design, and certainly less time for participant observation would be required for such a study.

Ethnography is labor intensive, too. Ethnography requires long hours each day, and may often require months of field work. The effort required by ethnography may create psychological tensions and frequent tiredness not part of the hazards of using methods from other disciplines.

As Fetterman (1984) reminds us, the final product of an ethnographic evaluation is an evaluation, not an ethnography. Ethnographic evaluation, as all ethnographic research, begins with the same objective--to gain an understanding. However, evaluations are quicker attempts to assess understanding than many traditional ethnographies.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the results of this research, the following major conclusions were reached concerning the effectiveness of the ethnographic process as a tool for evaluating adult and continuing education nontraditional programs.

1. The ethnographic method may afford a potential for conducting in-house education program evaluation.

Criticism has been raised regarding in-house evaluations, per se. Yet a realistic in-house appraisal can be given under certain sets of circumstances. A primary consideration might entail a panel of reviewers to guide the inquiry with the major responsibility of monitoring the process to insure objectivity. In addition, the panel, or committee, would direct the collection, analysis, and synthesis of information. Clearly, people who plan and conduct programs over long periods of time possess unique sets of information, and such information is of extreme value to any ethnographic study.

Regardless of the research design, an insider's point of view remains the objective of ethnographic work. While persons conducting an external ethnographic evaluation might not be able to build a similar confidence level with the community, administrators, and program attendees, the research could still have considerable value. Seemingly, there is still some merit in internal evaluation.

Persons involved over long periods of time in the planning and conduct of similar programs have made observations, overheard conversations and inuendos, and, hopefully, have gained the trust and confidence of all those involved in the programming. Indeed, the building of confidence levels in order to gain candid appraisals cannot happen overnight. Confidence is essential to ethnographic field work. However, a close working relationship with key informants has disadvantages, too. For example, those administrators interviewed at Oregon State University may or may not have been as candid in their responses as they might have been with an external evaluator.

2. The ethnographic method is capable of revealing information not normally gathered through other methods; such as traditional survey research.

This study developed a research protocol which used the ethnographic method as an evaluation device for obtaining information on nontraditional programs. This research was not intended to suggest that adult and continuing education program evaluators should abandon all other methods and adopt the ethnographic strategy. However, this research suggested that the ethnographic method can be effective under certain conditions, and that practitioners need to consider the broad-based information yielded by ethnography.

The primary reason for developing this research protocol was to demonstrate to adult and continuing education evaluators that measure the extent of participation and learner gains have not been sufficient indicators of true program worth. While education goals and objectives are important in the development of any learning situation, the evaluation process cannot be completed unless more depth is brought into the study.

3. Program evaluators in adult and continuing education need to draw more upon multidisciplinary knowledge to determine the true value of a nontraditional program.

A failure to assess program value by more holistic approaches has been a serious omission in the adult and continuing education evaluation process. The attitudes and behaviors of a wide range of participants such as planners, administrators, community members, students, those who attend programs, and other relevant individuals have not been considered in the evaluation of most adult and continuing education programs. Experimental design, for example, might work well in some situations, but only partially in other situations.

One of the chief difficulties of any research design intended for cross-disciplinary application has been to make the findings of that research meaningful for whom the research was intended. This

task becomes even more difficult when members of the discipline for whom the research was intended primarily view themselves as practitioners.

The aim of all research is to benefit those for whom the research is intended. Ethnography, a naturalistic form of inquiry, is best able to provide information which is within the experience of the practitioner who is involved in the planning and conduct of adult and continuing education programs. Information through the use of ethnography in the Oregon Heritage Festival clearly illustrates how various populations involved in educational programs perceive and affect the direction and outcome of a program.

4. Descriptive ethnographic evaluation provides broad-based information for more efficacious action on the part of program decision makers.

The principal utility of a descriptive ethnographic study is the accumulation of empirical data for subsequent comparative analysis or for theory building designs. While evaluation studies tend to be atheoretical, this is not to mean the study is not useful. Pelto (1970:326-327) comments on the relevance of descriptive research:

Social scientists frequently repeat a cliché to the effect that mere description by itself is worthless; only when descriptive statements are relatable to theoretical propositions do they become useful knowledge. This kind of statement is usually accompanied by another axiom-- that to provide useful knowledge social scientists must be able to predict outcomes or consequences of action.

These statements are particularly in error when it comes to practical applications . . . for often the predictions of consequences, or forecasts, are made by administrators, planners . . . and not by social scientists. Their policy decisions, we may assume, are most effective when they are based on accurate descriptive data. Existential statements such as:

'Twenty three percent of the people are malnourished,' or, 'At any given time about one third of the men are away from home working on plantations,' are frequently of direct practical use.

An example of the utility of descriptive research emerges from this study. Here, the attitudes of community leaders toward Oregon State University might be used by university administrators to begin building a more successful community relations program where both profited.

The Oregon Heritage Festival might have provided a vehicle for university and community cooperation. For example, Oregon State University and various community agencies might have put together a summer program which included the festival and other community programs such as Festival Corvallis. This scenario might have proved instrumental, if planned correctly, in attracting a wider variety of persons to Corvallis and the university. As an example, locals, tourists, and other visitors would be offered a package deal for a certain amount of money, with profits to be divided among the sponsors. For a certain amount of money, persons would be entitled to attend various community and Oregon Heritage Festival events such as concerts and tours. Various packages might be offered for various amounts of money. Such a program may serve as a potential recruitment device for Oregon State University, too.

Summer Term at Oregon State University would profit by incorporating the Corvallis community into its proposed summer activities. In fact, the Corvallis community might be critical to the eventual success of Summer Term. Both have talents, resources, and opportunities to draw upon. Broad umbrella concepts such as the Oregon Heritage Festival offer potential for the creation of such cooperative programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

It is generally recommended that further research be conducted to evaluate other nontraditional adult and continuing education programs in order to gain a further understanding of the application of ethnographic field techniques. As suggested in Chapter 1, the use of ethnography in policy related studies, such as evaluation, is a relatively new endeavor. Attempts to adapt ethnographic techniques, such as participant observation, in-depth interviewing and questionnaires to small-scale program evaluations, can be challenging for the researcher. Thus, each attempt, successful or unsuccessful, will provide a greater understanding for future researchers and better information for practitioners.

The use of the ethnographic method needs to be applied in more diverse evaluation contexts. Currently, the larger federally funded programs, such as the Experimental School Program, have received the majority of ethnographic research. Certainly programs of more local

or statewide importance need evaluation, too, whether or not they carry any national educational implications.

As Fetterman (1984a) suggests, ethnography is not a panacea. While it is one useful approach to be used in educational evaluation, in some contexts, ethnography might not be suitable. The more the method can be applied to various evaluation contexts, the more we will know of its usefulness and its limitations. There is a need for replication of study. While the Oregon Heritage Festival cannot be replicated in the same manner as it was studied in this research, similar nontraditional programs can be fully researched for eventual comparative purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAMS

Any research concerning the evaluation of a nontraditional education program carries certain general recommendations for other programs. This research offers the following recommendations:

1. Before any programming success can be realized, there must be an institutional commitment to the program. This support must be at all levels: from faculty, deans, and higher administrators. In some cases, the community must be considered and supportive of the program. Communication must be precise, to avoid misunderstanding of program objectives.
2. There must be sufficient financial support. Programs which have zero-based budgets, or budgets which are marginal, are too tenuous. Finances must include adequate salary and wages for planning and support personnel, advertising costs, and other needs for program variability.

3. Thematic presentations may have more successful potential than topical presentations. The Oregon Heritage Festival, as the name implies, had a historical focus. When a more contemporary theme was planned and executed during the third summer, change did not seemingly meet the expectations of those attending, and attendance declined.
4. Continual feedback from the university, community, and those attending nontraditional programs is mandatory. Continual modification of existing programs is usually necessary.

University and community based nontraditional programs are important for many different reasons. Public relations, general adult education, and building a positive image for the university are just a few of the reasons. Such programs, when depressed economic conditions occur, may be the most persuasive of all activities for ensuring continual funding since these programs reach more of the general population. Also, the work accomplished in this study has many cross-disciplinary applications, such as to inform evaluators that there is more than one way of knowing.

This research has made a contribution to adult and continuing education program evaluation. The study illustrated that the more time spent on project evaluation, and the broader the information base, the better the results. The ethnographic process serves to both objectively and subjectively evaluate conduct and continuing education programs so that better decisions can be made regarding the worth of a program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abt, Wendy, et al. One Year Out: Report of Rural High School Graduates. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.

Agar, Michael. The Professional Stranger. Orlando: Academic Press, 1980.

Alkin, Marvin. "Evaluation Theory Development." Educational Comment, U.C.L.A. Center for the Study of Evaluation 2(1) (1969):2-7.

Alkin, Marvin, and Frederick Ellet. "An Inquiry into the Nature of Evaluation Theorizing." Studies in Educational Evaluation 5(2) (1979):151-156.

Boaz, Franz. "Recent Anthropology." Science 98(3) (1943):311-314.

Boulding, Kenneth. "Science, Our Common Heritage." Science 207(33) (1980):831-836.

Bowen, Elbert. "A Quarter-Century of Collegiate Oral Interpretation Festival Going." Communication Education 25 (1976):127-131.

Boyd, Robert, and Daniel Rice. "An Overview of Research Activity in Adult and Continuing Education." Continuum 50(1) (1986):31-48.

Breuder, Robert, and Art Pollack. "Developing Non-Traditional Programs." Community College Review 11(1) (1983):13-21.

Britan, Gerald. "The Place of Anthropology in Program Evaluation." Anthropological Quarterly 51(2) (1978):119-128.

Broshier, Roger. "Adult Education: Issues of the Future." In Examining Controversies in Adult Education. Edited by W. Griffith and H. McClusky. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.

Burns, Allen. "An Anthropologist at Work." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 6(4) (1976):28-34.

Burns, Allen. "On the Ethnographic Process in Anthropology and Education." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 3(1) (1978):25-33.

Cassell, John. A Field Work Manual for Studying Desegregated Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Chambers, Erve. "Working for the Man: The Anthropologist in Policy Relevant Research." Human Organization 36(3) (1977):258-267.

Chen, Huey-Tsyh, and Peter Rossi. "Evaluating With Sense: The Theory Driven Approach." Evaluation Review 7(3) (1983):283-302.

Clinton, Charles. "The Anthropologist as Highered Hand." Human Organization 34(2) (1975):197-204.

Clinton, Charles. Local Success and Federal Failure: A Study in Community Development and Educational Change in the Rural South. Cambridge: Abt Associates, 1979.

Coates, Julie. Enrollment Analysis. Manhattan, Kansas: Learning Resources Network, 1985.

Comitas, Lambros, and Janet Dolgin. "On Anthropology and Education." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 9(3) (1978):165-180.

Cronbach, Lee. Designing Evaluation of Educational and Social Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cross, Patricia, and John Valley. Planning Nontraditional Programs. Edited by K. Cross and J. Valley. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Dagenais, Fred. "Theory-based Evaluation of an Experimental Program." Educational Research Quarterly 3(2) (1978):74-83.

Dickinson, Gary, and Ann Blunt. "Survey Research." In Changing Approaches to Studying Adult Education. Edited by W. Griffith and H. McClusky. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

Eisner, Edward. "The Use of Qualitative Forms of Evaluation for Improving Educational Practice." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 1(6) (1979):11-19.

Everhart, Robert. "Problems Doing Fieldwork in Educational Evaluation." Human Organization 34(2) (1975):205-215.

Ewell, Peter. "Assessment: What's It All About?" Change 17(6) (1985):32-37.

Fathy, Shadia. "The Role an Evaluator's Values Should Play in Program Evaluation." Adult Education 30(3) (1980):166-172.

Fetterman, David. Study of the Career Intern Program. Mountainview, California: R.M.C. Research Corporation, 1981.

Fetterman, David. Doing Ethnographic Educational Evaluation. In Ethnography in Education Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

Fetterman, David. Ethnography in Educational Research: The Dynamics of Diffusion. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984a.

Filstead, William. Qualitative Methods: A Needed Perspective in Evaluation Research In Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research. Edited by T. Cook and C. Reichardt. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979.

Firestone, William. Great Expectations for Small Schools: The Limitations of Federal Programs. New York: Praeger Books, 1980.

Firestone, William, and Robert Herriot. Multisite Qualitative Policy Research: Some Design and Implementation Issues. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

Fitz-Gibbon, Carol, and Lynn Morris. "Theory-Based Evaluation" U.C.L.A. Center for the Study of Evaluation 5(1) (1975):1-4.

Fitzsimmons, Stephen. "The Anthropologist in a Strange Land." Human Organization 34(2) (1975):182-196.

Friedland, William, and Dorothy Nelkin. Migrant Agricultural Workers in America's Northeast. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.

Fuchs, Edward. Teachers Talk: Views from Inside City Schools. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

Gillespie, David, and Ronald Perry. "Survey Return Rates and Questionnaire Appearance." The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 11(3) (1975):71-74.

Goetz, Judith, and Margaret LeCompte. "Ethnographic Research and the Problem of Data Reduction." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 12(1) (1981):51-70.

Gold, Raymond. Combining Ethnographic and Survey Research. In Methodology of Social Impact Assessment. Edited by K. Finsterbusch and C. Wolf. New York: Dowden, Hustchinson, and Ross, Inc., 1977.

Goldberg, Harvey. Evaluation, Ethnography, and the Concept of Culture: Disadvantaged Youth in an Israeli Town. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

Goldin, Carol, and Jim Thomas. "Adult Education in Correctional Settings: Symbol or Subsistence." Adult Education Quarterly 34(3) (1984):123-134.

- Guba, Egon, and Yvonna Lincoln. Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Guba, Egon, and Yvonna Lincoln. "Epistemological and Methodological Basis of Naturalistic Inquiry." Educational Communication and Technology 30(4) (1982):35-43.
- Harnett, Rodney. Nontraditional Study: An Overview. In Explorations in Nontraditional Study. Edited by S. Gould and K. Cross. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.
- Harris, Marvin. The Rise of Anthropological Theory. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Inc., 1968.
- Hemwall, Martha. Ethnography as Evaluation: Hearing Impaired Students in the Mainstream. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.
- Hennigh, Louis. The Anthropologist as Key Informant: Community Research in Southwest Oregon. In Anthropologists at Home in North America. Edited by D. Messerschmidt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Herriot, Robert. "Ethnographic Case Studies in Federally Funded Multi-Disciplinary Policy Research: Some Design and Implementation Issues." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 9(2) (1977:106-115.
- Holt, Margaret, and Bradley Courtney. "An Examination of Impact Evaluations." Continuum 49(1) (1985):23- 35.
- Houle, Cyril. The Design of Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.
- Houle, Cyril. Continuing Learning in the Professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.
- House, Ernest. "Assumptions Underlying Evaluation Models." Educational Researcher 20(3) (1978):4-12.
- Jick, Todd. Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action. In Qualitative Methodology. Edited by J. Van Manned. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.
- Jorgensen, Joseph. "On Ethics and Anthropology." Current Anthropology 12(4) (1971):326-333.
- Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: Chandler Press, 1964.

- Keiser, Lincoln. The Vice Lords: Warriors of the Streets. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Kimmel, Ernest. Problems in Recognition. In Explorations in Nontraditional Study. Edited by S. Gould and K. Cross. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.
- Kinsey, David. "Participatory Evaluation in Adult and Nonformal Education." Adult Education 31(3) (1981):155-168.
- Koppleman, Kenneth. "The Explication Model: An Anthropological Approach to Program Evaluation." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 3(1) (1979):59-64.
- Kurz, Dorothy. "The Use of Participant Observation in Evaluation Research." Evaluation and Program Planning 6(2) (1983):93-102.
- Lawson, K. "The Problem of Defining Adult Education as an Area of Research." Adult Education Quarterly 36(1) (1985):39-43.
- LeCompte, Margaret, and Judith Goetz. Ethnographic Data Collection in Evaluation Research. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.
- Legare, Thomas. "Evaluating Educational Programs When Experimental Design is Inappropriate." Educational Research Quarterly 5(2) (1980):30-49.
- Lincoln, Yvonna, and Egon Guba. Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1985.
- Lowe, John. The Education of Adults: A World Perspective. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1975.
- Madaus, George, Daniel Stufflebeam, and Michael Scriven. Program Evaluation: A Historical Overview. In Evaluation Models. Edited by G. Madaus, D. Stufflebeam, and M. Scriven. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing, 1983.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. Argonauts of the Western Pacific. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1922.
- Meidinger, Errol, and Allan Schnaiberg. "Social Impact Assessment as Evaluation Research." Evaluation Review 4(4) (1980):507-535.
- Messerschmidt, Donald. The Local-Federal Interface in Rural School Improvement. Cambridge: Abt Associates, 1979.

- Messerschmidt, Donald. Federal Bucks for Local Change: On the Ethnography of Experimental Schools. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.
- Meyers, William. The Evaluation Enterprise. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1981.
- Miles, Mathew, and Michael Humberman. "Drawing Valid Meaning from Qualitative Data: Toward a Shared Craft." Educational Researcher 30(5) (1984):20-28.
- Miles, Mathew, and Michael Humberman. Qualitative Data Analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.
- Nie, Norman, et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Pelto, Pertti. Anthropological Research: the Structure of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Riffel, Robert, et al. A Research on Desegregation in School and Classroom Settings. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1976.
- Rist, Roger, et al. Education and Employment Training: The View of Youth. Youth Work National Policy Study. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979.
- Rist, Roger, et al. Targeting on In-School Youth: Four Strategies for Coordinating Education and Employment Training. Youth National Policy Study. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Rogers, Vivian, and Robert Senegal. "Continuing Education Evaluation: Notes from a Self-Study." Continuum 49(1) (1985):1-11.
- Roper, Roy. Ethnography. In Social Impact Assessment Methods. Edited by K. Finsterbusch, L. Llewellyn, and C. Wolf. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.
- Rossi, Peter, and Richard Berk. "An Overview of Evaluation Strategies and Procedures." Human Organization 40(4) (1981):287-298.
- Roth, James. "Needs and Needs Assessment." Evaluation News 16(5) (1977):15-17.
- Sanders, William, and Thomas Pinhey. The Conduct of Social Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1983.

- Sapir, Edward. "Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture, a Study in Method." Department of Mines Geological Survey, Memoir 90, No. 13, Anthropological Series. Canada: Government Printing Bureau, 1916.
- Sarason, Seymour. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Schoepfle, Mark, Michael Barton, and Kenneth Begishe. "Navajo Attitudes Toward Development and Change." In American Anthropologist 86(4) (1984):885-904.
- Scriven, Michael. The Methodology of Evaluation. In Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation, AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Development, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.
- Scriven, Michael. Evaluation Ideologies. In Evaluation Models. Edited by G. Maudus, D. Stufflebeam, and M. Scriven. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishers, 1983.
- Simon, Julian, and Paul Burstien. Basic Research Methods in Social Science. Third Edition (1985). New York: Random House, 1969.
- Smith, Allen, and Albert Robbins. "Multimethod Policy Research: A Case Study of Structure and Flexibility." Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.
- Smith, Nick. "Evaluation Reflections: Requirements for a Discipline." Studies in Educational Evaluation 5(1) (1979):5-12.
- Smith, Nick. "Evaluation Studies: Sources of Value Influencing Educational Evaluation." Studies in Educational Evaluation 6(2) (1980):101-118.
- Smith, Nick. "Evaluation Studies: Evaluating Evaluation Systems." Studies in Educational Evaluation 7(2) (1981):173-181.
- Smith, Nick. "Evaluation Reflections: Evaluation Design as Preserving Valued Qualities in Evaluation Studies." Studies in Educational Evaluation 7(3) (1982):229-237.
- Smith, Nick. "Citizen Involvement in Evaluation: Empirical." Studies in Educational Evaluation 9(1) (1983):105-117.
- Soltis, Jonas. "On the Nature of Educational Research." Educational Researcher 33(12) (1984):5-12.
- Sork, Thomas. "The Postmortum Audit: Improving Programs by Examining Failures." Journal of Lifelong Learning 20(3) (1981):6-31.

- Sork, Thomas, and John Buskey. "A Descriptive Analysis of Program Planning Literature, 1950-1983." Adult Education Quarterly 36(2) (1986):86-96.
- Spindler, George. Education and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- Spradley, James. The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979.
- Spradley, James, and David McCurdy. Anthropology, the Cultural Perspective. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel, and Anthony Shinkfield. Systematic Evaluation. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishers, 1985.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel, and William Webster. "An Analysis of Alternative Approaches to Evaluation." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 3 (1980):5-19.
- Suchman, Evert. Evaluation Research. New York, Russell Sage, 1967.
- Tornatsky, Louis, and Elmima Johnson. "Research in Implementation." Evaluation and Program Planning 5(3) (1982):193-198.
- Tyler, Louise. "Evaluation: Beyond Either-Ors." Studies in Educational Evaluation 7(1) (1981):17-24.
- Tyler, Ralph. "A Rationale for Program Evaluation." In Evaluation Models. Edited by G. Maudus, M. Scriven, and D. Stufflebeam. Boston: Kluwer-Neijhoff Publishers, 1983.
- Valentine, John. Nontraditional Study: Translating Ideas into Action. In Surveying Personal and Community Needs Through Adult Education. Edited by W. Griffith and H. McClusky. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- van Willigen, John. Applied Anthropology. Boston: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, 1986.
- Wacaster, Charles, and William Firestone. "The Promise and Problem of Long-Term Continuous Field Work." Human Organization 34(2) (1978):109-110.
- Weiss, Ronald, and Michael Rein. "The Evaluation of Broad Aim Programs: Experimental Design, Its Difficulty and Its Alternaties." Administrative Science Quarterly 15(1) (1970):97-109.
- Wilson, Stephen. The Use of Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, pp.126-147, 1974.

Wilson, Stephen. "The Use of Ethnographic Methods in Educational Evaluation." Human Organization 36(2) (1977):200-203.

Wolcott, Harry. The Man in the Principal's Office. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Wolcott, Harry. "Criteria for an Ethnographic Approach to Research in Schools." Human Organization 34(2) (1975):111-128.

Wolcott, Harry. Ethnographers sans Ethnography: The Evaluation Compromise. In Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Edited by D. Fetterman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

Wolf, Charles. Social Impact Assessment: A Methodological Overview. Social Impact Assessment Methods. Edited by K. Finsterbusch, L. Llewellyn, and C. Wolf. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW FORMAT FOR UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

INTERVIEW FORMAT FOR UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

1. Please comment on your experience with special programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival. Have you had experience in the public and private sector as well?

How were the programs evaluated?

2. What are the necessary ingredients for these programs to be successful?
3. Specifically, how does OSU evaluate/measure the success of these programs?
4. The Oregon Heritage Festival is in its third year at OSU. How do you specifically view this program in terms of complimenting the mission of the university?

What other types of functions does it fulfill, if any?

What are its successes and failures?

5. What does the university expect from programs such as the Oregon Heritage Festival?
6. How does lifelong learning fit in the mission of the university? Is it only seen as part of Extension or DCE?

What specific types of activities are being considered in OSU long-range programming?

7. The Oregon Heritage Festival, in part, was created to stimulate summer term enrollment.

Do you visualize the OHF ever accomplishing this objective?
How? How not?

What types of changes would have to occur in summer term to accomplish this objective? Would the OHF or any special programs be necessary?

What types of studies have been done by summer term/OSU regarding the needs of summer term users? Are they considered to be a different or a special population?

What changes could be made to improve the festival and its concept?

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEW FORMAT FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS

INTERVIEW FORMAT FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS

1. The Oregon Heritage Festival is now in its third year. Do you see any improvements being made in the university-community relations?

In what specific ways has the OHF been successful or unsuccessful in university-community relations?

2. You have had contact with the OHF for several years now. How do you see the function of the program? Discuss its merits/failures.

3. Any community located adjacent to a university will have certain needs and expectations of that university. Has OSU met these needs, and in what way?

What are the major disappointments, if any?

What might be done to improve relations, and better meet needs?

4. In your opinion, please describe current community-university relations.

What changes have occurred under newer administrations?

5. What is the best way to get "the community" to come to campus in the summer?

APPENDIX 3
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FESTIVAL ATTENDERS

QUESTIONNAIRE

Your opinion is very important in helping us evaluate the Oregon Heritage Festival. Please complete the following questions and please fill out only one questionnaire during the 1986 Festival.

If you have "no opinion," leave the question blank.

1. Indicate whether you have attended previous festivals.
(circle one number)
 1. HAVE NOT ATTENDED PREVIOUS FESTIVALS
 2. ATTENDED IN 1984
 3. ATTENDED IN 1985
 4. ATTENDED BOTH YEARS

2. How did you first hear about the Oregon Heritage Festival?
(circle one number)
 1. RADIO
 2. NEWSPAPER
 3. WORD OF MOUTH
 4. FESTIVAL BROCHURE
 5. OTHER (please specify) _____

3. How many times have you attended Festival events this year?
(circle one number)
 1. 5 TIMES OR LESS
 2. 6 to 10 TIMES
 3. 11 to 15 TIMES
 4. 16 to 20 TIMES
 5. MORE THAN 20 TIMES

4. Please rate the events you have attended (circle one number for each event attended)

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR
a. EVENING LECTURES	1	2	3	4	5
b. FILMS	1	2	3	4	5
c. TOURS	1	2	3	4	5
d. EXHIBITS/DISPLAYS	1	2	3	4	5
e. FAMILY 5K WALK	1	2	3	4	5
f. LIAR'S CONTEST	1	2	3	4	5
g. CONCERTS	1	2	3	4	5
h. OPENING CEREMONIES	1	2	3	4	5

5. How, or in what way (if any) could the Festival be improved?

6. Below are some statements that have been made about the Festival. Please indicate if you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each.
(circle one number for each statement)

	<u>STRONGLY</u> <u>AGREE</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> <u>NOR DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>STRONGLY</u> <u>DISAGREE</u>
a. THE OREGON HERITAGE FESTIVAL IS MORE ENTERTAINING THAN EDUCATIONAL.....1	2	3	4	5	
b. ACADEMIC CREDIT SHOULD BE OFFERED AS PART OF THE FESTIVAL.....1	2	3	4	5	
c. THE FESTIVAL NEEDS MORE ACTIVITIES.....1	2	3	4	5	
d. THE FESTIVAL IS TOO LONG.....1	2	3	4	5	
e. I WOULD RECOMMEND THE FESTIVAL TO FRIENDS.....1	2	3	4	5	
f. I WOULD BE WILLING TO PAY FOR FESTIVAL EVENTS.....1	2	3	4	5	
g. THE FESTIVAL HELPS IMPROVE THE IMAGE OF OSU.....1	2	3	4	5	

To help us in our demographic profile of people who attend Festival events, please answer the following questions about yourself.

7. What is your age? _____
8. Are you _____ male _____ female
9. What is your occupation? _____
10. Are you currently enrolled as a student at OSU? ___ yes ___ no
If yes, how many credits are you taking this summer? _____

11. Which of the following best describes you?

1. LOCAL CORVALLIS RESIDENT
2. RESIDENT IN ANOTHER PART OF OREGON
3. VISITING FROM ANOTHER COUNTRY (specify country) _____
4. U.S. TOURIST

11a. About how many weeks do you plan to stay? _____ weeks

11b. Briefly, what are your reasons for visiting?

12. Is there anything else you would like to say about the Festival?

APPENDIX 4
PROFILE OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
(TABLES 13 - 29)

Table 13.
Previous Festival Attendance.

<u>Attendance Category</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Have not attended before	93	71.0
Attended in 1984	10	7.6
Attended in 1985	14	10.7
Attended both years	<u>14</u>	<u>10.7</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 14.
Best Form of Advertising.

<u>Type</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Radio	14	10.7
Newspaper	55	42.0
Word of mouth	30	22.9
Brochure	17	13.0
Other	<u>15</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 15.
Frequency of Attendance.

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
5 or less	101	77.1
6 - 10	17	13.0
11 - 15	10	7.6
More than 15	<u>3</u>	<u>2.3</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 16.
Rating of Evening Lecture Series.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	47	35.9
Good	25	19.1
Average	1	0.8
Poor	0	0.0
Very poor	1	0.8
Did not attend	<u>57</u>	<u>43.5</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 17.
Rating of Films.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	26	19.8
Good	21	16.0
Average	6	4.6
Poor	0	0.0
Very poor	1	0.8
Did not attend	<u>77</u>	<u>58.8</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 18.
Rating of Tours.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	49	37.4
Good	8	6.1
Average	3	2.3
Poor	0	0.0
Very poor	0	0.0
Did not attend	<u>71</u>	<u>54.2</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 19.
Rating of Exhibits.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	18	13.7
Good	10	7.6
Average	0	0.0
Poor	0	0.0
Very poor	0	0.0
Did not attend	<u>103</u>	<u>78.6</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 20.
Rating of 5K Walk.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	16	12.2
Good	1	0.8
Average	0	0.0
Poor	0	0.0
Very Poor	0	0.0
Did not attend	<u>114</u>	<u>87.0</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 21.
Rating of Liar's Contest.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	1	0.8
Good	4	3.1
Average	2	1.5
Poor	0	0.0
Very poor	0	0.0
Did not attend	<u>124</u>	<u>94.7</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 22.
Rating of Concerts.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Excellent	26	19.8
Good	10	7.6
Average	2	1.5
Poor	0	0.0
Very poor	0	0.0
Did not attend	<u>93</u>	<u>71.0</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 23.

Entertainment vs. Educational Value of Festival.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	7	5.3
Agree	21	16.0
Neither agree nor disagree	32	24.4
Disagree	45	34.4
Strongly disagree	8	6.1
No response	<u>18</u>	<u>13.7</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 24.
Academic Credit Offering.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	5	3.8
Agree	21	16.0
Neither agree nor disagree	42	32.1
Disagree	37	28.2
Strongly disagree	8	6.1
No response	<u>18</u>	<u>13.7</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 25.
Offering More Activities.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	7	5.3
Agree	44	33.6
Neither agree nor disagree	43	32.8
Disagree	17	13.0
Strongly disagree	1	0.8
No response	<u>19</u>	<u>14.5</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 26.
Festival Length.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	10	7.6
Agree	27	20.6
Neither agree nor disagree	44	33.6
Disagree	25	19.1
Strongly disagree	8	6.1
No response	<u>17</u>	<u>13.0</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 27.
 Recommending Festival to Others.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	48	36.6
Agree	55	42.0
Neither agree nor disagree	12	9.2
Disagree	3	2.3
Strongly disagree	1	0.8
No response	<u>12</u>	<u>9.2</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 28.

Willingness to Pay for Events.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	22	16.8
Agree	58	44.3
Neither agree nor disagree	24	18.3
Disagree	10	7.6
Strongly disagree	3	2.3
No response	<u>14</u>	<u>10.7</u>
Total	131	100.0

Table 29.

Improving the Image of Oregon State University.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Relative Frequency (Percent)</u>
Strongly agree	59	45.0
Agree	46	35.1
Neither agree nor disagree	14	10.7
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	1	0.8
No response	<u>11</u>	<u>8.4</u>
Total	131	100.0