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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

EDUCATION AND THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

The earliest schools in the United States of America were founded in a deeply religious atmosphere where moral values were inseparable from religious ones.1 Founded in 1830, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints wasted no time in establishing schools that encouraged both secular and religious education. This philosophy was clearly enunciated by the founder, Joseph Smith, when explaining the purpose of the University of Nauvoo:

The temple shall be a house of prayer, a house of learning, house of order, and a house of God; where all the sciences, languages, etc., which are taught in our country, in the schools of the highest order, shall be taught . . . . This building [temple] is designed for the double purpose, of a house of worship and an institution of learning.2

The development of the educational programs of the Church from 1830 to 1966 has been reviewed in a number of studies. Wherever the Latter-day Saints congregated in numbers they tried to organize their own schools where secular and religious instruction were combined. This was the practice in Utah until the influx of non-Mormons began to interfere with the religious aspects of their schools. A member of the Council of Twelve, Wilford Woodruff, who became the fourth president of the Church in 1888, expressed the concern of the Church leaders in a letter to local Church leaders as follows:

Dear Brethren: We feel that the time has fully come when the proper education of our children should be taken in hand by us as a people. Religious training is practically excluded from the district schools. The perusal of books that we regard as divine records are forbidden. Our children if left to the training they receive in these schools, will grow up entirely ignorant of the principles of salvation, for which the Latter-day Saints have made so many sacrifices. To permit this condition

---


4 Anderson, op. cit., p. 22.
of things to exist among us would be criminal. The desire is universally expressed by all thinking people in the church that we should have schools wherein the Bible, the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants can be used as textbooks, and where the principles of our religion may form a part of the teaching of the schools.  

As a result of this concern the Church began in 1875 to establish a series of Academies for religious and secular education at the secondary level. These Academies eventually numbered 35 when the Church leaders decided in 1926 to take a new approach while retaining the original philosophy. After considerable deliberation, all the Academies were closed except Brigham Young, Ricks and Colonia Juarez in Mexico. At that time a new program was instituted to provide religious education at facilities adjacent to secondary schools and colleges. 

INSTITUTES OF RELIGION

In 1926 the first institute of religion facility was constructed at Moscow, Idaho. It was there that

---


6Ibid., p. 42.

7Cameron, op. cit., pp. 31-41.

8Jacobsen, op. cit., p. 42.

Jay G. Eldridge, Professor of German Language Literature and Dean of the Faculty at the University of Idaho, suggested the name "Institute of Religion." A new full-time Institute of Religion facility was constructed each year for the next four years. The first Institute of Religion program in California was organized at the University of California, Los Angeles in 1932. Since that time the program has been expanded to many junior colleges and universities. In 1975 there were 75 Institute Directors administering full and part-time programs in California.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The leaders of the Church have continued to emphasize the importance of participation in religious classes while attending secondary schools and colleges or universities. In 1969, the President of the Church, David O. McKay, gave the following counsel to parents:

It should be the goal of parents to have their young people in seminary and institute work. It

---

10 Ibid., p. 49.  
11 Ibid., p. 547.  
12 Institute of Religion Program Descriptions, Church Education System, Salt Lake City, 1974.
should be part of their family planning, just as they plan for high school and college. 13

Before he became President of the Church in 1974, Spencer W. Kimball (1974-) admonished the young people to give seminary classes priority over high school classes and institute classes priority over college classes. 14

Despite the encouragement of Church leaders many young people have not availed themselves of opportunities to attend these classes. Few full-time institute programs have enrollments exceeding 70 percent of the LDS students enrolled on adjacent campuses. 15 The annual reports of Institute enrollment for 1973-74 show the four California Divisions having an average enrollment of 66 percent, ranging from 58 to 71 percent. 16 These areas included 60.5 percent of all the LDS students found anywhere in the world where Institutes of Religion are located. 17


16Ibid. 17Ibid.
Many people are willing to plod along for 16 to 20 years from grade one to PhD., to learn medicine or engineering or psychology, mathematics or biology—to study, research, attend classes, pay tuitions, accept help from teachers and professors—and yet to learn about God the maker of it all, the author of it all, in a few intermittent prayers and some very limited hours of research, they feel they can find the truths about God.\textsuperscript{18}

Administrators and staff from the central office of the Church Education System have agreed that the recruitment of students would be more successful if more effective methods of training Institute personnel in public relations were developed.\textsuperscript{19} They have felt that a study of the present skills and background training in public relations of the directors would be helpful in developing such training programs.\textsuperscript{20} They have also recommended that the study should identify which public relations practices had been most helpful to Institute Directors.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{18}Spencer W. Kimball, "The Cause is Just and Worthy," The Ensign, May, 1974, p. 119.

\textsuperscript{19}Based on personal interviews with Ward Magleby (Publicity) June 24, 1974; Dan J. Workman (Assistant Administrator) July 5, 1974, and Neil K. Flinders (Research) July 19, 1974, all from the Department of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid. \textsuperscript{21}Ibid.
PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to determine the public relations practices and background training of directors of L.D.S. Institutes of Religion in California during 1974-75 and to compare the public relations practices of those who had formal training in public relations principles with those who did not.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What kinds of public relations practices and principles were considered most important by recognized authorities in the field of education?

2. How much formal training in public relations principles and skills had been experienced by the institute directors involved in this study?

3. To what extent did the following groups of institute directors use the public relations practices identified in the questionnaire? (a) Directors with and without formal training in public relations principles and skills. (b) Directors of institute programs adjacent to two-year colleges and directors adjacent to four-year colleges or universities. (c) Directors of the four divisions of Institutes of Religion in the State of California.
4. How did the institute public relations programs vary with regard to emphasis on selected publics; i.e., local priesthood leaders, parents, students and campus leaders: (a) Within California? (b) Between institute divisions in California? (c) Between programs at two-year colleges and universities?

5. How many of the public relations practices did the institute directors consider (a) useful and (2) impractical in terms of time and effort?

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Church

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as "Mormons," with headquarters in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Ward

Basic ecclesiastical unit of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, usually consisting of 300 to 800 members.

Bishop

Ecclesiastical leader of a ward.

Stake

Ecclesiastical unit consisting of several geographically contiguous wards.
Stake President

Ecclesiastical leader of a stake, and the ecclesiastical superior of a Bishop.

Campus Leaders

(a) Appointed administrators, faculty and staff on adjacent campuses; (b) Elected student officers on adjacent college or university campus.

Campus Administration

Appointed college or university officials.

Church Education System

The official title of the weekday religious and secular school system of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, including elementary schools, junior high schools, high schools, colleges and universities throughout the world.

Institute of Religion

A facility of the Church Education System in which a program of religious instruction is carried out for college or university students at or near a particular college or university. Usually referred to as the "Institute."
Seminary

A weekday religious instruction program for junior and high school students of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

L.D.S. Students

Members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints attending some educational institution.

Director

Usually refers to the administrator of a weekday religious program for L.D.S. college students at a particular college or university or post-high school institution of academic or vocational training. He may also have responsibility for administering several part-time programs.

Publics

Those segments of the community with which the Institute of Religion has an interface.

Public Relations or School-Community Relations in this Study

School-community relations are all of the interactions, contacts and communications on the part of the mutually or reciprocally interested persons, groups, or organizations which seek to result in an effective and harmonious working
relationship between the schools and the community which the schools serve.22

**Division**

A geographic unit of the Church Education System involved in religious instruction, supervised by a division coordinator, usually comprising several institutes of religion and seminaries.

**Division Coordinator**

The administrator of a major geographical unit of the religious education program usually encompassing the same area as several ecclesiastical units.

**RESEARCH PROCEDURES**

A review of the literature related to the field of study was undertaken to identify public relations practices considered most important by authorities in the field of public and school-community relations. The principles and practices identified in the review of related literature were used to develop a list of questions for a questionnaire for administering to institute directors. In order that ambiguity might be reduced to a minimum and to ensure an approximate testing time of 20 minutes for completion the questionnaire was pilot tested

---

by five institute directors. The questionnaire was then submitted for final adjustment and approval to the Associate Commissioner of Education for the Church Education System. It was approved as submitted and authorized for use in the study.

The questionnaire was submitted to all Directors of Institutes of Religion during their respective division faculty meetings held in January and February, 1975. To encourage frankness and accuracy all questionnaires were returned anonymously. Division coordinators were assured that no divisions would be identified in the comparisons made in the study. The divisions were only referred to in the study as divisions A, B, C, and D. The data obtained through the questionnaires were extracted from the questionnaire and tabulated by computer. The data were analyzed, discussed and organized into tables.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The evolution of community-school relations as a subject of importance to educational administrators was reviewed. Those definitions, principles, objectives and practices considered most important by writers and researchers were identified for use in clarifying the problem and developing a valid questionnaire. Studies concerned with community-school relations in the week-day religious education programs of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints were also examined.

THE EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS AS A PROFESSIONAL SKILL IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

The evolution of public relations as a profession in education was traced without much difficulty. There were relatively few books that focussed entirely on public relations in education. Many publications on administration considered the importance of public relations. Olsen traced the development of educators' attitudes from 1897 to post World War II as a transition from "keep out" through "come and see" until the present "let's plan

13
together"¹ According to Dresser, "Community-school relations were not seriously considered until the depression years of the 1930's when public clamor grew for a reduction in school expenditures."²

In 1951, Fine suggested that public relations as a profession in education was no longer a "mystery" but had come of age.³ He shared the perspective of Bernays who traced the evolution of public relations during the first half of the century as follows:

Since 1900, there have been four periods of evolution in public relations as a profession in the United States. The first--1900-1914--was a battle between muckraking on the one hand and white-washing publicity efforts on the other. The second--1914-1918--was marked by an effort by our government to sell the American people our war aims and war ideals in World War I. The third--1919-1929--saw public relations activities in the industrial field developing, in part, from principles and practices successfully tested in the Great War. Since 1929, American public relations activities have been devoted mainly to efforts in commerce and industry, to bring about adjustment between private interest and public responsibility. These last two periods--1919 to date--have brought forth public relations literature and periodicals, a strengthening of ethical standards, a broadening of scientific practice, a spread of academic study and research, and a general recognition of the importance of the new profession by the great social forces of our country.⁴

²William L. Dresser, "School-Community Relations" (lecture handouts for a course in school-community relations at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, July, 1974).
⁴Fine, p. 12.
DEFINITIONS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Garrett, former President of General Motors, defined public relations as:

Public relations . . . is merely human decency which flows from a heart good, genial and sturdy enough to be reflected in deeds that are admirable and praiseworthy. Public relation is the name we apply to the policies and acts of an organization. 

Dubia, Public Information Officer of the ABC Unified School District, favored the following definition from Public Relations News, a magazine for public relations professionals:

Public relations is the management function which evaluates public attitudes, identifies policies and procedures of an individual or organization with the public interest in mind and executes a program of public action to earn public understanding and acceptance.

Dresser defined public relations in education as:

. . . a process of communication between the school and community for the purpose of increasing citizen understanding of education needs and practices and encouraging intelligent citizens interest and cooperation in the work of improving the school.

Hyatt defined school-community relations comprehensively as:

. . . All of the interactions contacts and communications on the part of mutually or reciprocally interested persons, groups, or organizations which

---


6 Dubia, p. 5.

7 Dresser, p. 1.
seek to result in an effective and harmonious working relationship between the schools and the community which the schools serve.8

OBJECTIVES OF SCHOOL–COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAMS

The objectives of public relations programs were expressed as ultimate goals and intermediate objectives. The ultimate objective according to Dresser was to improve the quality of education.9 Reeder classified it with all other phases of school administration. "Like all other phases of school administration it is designed to advance the welfare of the persons for whom the schools exist."10

Intermediate objectives were expressed by many writers. Kunz suggested the objectives of "fostering understanding" and "learning needs and desires."11 Fine refers to a study in which 275 colleges indicated that the most important objective was to build goodwill.12

The American Association of School Administrators has stressed the development of opinions while encouraging

8 Norman F. Hyatt, "School Community Relations Seminar," (lecture materials, Brigham Young University seminar in Sacramento, California, Spring, 1974).
9 Dresser, p. 3.
12 Fine, p. 12.
the selection of a particular few.\textsuperscript{13} Reck emphasized converting publics into agents "speaking and acting for the institution."\textsuperscript{14} Stewart Horral said the objective should be to seek harmony between the group and the public.\textsuperscript{15} College presidents and public relations directors listed in order of importance the following objectives:

1. Create goodwill.
2. Interpret college to community.
3. Add to reputation of college.
4. Bring in higher type of student.
5. Educate general public.
6. Point out advantages of own college.
7. Publicize faculty research.
8. Bring in more students.
9. Be of service to students.
10. Prevent misinterpretation or misunderstanding.
11. Raise money for endowments.
12. Help students get employment.
13. Act as co-ordinating department.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS PROGRAMS}

Abraham Lincoln was credited with saying, "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail, without it nothing can succeed."\textsuperscript{17}

---


\textsuperscript{14}Fine, p. 425, citing W. Emerson Reck.

\textsuperscript{15}Fine, p. 45, and AASA, p. 12, both citing Stewart Horral.

\textsuperscript{16}Fine, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{17}Reeder, p. 533, citing Abraham Lincoln.
The importance of effective public relations programs has become evident in many ways. For example, the criticism that has come from misunderstanding, and the inability of school districts to raise funds through bond issues because the public are unsympathetic. The importance of being aware and in position to influence what takes place was summarized by John Stuart Mill as follows:

Great economic and social forces flow like tides over half-conscious people. The wise are those who foresee the coming event and seek to shape their institutions and mold the thinking of the people in accordance with the most constructive change. The unwise are those who add nothing constructive to the process, either because of ignorance on the one hand or ignorant opposition on the other.

James and Stout put it quite plainly, "the positive progress of schools is reduced when patrons do not have adequate information about their schools." The public responds to what they know or think they know. Feirer has compared schools to industrial companies who spend millions of dollars on public relations programs because, . . . each corporation in fact produces two images: the inner image representing the goods and services.

---


19Dresser, p. 4, citing Mill.

it produces and the outer image, or what the public thinks of the company. These two images are not always the same. . . .21

If the public is to understand the needs of education as they really are, it is unlikely it will happen without effort by someone. It has become the "producer's" responsibility to ensure accurate perception of needs and objectives by the "consumer." Curry reported that, "the majority of parents were primarily interested in information that would enable them to help their children."22

This was in harmony with the findings of Gallup. "According to recent public opinion polls, administrators who try to inform citizens about their schools will have a receptive audience."23

ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS

The Administrator's Responsibility to Initiate Positive Public Relations

There was little doubt that the chief administrator sets the stage for the tenor and effectiveness of the


public relations programs. Effective participation of public or citizens, according to Campbell and Ramseyer, required an administrator who both initiated and maintained positive relations.24 According to Ovard, the administrator was in the center of things and "his role is most important in the creation of good or poor public relations."25 The principal administrator was ideally suited to direct the process as outlined by Cutlip and Center. They suggested four steps: "research listening, planning-decision making, communication, and evaluation."26 According to Chester and others, "schools are a reflection of community priorities, problems, and concerns."27 Public relations then was the process of achieving harmony of understanding between the institution and the community.28 Fundamental to this was the need for administrators to know their publics.29 Reck stressed this as follows:

To get anything like a true measure of the results accruing from publicity, an institution should keep

---

28Cutlip and Center, p. 15. 29AASA, p. 12.
in close touch with its thirty or more publics at all times.\textsuperscript{30}

Notwithstanding this, Carol found that although a new role for the administrator as a community leader was emerging, college preparation was of low priority, too broad and minimal.\textsuperscript{31}

Many Publics

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) brought attention to the following important concept:

There is not one public. There is virtually an infinite number of publics, each one to be identified with the situation or problem which is common to the individuals whose interests and welfare are commingled therein.\textsuperscript{32}

Reck noted 30 or more publics for the public schools, grouping them into seven major classifications.\textsuperscript{33} Ovard drew attention to the fact that "the administrator should remember that no community, nor the groups within it, stand willing to carry out a public school program. The school must work with these groups to help them arrive


\textsuperscript{32}AASA, p. 15. \textsuperscript{33}Reck, p. 7.
at a common goal." Ungaro has said that to create a better understanding of our schools, educators need to know and not guess at the opinions held by the "publics" so that intelligent programs of interpretation and effective working relationships can be planned.35

The AASA was quite emphatic that public relations programs that are not sensitive to public understanding and attitude are destined to fail.36

Parents a Major Public

Numerous articles and studies emphasized the importance of parents as a major public. Many parents have been interested in information from the schools that would help them help their children.37 According to Smith, adolescents seek direction from parents, while Boger saw parents as the primary change-agents for children.38,39

Studies of enrollment in LDS week-day religious instruction

34 Ovard, p. 49.
36 AASA, p. 27. 37 Curry, p. 27.
programs have established that parents were the major influence in students' decisions to enroll. 40 Ironically, as Brodinski observed, "it is an open secret that some boards and some educators feel most uncomfortable when the subject of parental involvement is broached." 41 However, Claasen even recommended parents get involved in counselling discussions on the junior college level. 42 A. John Bartky, former Dean of the School of Education at Stanford University, has observed, "an administrator may be brilliant and capable but if he fails to maintain a good relationship with parents and the entire community, his abilities will be wasted." 43 Ligon drew attention to the considerable weight of evidence in support of "... the hypothesis that when parents are thoroughly convinced that


something is good they will pay any price, make any
sacrifice to secure it for them."^{44}

Assessment

The first step in developing programs was fact
finding. No one program has universal application. It
was generally agreed that local conditions vary so much
that programs must be tailored.^{45} The administrator also
needed to know what changes were occurring. Warren
identified seven major changes that were occurring involv-
ing such fundamentals as values. Any analysis ought to be
concerned with certain background factors like, community
groups, personalities, participation opportunities for the
community, district plans for citizen involvement, commun-
ications in the district, and possible resources available.^{46}

The purpose of surveys, according to Snyder, should
not be for "mere pulse-taking" but "to provide information
for educational decisions."^{47} Sumption and Engstrom listed
at least six factors causing communities to differ from

^{44} Ernest Mayfield Ligon, A Greater Generation

^{45} Fine, p. 358.

^{46} National Center for Educational Communication,
"School-Community Relations and Educational Change,"

^{47} Fred A. Snyder and others, "Community Attitudes
toward the Community College," (Harrisburg Community
each other. They were "... (1) tradition and nationality background, (2) sets of values which the community holds, (3) economic bases, (4) geographic features, (5) social structure, and (6) political structure." 48

Administrator as Change-Agent

The administrator was not only expected to be aware of change as mentioned above, but he had the responsibility to know how to effect changes that were in the public interest. 50 The skills of a change-agent were considered an essential part of his repertoire. According to publications of the AASA, "much of the public relations effort is concerned with the development of opinions encouraging the selection of a particular view." 51 Reck said the major objectives of any public relations program is to "convert . . . publics into agents who will speak out for the institution." 52

---


49 Fine, p. 4.


The Institute Director as Change-agent

Consistent with the urgings of the President of the Church, the public relations program of an institute director emphasized enrolling Latter-day Saint college students. This included trying to change the attitudes of those students who put their academic goals ahead of their spiritual goals. According to Guth, this kind of effort has lead to resistance. Chester has observed that schools have been a reflection of community priorities, problems and concerns.

Power Structures

Tait asserted that "change agents need to be aware that power structures may vary by issue areas and social systems." Power structure has been defined as follows:

A power structure was conceptualized as that pattern of relationships among individuals which enables the individuals possessing social power to act in concert to affect the decision-making of the social system on a given issue area.

The term "social power" implies ability to influence or control others. Much has been written on the importance

---


55 Chester and others, p. 64.

56 Tait, p. 157.  
57 Ibid., p. 153.
of power structures. Power structures were often considered in negative terms because of the influence that had been wielded without social responsibility.58

There may exist other power structures to which the director should be alert. In order to cope with such situations, Dresser recommended the following for administrators:

1. Maintain a complete independence and freedom of action.
2. He will judge each issue on its merits and act accordingly.
3. He will never align himself with any group that is self-serving at the expense of the people he serves.
4. He will conduct himself in such a manner as to develop a reputation for fairness, consistency, and impartiality in his relations with all groups in the community.
5. He will recognize that losing his job is not as bad as losing his integrity.59

Two of the most important power structures were parents and peer groups.60 Boger found that parents and family are primary change-agents affecting the attitudes and success of children in schools.61 Studies of enrollment in the LDS Church week-day religious education classes by Christensen helped to identify the following power structures as factors which affect the probability of

58 Dresser, "The School and the Community Power Structure" (lecture handout material for course in School Community Relations, Brigham Young University, Summer, 1974), p. 1.

59 Dresser, p. 3

60 Dresser, p. 10.

61 Boger and others, p. 31.
students enrolling: ". . . association with peers, influence of the family . . . attitude towards church leaders . . ."62 These may have included significant power structures.

Change-agent Fundamentals

Innovation is an important element of recruitment especially as it involves those who are reluctant to enroll. In a review of strategies designed to modify behavior it was found that "innovators use a greater number of sources of information than laggards."63 In a case study illustrating types of success in gaining financial support through effective community-school relations it was suggested that the administrator should begin his analysis of his situation by asking "what kinds of things work?"64 It was further emphasized that analysis should take into account the following factors: " . . . community groups, personalities, participation opportunities for the community, patterns of communication and previous resources."65

---


64 National Center for Educational Communication, p. 2.

65 Ibid., p. 12.
In *The Management of Change*, Havelock listed the essential steps in producing and maintaining change as follows:

1. Building a relationship.
2. Diagnosing the problem.
3. Retrieving relevant knowledge.
4. Selecting the innovation.
5. Developing supportive attitudes and behaviors.
7. Stabilizing the innovation.66

**Other Emphases**

There are many other principles to which authors and respected authorities gave great emphasis. Fine felt that the ability to discriminate between publicity and public relations is crucial. He wrote,

> The schools must learn to differentiate between publicity and public relations—publicity, of course, is merely one of the tools, and not the most important one, at that, of the broad area of public relations.67

Hyatt emphasized awareness when he suggested the following basic criteria for evaluating a school-community relations program.

1. Declaration of philosophy and objectives.
2. General, yet descriptive statements regarding the environment in which schools are found.
3. Descriptive statements regarding structure and organization of the school system.
4. Descriptive statements of institutions having impact on cultural level of community (public relations).

---


*67* Fine, p. 358.
Sumption and Engstrom have submitted four basic principles as essentials. They were as follows:

First, a recognition of the school as a public enterprise . . . second, that truth in the pragmatic sense, is the only valid and legitimate guide to action . . . third, there must be a structured, systematic, and active participation of the people of the community in the educational planning, policy making, problem solving, and evaluation of the school, . . . fourth, there must be a clear and effective two-way system of communication between the school and its community.  

In the Operational Guidelines booklet for the Seminaries and Institutes of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, it was suggested that:

An effective Public Relations program is generated best from direct and effective service, going the extra mile, knowing the facts, and avoiding rumor and impetuousness in all their forms will build confidence in departmental personnel and programs.

The importance of maintaining the highest standards was emphasized frequently. Horral was quoted by Fine as saying, "The best insurance against misunderstanding and criticism is for all engaged in higher education constantly to strengthen their public relations techniques." These

---


69 Sumption and Engstrom, pp. x-xi.


71 Fine, p. 358.
high standards included creativity. According to Gillman, President of the Institute of Public Relations, "Public relations practice demands a flair and an inventive mind but it can only succeed if the groundwork is properly done, and the highest standards are maintained."72

The skilled administrator is faced with the personal challenge to maintain integrity in his approaches. Savage warned about those who use "the techniques of interpersonal and group relations for unworthy purposes."73 Halpin called this fraudulency:

(M)any [sic] school administrators have learned the vocabulary of democracy and have practiced the techniques of human relations. But the man who uses these words and techniques and has no respect for the heart of others, is a fraud.74

Decisiveness

Savage drew attention to the uncertainty about appropriate administrative "models" which affect the public relations practices of educators. He described two trends that were competing. The one was the "preoccupation of both professional educators and training institutions with educational means rather than ends," and the other "to accept working role models and


74 Savage, p. 22.
leader images from other fields such as government, industry and business." Lack of decisiveness from uncertainty was often camouflaged by the announcement, "Studying the problem." Weiler and Guertin recommended quick decisions even on controversial matters.

In the long run, a quick decision to take action of some kind, despite the absence of sufficient information to make such a decision a comfortable one may often be the course that risks the least controversy.

IMPORTANT PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTICES

Organizing

Dubia emphasized establishing a philosophical position or goal and the use of needs assessment to develop programs to meet the needs. She provided an example of a guiding policy made up of the following four categories:

"(a) Community Relations-goals, (b) Community Relations-programs, (c) Freedom of Information and (d) Community Relations-Responsibilities." Barkelew recommended keeping aware of what other school districts were doing and provided a list of some

75 Ibid.


77 Ibid. 78 Dubia, p. 6.
73 practices being used by other districts.  

(See Appendix A) Hyatt prepared an analysis for School-Community activities. It involved:

I. Evaluate Criteria  
II. Statistical Data  
III. Curriculum and Program  
IV. Physical Facilities  
V. Board of Education  
VI. Community Relations  
VII. Management Systems  
VIII. Uses to be Made of Analysis

He also listed some 25 suggestions on promoting good relations, preventing and solving typical problems. 

The importance of proper organization was stressed by many writers, such as, Barkelew, Dresser, and Fine. Dubia and Fine emphasize goal-setting. Evaluation was considered vital. Manor provided a list of contacts that can be modified and tailored to prepare a list for rating school public relations programs. (See Appendix B) Snyder and others have suggested that decisions should be based on regular surveys designed to gather such information rather than mere "pulse-taking."

---

80 Hyatt, p. 1.  
81 Ibid.  
82 Dubia, pp. 4-6.  
84 Snyder, p. 13.
Olsen recommended 10 points for effective organization.85 (See Appendix C) Kunz drew attention to the importance of including non-professional staff such as bus drivers and custodians in organization of the program.86

Communication

Dubia has pointed out that "communication is the soul of a positive public relations program."87 She added:

. . . true communication is not the sending out of a message or feeling along. It requires receiving as well as sending, and it also requires an effective channel through which the message must be transmitted, a channel devoid of what communication scholars call "channel noise" or "semantic noise" . . . .88

Dresser listed seven characteristics starting with the principle of two-way communication which he referred to as the "impulse-response relationship,"89 with the school responding to the community. The other six characteristics he has identified were comprehensiveness, flexibility, accuracy, structure, organization, and long-range planning.90 (See Appendix B)

85 Olsen, p. 475-6. 86 Kunz, pp. 15-16.
87 Dubia, p. 5. 88 Ibid.
90 Ibid.
Burger reported that many studies have shown that skilled public relations men focus very precisely on "those aspects of the product which require independent endorsement of product claims." This being in preference to general publicity. 91

Media

The well-planned public relations program utilizes every form of available media. Fine recommended direct mail to achieve the "personal touch." According to McCloskey, "newspapers are valued sources of information which have substantial influence on public opinion." 92 He emphasized the importance of good school-newspaper relations based on mutual cooperation. 93 Fine reminded administrations to be "ready to make reporters feel at home." 94

Kenneth Brown, an eminent public relations supervisor and consultant, recognized the importance of the newspapers but included radio and television as significant


media. Fine felt that it was essential for colleges and universities to "... take the lead in maintaining sound constructive radio and television programs." Other studies showed that innovators emphasized television.

There was some question about what to publicize. Fine quoted Grimwell's definition of news, "... immediacy, proximity, consequence, prominence, unusualness, human interest, drama."

**Effective Teachers**

However, all the powerful public relations techniques available cannot compensate for poor teaching. Feirer reminded those in vocational education that, "It is a truesome in all areas of education that good teachers not only turn out good pupils, they attract them."

**SUMMARY**

It appeared that there was a good deal of concurrence and little disagreement in the field of school-community relations about the following points.

---


66 Fine, p. 530. 97 Wolf, p. 95.

98 Fine, p. 132. 99 Feirer, p. 11.
One, the school administrator was responsible. He was responsible for gathering and disseminating information. He was responsible for initiating and maintaining positive relationships with all segments of the public. Those relationships included internal relations of students, professional and non-professional staff, as well as community members. Secondly, the community that was well-informed by a candid program of the highest quality was likely to be cooperative and supportive. Great benefits could be accrued from involving the public in continuous and ongoing school programs having immediate and long-range objectives. Fourthly, studies of the seminary and institute programs of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints indicated that enrollment increased when such publics as parents, local Church leaders, and students were favorably impressed. Finally, the observation by Durrance in 1967 was applicable.

... it is the task of the teacher education institution to help both pre-service and in-service teachers develop the techniques needed for planning, developing and evaluating a school-community program where emphasis is given to basic needs.100

Chapter 3

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This study was designed to identify how much formal training in public relations principles had been experienced by institute directors in California and what practices were being used by them. The directors were also asked to evaluate the usefulness of specified public relations practices which had been identified as valid by a panel of five educators recognized as authorities in the field of community school relations. These practices were listed on a questionnaire (see Appendix E) which was pilot tested on institute personnel from three institutes to help identify ambiguities, improve clarity, and ensure a maximum administration time of not more than 30 minutes.

DATA COLLECTION

Seventy-five directors in the four divisions of institutes in California completed the questionnaire anonymously. They represented the entire population of directors in the study area. The questionnaire was administered in four locations during division faculty meetings in January and February, 1975. The data were
extracted from the questionnaire and keypunched onto computer cards. The results were then tabulated by computer, analyzed, and presented in tables.

DATA

The institute directors responded to 102 questions regarding their public relations programs and background training in public relations principles. (See Appendix E) Directors evaluated the practices listed in the questionnaire with regard to usefulness and practicality, whether they had utilized them or not. Fifty-four questions were to provide a basis to compare the public relations programs of the directors in the following categories: (1) location by division in which they served, (2) type of college they served, and (3) background training in public relations principles.

Directors in Each Division and Types of Assignment

As shown in Table 1, the composition of directors in the divisions varied. Forty-four directors were serving two-year colleges and 31 directors were serving universities. The ratio of directors serving two-year colleges to those serving universities was 2 to 12 in division A, 8 to 7 in division B, 15 to 8 in division C, and 19 to 6 in division D.
Table 1
Categorization of Institute Directors with Regard to Location and Type of Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Location by Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Training in Public Relations Principles

Directors were placed in three categories according to their background training in public relations. The categories were (1) no training at all, (2) informal training, either through self-initiated study or incidental training as a by-product of other training or experience, and (3) some formal training, whether it took place in workshops, as part of a course, or as a complete course.

As reflected in Table 2, 19 directors (13 percent) indicated that they had experienced no training; 29 (39 percent) felt that they had experienced some kind of informal training; 36 (48 percent) reported they had received formal training.
Table 2

Background Public Relations Training of Institute Directors in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Utilization of Public Relations Practices by Institute Directors with and without Formal Training in Public Relations

Institute directors with and without formal training were compared with regard to their utilization of the 54 public relations practices. The difference between these two groups was consistent whether the means, the medians or the ranges were compared. In each case, those with formal training utilized more of the practices listed. As shown in Table 3, those with formal training utilized an average of 30.4 practices, a median of 30.0 practices and a range of usage from 14 to 48 practices. Those without formal training were consistently lower, utilizing
Table 3
The Number of Public Relations Practices Utilized by Institute Directors with and without Formal Training in Public Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Practices Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an average of 26.9 practices, a median of 28.0 practices, and ranging from 14 to 39 practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Relations Practices</th>
<th>Utilized by Directors</th>
<th>Serving Two-year Colleges and Universities in California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The directors were divided into two groups, 44 serving two-year colleges and 31 serving universities. As shown in Table 4, those serving two-year colleges utilized slightly more public relations practices when means and medians were compared. The means for the two-year colleges and universities were 29.2 and 28.6 respectively, and the medians were 32 and 27 respectively. The number of practices utilized by two-year college directors ranged from 14.0 to 42 practices, while university institute directors ranged from a low of 14.0 to a high of 48 practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Relations Practices</th>
<th>Utilized by Directors</th>
<th>From Four Divisions of Institutes in California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the four divisions of institutes A, B, C, and D, there were respectively 12, 15, 23, and 25 institute directors. As reported in Table 5, these divisions did not vary much in their public relations practices. When means were considered, division B was the highest, with 29.9 practices and A was the lowest, with 27.4 practices. Divisions C and D had means of 28.6 and 28.0 respectively.
Table 4

The Number of Public Relations Practices Utilized by Institute Directors from Institutes Adjacent to Two-year Colleges and Universities in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number of Practices Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year colleges</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Number of Public Relations Practices Utilized by Directors from Four Divisions of Institutes in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Number of Practices Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The median number of practices utilized by the divisions varied more than the means. Division C median was the highest with 31 practices; division D was the lowest with 27 practices; and divisions A and B had medians of 29 and 28 respectively. Divisions A and C had medians higher than their means, while B and D medians were slightly lower than their means.

The range of practices utilized were similar at the lower ends but varied considerably at the upper ends. Division D, with the lowest median (27), had the widest range of utilization, varying from 14 to 48 practices. Division A, with the lowest mean (27.4), also had the narrowest range, from 14 to 35 practices utilized. Divisions B and C had ranges of 15 to 45 and 14 to 41 respectively.

Sources of Feedback
Information Sought by Institute Directors

Directors indicated how often they sought feedback about their programs from the following sources: (1) school boards of education, (2) parents through their children, (3) through mailed questionnaires to various publics, (4) parents through interviews, and (5) miscellaneous other sources. The frequencies of these solicitations of feedback were grouped in three categories: once-a-month, once-a-term and once-a-year.
In all cases, stake boards of education were approached more often and by more directors than any other source. Each month, 17 directors sought feedback from stake boards; one director sought feedback from parents through their children; and two directors used student interviews.

Each term, 21 directors sought feedback about their programs from stake boards of education, six sought feedback from parents through their children, five mailed questionnaires to various publics, and two interviewed parents.

Each year nine directors contacted stake boards of education, nine contacted parents through their children, four mailed questionnaires, eight held interviews with parents and one contacted bishops for feedback.

Many directors did not solicit feedback from the sources listed above, as reported in Table 6. A total of 47 directors solicited the stake boards periodically, but 28 directors did not. Sixteen directors solicited parents through their children, but 59 did not. Nine directors utilized mailed questionnaires, while 66 did not. Three directors indicated they had used other approaches periodically, while 71 indicated they had not done anything else to solicit feedback.
Table 6
Sources of Feedback Information about Institute Programs Sought by Institute Directors in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency of Use of Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake boards of education</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents through students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaires</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with parents</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three categories of local church leaders, stake presidents, bishops and young adult leaders, were included in this list of those invited to participate periodically in institute activities. On a monthly basis, 31 directors invited young adult leaders, five invited stake presidents and three invited bishops to participate in institute activities. Each term, 27 directors invited stake presidents, 17 directors invited bishops and nine directors invited young adult leaders. On an annual basis, 26 directors invited stake presidents, 25 invited bishops, and five invited young adult leaders. Seventeen directors never extended invitations to stake presidents. Thirty directors did not extend any invitations to bishops or young adult leaders.

The five categories of campus leaders included in the list of those invited to participate in institute activities were (1) college presidents, (2) deans, (3) faculty, (4) counselors and (5) student leaders. Each term, five directors invited college presidents, six invited deans, 11 invited college faculty, five invited counselors, and three invited student leaders. Each year, many more directors invited campus leaders to participate in institute activities. Twenty-five directors
Table 7
Frequency of Institute Directors in California Inviting Local Church Leaders and College Administrators to Participate in Institute Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Frequency of Invitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake presidents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adult leaders</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College presidents</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College deans</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
invited presidents, 25 invited deans, 21 invited campus faculty members, eight invited student leaders. The data are found in Table 7.

| Directors Using Publicity Materials from Specified Sources |

Table 8 shows which sources of publicity materials were used the most by institute directors. The frequency of usage is also shown in three categories: never, occasionally, and usually. The most popular identified by directors were those developed by themselves (40 percent). The least popular materials were those provided by the Church Education System (11 percent "usually," 44 percent "never"). Between 40 and 52 percent of the directors used all the sources "occasionally."

The percentage of directors never using these sources varied from 19 percent for self-developed to 24 percent for student developed, to 36 percent for staff-developed and to 44 percent for materials developed by the Church Education System.

| Institute Directors Providing Public Relations Training for Faculty, Non-teaching Staff, and Parent Committees |

Institute directors indicated, as shown in Table 9, how often they provided public relations training for teaching faculty, non-teaching staff and parent committees.
Table 8

Institute Directors in California Using Publicity Materials from Specified Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Never No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Occasionally No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Usually No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self developed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff developed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student developed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Education System</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Institute Directors in California Providing Public Relations Training for Faculty, Non-teaching Staff, and Parent Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those Being Trained</th>
<th>1/month</th>
<th>1/term</th>
<th>1/year</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent committees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Few provided this training. Seven directors provided the faculties with public relations training once-a-month and four directors provided faculties with training once-a-term. Four directors provided non-teaching staffs with training once-a-month. Seven directors provided parent committees with training once-a-month, one director provided them with training once-a-term and one provided them with training once-a-year.

**Directors Inviting Parents**

*for Specific Purposes*

to Visit their Institutes of Religion

Table 10 reflects the number of directors who periodically invited parents to their institutes to (1) observe activities, (2) discuss the institute program, (3) discuss their children, (4) to participate in institute activities and (5) attend open house programs.

Thirty-three directors extended invitations to parents to observe activities once-a-month (8), once-a-term (15), and on various occasions (10). Forty-two did not invite parents for this purpose.

Twenty-seven directors invited parents to the institute to discuss the program, once-a-month (6), once-a-term (6) and at various times (9). Fifty-four directors did not use this practice.

Thirty-one directors invited parents to the institute to discuss their children once-a-month (3),
Table 10

Frequency of Institute Directors in California
Inviting Parents for Specific Purposes
to Visit Institutes of Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe activities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the program</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss their children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open house program</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
once-a-term (5) and at various times (13). Fifty-four directors did not use this practice.

Thirty directors invited parents to participate in institute activities once-a-month (17), once-a-term (6) and on various occasions (6). Forty-five never used this practice.

Twenty-eight directors invited parents to open houses. Eleven invited them each month, 12 extended invitations each term, and five directors invited them at various times. Forty-seven directors did not use this public relations approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The California Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors Involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified Groups in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Evaluation of Institute Public Relations Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 11 shows how many directors involved certain groups in the design and evaluation of their institute public relations programs. Directors indicated how often the design and evaluation of their programs was carried out by (1) themselves, (2) non-teaching staff members, (3) institute student leaders, (4) parents and (5) priesthood leaders. The frequency of involvement was indicated by "never," "occasionally," or "usually."

Most of the directors (67 percent) "usually" did the design and evaluation of their programs themselves.
Table 11

Frequency of Directors in California Involving Specified Groups in the Design and Evaluation of Institute Public Relations Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design/Evaluation By</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching staff</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents were "usually" involved only three percent of the time. "Usually" 21 percent of the directors involved their non-teaching staff, 17 percent their student leaders, and 15 percent their priesthood leaders. Twenty-one percent of the directors "occasionally" involved themselves, 33 percent involved their non-teaching staff, 35 percent involved student leaders, 11 percent involved parents and 43 percent involved priesthood leaders. In the "never" category 12 percent of the institute directors were never involved in the design and evaluation of their public relations programs. Forty-five percent "never" involved their staff, 49 percent never involved student leaders, 87 percent never involved parents and 43 percent never involved priesthood leaders.

**Use of Specified Methods of Publicity by California Institute Directors**

Table 12 shows the number of institute directors using the following methods of publicizing institute activities: (1) announcements at meetings such as firesides, (2) announcements at activities, (3) mailouts or flyers, (4) newspaper articles, (5) television, (6) radio, or (7) seminary presentations. Directors indicated whether announcements were made: (1) before school year began, (2) at the start of the school year, (3) at mid-term, and (4) at term end.
Table 12
Institute Directors in California Using Specified Methods of Publicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Publicity</th>
<th>Before School Yr. Starts</th>
<th>Start of School Year</th>
<th>Mid Term</th>
<th>Term End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings (firesides, etc.)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At activities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-outs (flyers)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to seminars</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Announcements at meetings and activities or through mailouts and flyers were used the most by directors. Before the start of the school year, 55 directors (73 percent) used meetings announcements, 44 directors (59 percent) used announcements at activities, and 51 directors (68 percent) used mailouts and/or flyers. At the start of the school year directors also used meetings announcements (40), announcements at activities (36), and mailouts (29). At mid-term 43 directors utilized meetings announcements, 31 used announcements at activities and 25 used mailouts. At term-end few directors used meetings announcements (17), announcements at activities (13) and mailouts (11).

The news media were not used by many directors. Before the start of the school year, newspapers were used by 10 directors, television by one director and radio by six directors. At the start of the school year newspapers were used by seven directors and radio by two directors. At mid-term six directors used newspapers, one used television and three used radio. At term end two directors used the newspaper and two used radio. Seminary presentations were used before the start of school by 23 directors, at the start of the year by four directors, by 22 at midterm and by 19 at term end.
Institute directors indicated which of five specified methods they used to inform five specific publics about institute activities. They used the five specified methods, student contacts, open houses, telephone calls, luncheons, newsletters, and a variety of other approaches. As shown in Table 13, the publicity effort was directed at stake presidents, bishops, parents, campus administrators, and seminary students.

Stake presidents, bishops and seminary students received the most publicity. The most popular methods of approaching stake presidents were telephone (34 directors) and newsletters (31 directors). Luncheons (13 directors) were used the least. Newsletters were used the most by directors (34) to inform bishops. Telephones were used by 20 directors. The least-used method for informing bishops was luncheons (five directors). Students, open houses and newsletters were used to inform seminary students.

Relatively few directors kept parents and campus administrators informed about institute activities. Out of 75 directors, 16 sent publicity to parents through students; 14 publicized through open houses. Ten directors used newsletters, six used the telephone, and two
Table 13

Number of Institute Directors in California Using Specified Methods for Publicizing Institute Activities to Specified Publics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake president</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus administration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary students</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


used luncheons. Campus administrators sent institute publicity to 11 directors through students and 12 directors sent it through open houses. Eight directors informed them through telephoning, seven used luncheons and three used newsletters.

Directors Emphasizing Specific Publicity Content in Recruitment Materials

Institute directors indicated how often they utilized the following themes in their institute recruitment materials: (1) "balanced education," (2) "spiritual knowledge," (3) "obedience to the brethren," (4) "quality associations," and (5) "home away from home." Directors indicated how often they used the theme by checking the following categories: "never," "rarely," "frequently," and "always." As shown in Table 14, the first four themes enumerated above were used by more than half of the directors. The most popular theme was "spiritual knowledge" and it was "always" used by 56 directors. The least popular theme was "home away from home," and it was "usually" used by 23 directors.

"Balanced education" was used by 67 directors, 23 "frequently" and 44 "always." "Obedience to the brethren" was "frequently" used by 25 directors and "always" used by 38 directors. "Quality associations" was emphasized "frequently" by 26 directors and "always"
Table 14

Frequency of Institute Directors in California Emphasizing Specific Publicity Content in Recruitment Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis of Content of Publicity for Recruitment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience to brethren</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality association</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home away from home</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by 41 directors. Few themes fell into the "never" category, except for "home away from home" which was "never" used by 13 directors.

**Recommended Public Relations Practices**
*Used on Four Publics by Institute Directors in California*

In the questionnaire there were 20 questions relating to priesthood leaders, 13 questions relating to parents, 12 questions relating to students and 10 questions relating to campus leaders. As shown in Table 15, directors used a higher mean percentage of public relations practices relating to priesthood leaders (72 percent) and students (76 percent) than those relating to parents (33 percent) and campus leaders (33 percent).

**Public Relations Practices Utilized to Contact Four Specific Publics by Directors in Four California Divisions**

Table 16 contains the mean number of public relations practices utilized by institute directors to contact priesthood leaders, parents, students and campus leaders in four California divisions A, B, C, and D. The difference between the average number of public relations practices used by the directors in these four divisions was small.

The mean percentage of practices used to contact priesthood leaders varied from 66 for division A to 68
Table 15

Number of Recommended Public Relations Practices
Used on Specific Publics by Institute Directors in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publics</th>
<th>Number of Recommended Practices</th>
<th>Number of Practices Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priesthood leaders</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus leaders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16
Number of Public Relations Practices Contacting Four Specific Publics by Institute
Directors of Four Divisions of Institutes of Religion in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Priesthood Leaders</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Campus Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for division D, 76 for division B, to 78 for division C. The mean percentages of public relations practices used to contact students were even closer. Division A used 65 percent, C used 66 percent, D used 66 percent and B used 70 percent.

Directors in divisions A, B, C, and D had a mean use of 36 percent, 31 percent, 33 percent and 32 percent, respectively, of the public relations practices relating to parents. Directors in division A used fewer public relations practices to contact campus leaders than those in divisions B, C, and D. The mean percentage of practices was 20 percent for division A, 37 percent for division B, 34 percent for division C and 36 percent for division D.

The Number of Public Relations Practices Utilized by Directors of Two-year Colleges and Directors of Universities to Contact Four Specific Publics

Directors serving two-year colleges and directors serving universities indicated which practices they used to contact priesthood leaders, parents, students, and campus leaders. The mean number of practices used by directors serving two-year colleges and the mean number of practices used by directors serving universities to contact the four publics listed above are reported in Table 17.
The average numbers of public relations practices used by both groups of directors were almost identical in most cases. The variations in means between institute directors serving two-year colleges and universities when contacting priesthood leaders were 14.6 and 14.3 respectively, when contacting parents it was 4.2 and 4.3 respectively, when contacting students it was 8.4 and 7.5 respectively, when contacting priesthood leaders, it was 3.8 and 2.6 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute Directors</th>
<th>Evaluations of Public Relations Practices Relating to Four Specific Publics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Institute directors evaluated public relations practices related to priesthood leaders (20), parents (13), students (12) and campus leaders (10). Directors indicated whether they considered the various practices "useful," "insignificant," and "impractical" in terms of time and effort. As shown in Table 18 few practices were classified impractical or insignificant. More were classified as "useful." The most "useful" practices were those relating to priesthood leaders (60.1 percent) and students (62.8 percent). The average percentage of "useful" public relations practices relating to parents and campus leaders was approximately the same, 27.2 percent and 27.3 percent.
Table 17
Number of Public Relation Practices by California Institute Directors at Two-year Colleges and Universities Contacting Four Specific Publics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Mean of Publics Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priesthood Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publics</td>
<td>Number of Related Practices</td>
<td>Evaluations of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priesthood leaders</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus leaders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighty-six public relations practices considered important by authorities in the field of school-community relations were evaluated by the directors of institutes of religion in California. Institute directors did not agree on their evaluations. The mean percentage of recommended public relations practices evaluated "useful" by directors in divisions A and B were 54 percent and 52 percent respectively. The mean percentages of recommended public relations practices categorized as "useful" by divisions C and D were respectively 42 and 45 percent.

This information was reported in Table 19.

The median evaluations for the divisions do not follow the same pattern as the means. The median number of practices considered "useful" by each division A, B, C, and D as 49, 40, 41, and 38.

The institute directors with and without formal training evaluated 86 public relations practices recommended by authorities in the field and identified those they considered "useful." The average number of practices
Table 19
Recommended Public Relations Practices Categorized as Useful
by Directors of Four Divisions of Institutes of
Religion in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Number of Practices Categorized as Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identified as "useful" by directors with formal training in public relations (48.4) was higher than the average number of practices identified as "useful" by those without formal training in public relations (48.0). The median categorization by each group was lower than their respective means. The medians of those with and without formal training were 42 and 35 respectively.

The ranges of the evaluations of both groups varied. Those with formal training in public relations varied in their categorization from 22 "useful" practices to 77 "useful" practices. Those without formal training varied from 22 "useful" practices to 62 "useful" practices. These results are reported in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Public Relations Categorized as Useful by Institute Directors Serving Two-year Colleges and Directors Serving Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Forty-four directors from institutes serving two-year colleges, and 31 directors serving universities evaluated 86 public relations practices considered important by authorities in the field of school-community relations. As shown in Table 21, the mean number of public relations practices categorized as useful was almost the same for both of the above groups of directors.

Forty of the public relations practices were categorized as "useful" by directors of institutes serving
Table 20
Number of Recommended Public Relations Practices Listed as Useful by Those Institute Directors in California With and Without Formal Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Number of Practices Categorized as Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without formal training</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With formal training</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21
The Number of Recommended Public Relations Practices Categorized Useful by Directors of Institutes Serving Two-year Colleges and Institutes Serving Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Number of Practices Categorized as Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year colleges</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two-year colleges and 41 practices were categorized as "useful" by directors serving universities. The median numbers of practices categorized as useful by two-year college institute directors and university institute directors were 39 and 42 respectively. The ranges of practices categorized as useful by two-year college institute directors and university institute directors were 18 to 72, and 10 to 83 respectively.

Institute Directors Utilizing Selected Public Relations' Practices

All the practices listed in the questionnaire were divided among 11 clusters each cluster having common features. Table 22 summarizes the data. The 11 clusters were:

1. Participation in formal public relations training.
2. Systematic on-going public relations' program.
3. Identification of potential students on campus and in high school.
4. Identification of students' needs.
5. Seeking feedback periodically from publics.
6. Inservice training program in public relations' programs.
7. Design and evaluation of public relations' programs.
Table 22
The Number of California Institute Directors Participating in Selected Public Relations Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Institute Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formal public relations training</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Systematic ongoing public relations' program</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification of potential students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) on campus</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) in high school</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of students' needs</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seeking feedback periodically from publics</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inservice training program in public relations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Design and education of public relations' program</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Screening of publicity materials prior to use</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Regular program for keeping publics informed</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Publicity: (a) activities</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) mailouts</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) news media</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) specials</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Courtesy visits to community leaders</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Screening of publicity materials prior to use.
9. A regular program for keeping publics informed.
10. Providing publicity at activities through mailout, using the news media and through special presentations.
11. Courtesy visits.

More than 50 percent of the directors reported using the following public relations practices: identification of potential students (99 percent), identification of students' needs (70 percent), designing and evaluating public relations program (65 percent) screening of public relations materials (60 percent), publicity at activities (65 percent) and through mailouts (60 percent) and courtesy visits to community leaders (60 percent).

Less than 50 percent of the directors reported utilizing the following practices: participation in formal public relations training (48 percent), systematic on-going public relations program (33 percent), staff in-service training in public relations (20 percent).

Institute Director
Characterizing Their
Own Public Relations
Programs

When directors were asked to characterize their own programs 53 (71 percent) responded. As shown in Table 23, 13 (17 percent) described their programs as structured and organized; 12 (16 percent) described
their program as unstructured; 26 (35 percent) saw their programs mainly as first-aid programs for use when problems occurred; two (3 percent) felt they were in need of help. Twenty-two (29 percent) did not respond to this question.

Table 23
California Institute Directors
Characterizing Their Own
Public Relations
Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured and organized</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly for first-aid (when something goes wrong)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In need of help</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

SUMMARY FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter contains a summary of the findings, the conclusions, and the recommendations of this study. It also includes a restatement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research design and procedure.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to determine the public relations practices and background training of directors of L.D.S. Institutes of Religion in California during 1974-75 and to compare the public relations practices of those who had formal training in public relations principles with those who did not.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What kinds of public relations practices and principles were considered most important by recognized authorities in the field of education?
2. How much formal training in public relations principles and skills had been experienced by the institute directors involved in this study?

3. To what extent did the following groups of institute directors use the public relations practices identified in the questionnaire? (a) Directors with and without formal training in public relations principles and skills. (b) Directors of institute programs adjacent to two-year colleges and directors adjacent to four-year colleges or universities. (c) Directors of the four divisions of institutes of religion in the state of California.

4. How did the institute public relations programs vary with regard to emphasis on selected publics; i.e., local priesthood leaders, parents, students and campus leaders. (a) Within California, (b) Between institute divisions in California, (c) Between programs at two-year colleges and universities.

5. How many public relations practices did the institute directors consider (a) useful and (b) impractical in terms of time and effort?

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

A review of the literature related to the field of study was undertaken to identify public relations practices considered most important by authorities in the field of public and school-community relations. The principles
and practices identified in the review of related literature were used to develop a list of questions for a questionnaire. These questions were submitted to a panel of authorities in the field of school-community relations for validation and to find out if they were comprehensive enough. The results of their suggestions were used to prepare a questionnaire. The preliminary version was administered to institute personnel from three institutes of religion to help eliminate ambiguities, to help clarify questions and to ensure a maximum completion time of not more than 30 minutes. Authorization was received to administer the questionnaire at mid-year division faculty meetings. All 75 institute directors in California completed the questionnaire at these meetings held during January and February, 1975.

Data were extracted from the questionnaires and key-punched for computer processing. The results were compiled and presented in tables. Whenever helpful the data were presented in terms of means, medians and ranges.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

From the data of this study the following findings were reported.

1. The public relations principles and practices considered most important by writers in the field of education were related to having an ongoing systematic
program which included the following: identification of publics, analysis of needs, setting of goals, creating suitable climates, two-way communications, utilizing all the media, being aware of and knowing how to work with power structures, and maintaining a program based on the highest standards of honesty and integrity.

2. Ten (13 percent) institute directors reported experiencing no formal training in public relations. Twenty-nine (39 percent) had received informal training in public relations either through self-initiated study or incidentally as a by-product of other experiences. Thirty-six (48 percent) reported experiencing formal training in public relations principles either in workshops, or as part of another course, or in a formal course in public relations.

3. Institute directors with formal training used an average of 30.4 public relations practices while those without formal training used an average of 26.9 practices.

4. Institute directors of programs serving two-year colleges, averaged 29.2 public relations practices and directors of programs serving universities averaged 28.6 practices.

5. The directors in four divisions used approximately the same average number of public relations practices. In divisions A, B, C, and D they used an average of 27.4, 29.9, 28.6 and 28.0 public relations practices respectively.
6. Institute directors were more inclined to use public relations practices related to priesthood leaders and students than public relations practices related to parents and campus leaders. They utilized 72 percent of the public relations practices relating to priesthood leaders, 67 percent of the practices relating to students, 33 percent of the practices relating to parents and 33 percent of the practices relating to campus leaders.

7. Institute directors in divisions B and C used more of the public relations practices (76, 75) relating to priesthood leaders, than directors from divisions A and D (66 and 68).

8. Institute directors in divisions A used more public relations practices relating to parents (36), than directors in divisions B (31), C (33), and D (32).

9. The institute directors in divisions B utilized a higher average number of public relations practices (70) relating to students, than directors in divisions A, C, and D, (65, 66, and 66).

10. Directors in divisions B, C, and D used more public relations practices (34, 37, 36) relating to campus leaders than directors in division A (20).

11. Institute directors serving two-year colleges and directors serving universities utilized approximately the same average number of public relations practices when relating to (a) priesthood leaders (14.6 and 14.3),
(b) parents (4.2 and 4.3), (c) students (8.4 and 7.5) and
(d) campus leaders (3.8 and 2.6).

12. Institute directors categorized as "useful" an average of 46.8 (54 percent) of the public relations practices recommended by experts in the field of school-community relations.

13. Less than one percent of the public relations practices relating to priesthood leaders (.7) and students (.7) were considered impractical in terms of time and effort. Institute directors evaluated as impractical 2.4 percent of the public relations practices relating to parents and 1.4 percent of the public relations practices relating to campus leaders.

14. Seventy-one percent of the institute directors responded when asked to characterize their public relations programs. Seventeen percent classified their programs as "organized-structured." Sixteen percent indicated that their programs were unstructured, 35 percent described their programs as "first-aid" programs for use in emergencies, and three percent said their programs needed help.

15. Depending on the particular practice, 50 percent or more of the directors reported utilizing the following practices: student identification, identification of student-needs feedback soliciting, designing and evaluating their public relations programs, screening of
publicity materials, regular publicity and courtesy visits to community leaders.

CONCLUSIONS

From the findings of this study it was concluded that:

1. Most of the institute directors in California had some type of training in public relations, but less than a majority had formal training in public relations.

2. Institute directors in California were not familiar with many public relations principles and practices considered important by experts in the field of school-community relations.

3. There was no important difference between the public relations practices of institute directors in the four California divisions.

4. Institute directors in California have the same perceptions of the needs of their publics, regardless of where they are located or whether they serve two-year colleges or universities.

5. California Institute directors, in general, do not see the need to have structured public relations programs.
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Inservice programs for institute personnel who participated in this study should include training that would help them effectively utilize the public relations principles identified in this study.

2. A similar study be undertaken covering institute directors in the balance of the system to determine if the findings of this study apply to the whole system.
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APPENDIX A
ORGANIZING THE SCHOOL AND THE DISTRICT FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

ANN H. BARKELEW is Public Information Officer, Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools.

Whatever communications strategies and techniques you decide to implement must be unique to your particular school, district or office . . . but it never hurts to take a look at what some schools and districts are doing to improve communications with their public--

1. Hold monthly informal "Yap sessions" involving superintendent and staff—principal and staff.

2. Invite special luncheon guest from the community.

3. Have mini-tours for special groups, including businessmen, senior citizens, the Junior League, and teachers from feeder schools.

4. Set up a welcome wagon for your school.

5. Put course in public education in the curriculum for a day or a quarter.

6. Have staff recognition for years of service to the schools and to the community.

7. Put notes in student newspapers—or do regular columns.

8. Make daily bulletins provocative.

9. Survey swithcord queries and questions asked of school personnel.

10. Study the tone of letters to the editor re: education—anywhere.

11. Use the grapevine network.

12. Set up a listeners' bureau.


14. Try neighborhood coffees—and take a teacher along.
15. Report back to staff on concerns of the district --on a regular basis. Don't let them learn about things "second hand."

16. Have localized publications--for specific publics.

17. Put together a packaged slide show in a suitcase --for homes.

18. Have press conferences for student newspapers.

19. Send letters to staff once a year--not a form letter.

20. Be visible in the mornings--talk with each staff member each day.

21. Hold briefing sessions with bartenders, barbers and beauticians.

22. Invite representative groups of parents to have early morning breakfast at your school. Solicit their concerns, problems of children, and suggestions for improving "things."

23. Hold brief seminars with realtors and real estate salespersons--get to new residents. Provide them with a fact sheet on each school.

24. Form student advisory committees to study problems and make recommendations.

25. Have an information brochure on each school.

26. Send thank-you-grams to staff and students who go beyond the call of duty.

27. Publish a staff newsletter on a regular basis.

28. Sit and eat with students in their lunch areas.

29. Try cafeteria food occasionally.

30. Budget for a survey of citizens to learn their thoughts about your schools.

31. Invite citizens into schools to observe programs.

32. Periodically, conduct tours of your school.

33. Send birthday and other appropriate cards to staff members--don't leave it up to the staff hospitality committee.
34. Set up a bulletin board and post laudatory materials and articles.

35. Teach a class period occasionally.

36. Meet with each staff member at least once a year.

37. Have a slide show on each new program—and make it available for use.

38. Place suggestion boxes around and let it be known suggestions are read.

39. Invite citizens and students to participate in teacher inservice programs.

40. Have a teacher/administrator/staff group toastmasters club—get some practice.

41. Have guidelines on how to avoid educational jargon in writing and speaking.

42. Be accessible to staff, students and parents to discuss problems, gripes or suggestions.

43. Turn people on—by being enthusiastic yourself.

44. Have a communication advisory committee and make it an active one.

45. Hold demonstration classes for parents and other citizens.

46. Switch classes with a nearby parochial school teacher/administrator once a year . . . or substitute in a "comparable" district (not pre-arranged).

47. Assist students in a study of the functions of a school board.

48. Attend board meetings.

49. Form an innovative ideas council of teachers and administrators.

50. Do something about the PR training of your staff --what they say and how they say it affects your image, too.

51. Resolve that the label "officious" will never be tagged on you.
52. Know the importance of body talk.

53. Be a listener.

54. Use the school board meeting as a communications vehicle.

55. Have a clear understanding about who is responsible for what--known to all.

56. Try rumor mill sheets . . . question and answer cards . . . or idea cards to get community input.

57. Have a rumor control clearing house.

58. Have a "drop in" room where teachers are available to talk on an informal basis with students.

59. Have a telephone for students . . . financed by student body funds.

60. Keep those outdoor bulletin boards filled and interesting.

61. Put up a marquee at elementary schools to advertise all the exciting classroom events.

62. Make staff meetings for all staff.

63. Schedule student art displays in local businesses' windows.

64. Reverse roles with students occasionally.

65. Revive the old Parent-Staff talent show.

66. Use cross-age tutoring.

67. Build an awareness of trends and plans of other departments within a school and within a district office.

68. Encourage teacher phone calls to absent students.

69. Have an all-school brain-storming day to get several hundred workable communications ideas.

70. Recognize the civic contributions of staff members.

71. Be sure the instructional program gets equal billing at school board meetings.
72. Invite those ladies in accounting and purchasing to visit classrooms so they can see the results of all their work.

73. Try teacher phone calls to parents to invite them to back-to-school nights.
RATE YOUR PUBLIC RELATIONS

So that you can take an inventory of accomplishments and progress in your public relations activities, here is a checklist of necessary contacts for all vocational education personnel. Fill in your special publics at the bottom, so that the list fits your own particular situation, and rate yourself periodically.

Date __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Improve</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Improve</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Fraternal Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants' Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Colleges and Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio and TV Station Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine Editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Special Publics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING PUBLIC RELATIONS
Edward G. Olsen

1. Maintain a warm welcoming atmosphere.

2. Remember always that parents want their children to be better off than they are.

3. Begin with real problems that are right at hand.

4. Get people working as teams—including if possible both children and adults on committees.

5. "Plan big" but "begin small" (so as to assure initial success), then expand as rapidly as possible.

6. Arrange for appropriate self-appraisal by the group itself.

7. As the program expands, be sure it develops appropriate structure and organization.

8. Remember that the responsibility for a community school does not lie solely with school people.

---

PLANNING PUBLIC RELATIONS

Arnold Manor

1. Establish objective. Decide what publics are to be reached.

2. Research. Find out what these publics now believe about your objectives.

3. Reorientation of objectives. Change your plan in terms of the attainable.

4. Determine your themes. Get your ideas from what the public currently believes.


6. Organization. Work within the operational plan set up in your school.

7. Planning. Map out a calendar for public relations.

8. Tactics. Select techniques at media.

---

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

1. Importance of communication.

If a school system is to serve the community with maximum effectiveness, there must be continuous communication between school and community.

Communication must be of a two-way nature.

Communication is the nervous system of the school community. The public schools belong to the people.

2. The nature and objectives of communication.

Characteristics:

Two-way communication - The coordination of efforts is a function of communication.

The impulse-response relationship - The school must respond to the community.

Comprehensiveness - The communication system should strive to reach everyone in the community. The achievement of an effective communication system requires careful planning based on a thorough knowledge of the social structure of the community.

Flexibility - The modern community is changing, and the modern communication structure must be flexible enough to accommodate these changes.

Accuracy - Must provide a reasonably accurate transmission of information.

Structure - A structure is an established framework of communication channels which is designed to promote the efficient flow of information. Structure helps achieve accuracy, increases speed, and tends to eliminate duplication and conflict.

Organization - The organization directs and controls the flow of information through the communication structure. The objective is one of ensuring the information is properly forwarded, through the proper channels, to the proper persons at the proper time.
Long range planning - The most effective communication will be that which is developed and operated on a long-range basis.

3. Objectives: Goal - is to make education as effective as possible or to achieve the best possible education for the community.
Dear Brother:  

It is the intention of the department to provide meaningful and helpful materials for effective public relations programs at the Institutes of Religion. We need your help to identify which of the following practices have been tried and what you may have discovered.

BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE PLEASE READ ALL THE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW

Directions for marking the survey:

1. The First Two Columns are to indicate whether or not you have tried the particular practice. Please check either yes or no on all questions (be careful to avoid accidental omissions).

2. The Next Three Columns are for indicating how effective a particular action was when used at your Institute.

Detrimental indicates this action had a detrimental effect on the public relations image of your Institute.

Not Significant indicates no apparent advantage or disadvantage resulted from this action.

Useful indicates this action proved very effective. The results of this action were mainly positive. You would be inclined to repeat this action regularly where relevant.

3. The Last Column is to indicate whether the action cited was or is too impractical for your program when time or money are considered.
4. If you have materials relating to any of the public relations practices, please circle your yes or no check mark.

What kind of training or experience with public relations principles have you had?

1. None
2. Only in incidental experience
3. Personal self-initiated study
4. Workshops
5. Part of another course
6. A formal course—at least a quarter or semester
7. Other (please describe)

Do you have a systematic ongoing public relations program that includes:

8. Scheduled planning sessions
9. Writing goals and objectives once a semester, once a year
10. Scheduled evaluations
11. Identification of your "publics" ("publics" means segments of your community which may be affected by the Institute program, interested in it, in a position to facilitate or hinder its functioning.)
12. Periodic community surveys
13. An organized procedure for receiving casual visitors who arrive at the Institute
14. Any special presentations to explain the Institute program to groups or individuals
15. Other (please describe)

Do you identify potential Institute students who are currently enrolled on the adjacent campus?

16. Through the church Priesthood channels (local leaders and/or young adult leaders)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sign-up tables on the adjacent campus during registration time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Religious affiliation indication on campus registration forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you identify potential Institute students who are high school seniors?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Through Priesthood channels--ward officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Surveys of seminary mid-year graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Surveys of graduating seminary seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you utilize any of the following for identifying the needs of LDS students to be filled by the Institute?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Young Adult leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Institute class organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LDS Student Association Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Personal research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 29 | Is there a recognized LDS club on the adjacent campus?                         |
| 30 | Do you usually have LDS students elected to student government positions? Each term ; each year |

Which of the following do you use to obtain public feedback?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effectiveness

Are you aware of parental attitudes or feelings about:

- 36. The Institute curriculum
- 37. Institute social-cultural activities
- 38. Institute influence on the academic achievement of their children
- 39. Leadership responsibilities and training being experienced by their children
- 40. Other (please explain)

#### Are the following Church and Campus leaders invited to the Institute to observe or participate in Institute activities? If so how frequent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Stake President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Young Adult Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. College President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. College Deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. College Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. College Counsellors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. College Student Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Others (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does your program involve regular public relations training of:
If so how frequent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. Teaching faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Staff (non-teaching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Parent Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Who produces your publicity materials?
How often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>occasionally</th>
<th>usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54. Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. CES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are parents invited to the Institute to:
How Often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>term</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59. Observe activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Discuss the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Discuss their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Other--please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you publicize Institute programs and activities through:
When?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>before start</th>
<th>start</th>
<th>mid-term</th>
<th>term</th>
<th>end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. Meetings--firesides, etc.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. At activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Mail-outs flyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. News Media: Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Presentation to Seminaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who is directly involved in the design and/or evaluation of your public relations program?
To what extent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>occasionally</th>
<th>usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73. Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Staff--non teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>occasionally</th>
<th>usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75. Staff teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Student leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Priesthood leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Others (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is all publicity material systematically screened for accuracy and tone (positiveness, appropriateness)?
To what extent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>occasionally</th>
<th>usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80. By yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Others (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have a regular program designed to keep the following "publics" informed about happenings at the Institute, such as success stories and activities of students? Which media do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>student</th>
<th>open house</th>
<th>phone</th>
<th>dinner</th>
<th>news letter</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82. Stake President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Campus Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Seminary Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Effectiveness**

Do you emphasize the following in your recruitment publicity? How often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87. Balanced education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Spiritual knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Obedience to brethren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Quality associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Home away from home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do LDS students participate in campus activities such as the following? How many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>a few</th>
<th>many</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93. Extra-mural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Spectators at athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Rallies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99. Do you make periodic courtesy visits to campus administrators?
Each year . . . . . . . . . . . .
Each term . . . . . . . . . . . .
Other . . . . . . . . . . . .
Comment . . . . . . . . . . . .

100. Do you participate in any activities on campus as a speaker or panel member? . . . . . . . . . . . .
Any comments . . . . . . . . . . . .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>101. What other things have you done that you feel were successful public relations practices?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>102. How would you characterize your public relations program?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impractical</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
<th>Detrimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Very structured-organized
- Not very deliberate
- Mainly for First-aid (when something goes wrong)
- In need of help
- Other (please explain)
THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTICES OF DIRECTORS OF
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ABSTRACT

Seventy-five directors of the Institutes of Religion of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in California, responded to a questionnaire regarding their public relations' practices. Institute directors with formal training in public relations utilized more practices, an average of 30.4, than directors without formal training who used an average of 26.9 practices. Institute directors in different locations (divisions) did not differ in the average number of practices used. Seventeen percent of the directors had structured public relations' programs. Directors emphasized more frequently public relations practices relating to priesthood leaders (72 percent) and students (67 percent) than practices relating to parents (33 percent) and campus leaders (33 percent).
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