THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO CERTAIN SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

By

WESLEY FRANCIS PITTMAN, JR.

Bachelor of Arts
Northwestern State College
Alva, Oklahoma
1936

Master of Science
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1943

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1957

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO CERTAIN SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Thesis Approved:

W R Chauncey
Thesis Adviser

Eli C Fortig

W Ware Marsden

Robert MacVicar
Dean of the Graduate School

PREFACE

No public position, at least a local one, is more important than that of school board member, for what the citizens of the next generation will be the schools of today will largely determine.

Within the broad limits of available resources, the level of school service in each community faithfully registers the caliber of its school board; consequently any community is doomed to disappointment if it hopes to have good schools without taking the trouble to select and put into office representative and capable school board members.

Hope for the extension, improvement, and lasting success of democracy rests heavily upon free public education and, in turn, upon the stewardship of the school board member who is, at the same time, custodian of the rights of every child.

Trusteeship in education is a serious and important business--an all-American institution. The responsibilities of the office at large and the opportunities for service to children and to the nation are unlimited.

What type of person is best suited to render decisions in the interest of all the children in the community? How many times have we selected what we believe to be the perfect board member only to find to our regret that this otherwise eminent man reacts to this particular responsibility in a partisan manner? Why do people react in this way or in that way even though they know better?

The effect of the socio-economic status on human behavior has long been of interest to the investigator. If this study has in some way shed light on the effect of the various socio-economic factors on one's capacity

capacity as a school board member, it has served its purpose.

The investigator is especially indebted to his adviser, Professor M. R. Chauncey, whose patience, mature judgment, and tactful assistance made the study possible. His deepest appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Professors Eli C. Foster, Ware Marsden, and Guy Donnell.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nothing is more American than local lay control of public education. Visitors from foreign countries find this feature of our educational system hard to understand. They cannot see how we can afford to entrust to laymen the professional and technical tasks that grow out of their responsibility for the school system. They do not understand why professional public school administrators should be subjected to convincing lay board members about the value of their program when their talents and energies could be turned to better use.

Criticism of lay control of public education has not been restricted to foreigners. In 1934 the eminent Charles H. Judd,[1] at that time Dean of the School of Education of the University of Chicago, developed the thesis that school boards are an obstruction to the advance of public education and that in time they would be completely abolished.

New members of lay boards of education often enter upon their duties inspired by a zeal for reform, born of ignorance and conceit. Their trial-and-error efforts are responsible for much of the retardation of our public school system. They often disregard the technical advice of their expert appointees and substitute lay opinion for professional judgment.

The subject of lay school boards and lay control of education has

---

[1]Charles H. Judd, "School Boards As An Obstruction to Good Administration," The Nation's Schools, XIII (February, 1934), 13-15.

long been of interest. In recent years there has been considerable conjecture in educational circles as to the relationship that may or may not exist between the effectiveness of lay board members and their socio-economic status. This study is an investigation in that area.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to (1) report the socio-economic status of Arizona's school board members, (2) determine the relationship of the effectiveness of school board members to certain socio-economic factors, and (3) determine the differences in scores of effectiveness existing between the board members of the large school districts and the board members of the small school districts in this study.

The socio-economic factors of interest to this investigator were (1) sex, (2) age, (3) marital status, (4) education, (5) occupation, (6) teaching experience, (7) family income, (8) property ownership, (9) community's respect for member's spouse, (10) number of member's children, (12) political activity, (13) political affiliation, (14) fraternal affiliation, (15) service club affiliation, (16) church affiliation, (17) religious activity, (18) length of residence in community, and (19) length of school board service.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to a study of school board members who were serving school districts employing ten or more teachers in the State of Arizona. The limitations and weaknesses of data-gathering instruments and rating scales were recognized. The subjectivity of administrators' ratings of board members was recognized.

Need for the Study

Other things being equal, the caliber of individual board members largely determines the adequacy and quality of the educational service that they provide collectively as a board.

If there are means of predetermining, to some extent, the probable effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a prospective board member, that knowledge would be of worth. If a particular socio-economic status tends to react more favorably for the citizens of tomorrow, that knowledge would be of worth.

Chancellor said, "The sort of men educators as a class desire and intend to have, they can usually get, for board members."[2]

Review of Related Research

Charters,[3] of the University of Illinois Bureau of Research, in a search for all studies on school boards, found over one hundred studies concerned with school boards. Nearly all of these studies were status studies or reports on conditions. Charters placed greatest value on analytical studies that revealed statistical significance of differences or relationship between variables. Without discounting the value of status studies, the present investigator agrees with Charters that analytical studies that reveal the significance of differences found existing between variables usually make the greater contribution. The criticism that

---

[2]W. E. Chancellor, Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision (New York, 1915), p. 15.

[3]W. W. Charters, Jr., "Research on School Board Personnel," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (January, 1954), 327.

Charters made of the conduct of related studies in the area served the present investigator well and guided him away from some of the pitfalls that could have handicapped this effort. This effort gives status plus an analysis of the relationship of the effectiveness of school board members to the nineteen socio-economic factors already mentioned.

Counts[4] popularized the status study and the identification of board members by socio-economic data when in 1927 The Social Composition of School Boards was published. A number of similar studies of a single state followed the Counts study. Counts believed that members of the dominant or favored class made undesirable board members because their outlook was conservative and they might be tempted to operate the schools to their own advantage.

Struble[5] was the first man to attempt to reveal the influence of socio-economic factors on a school board member's effectiveness. The Struble study was made in 1922 and delimited itself to a consideration of the following six factors: (1) occupation, (2) number of member's children, (3) age, (4) length of school board service, (5) marital status, and (6) teaching experience; and the effect of these factors on a board member's outlook on financial, academic, and personal matters. This study was made before reasonably accurate instruments for measurement of attitudes were in use; nevertheless, in this report there are many references to and comparisons with the Struble findings.

---

[4]G. C. Counts, The Social Composition of School Boards (Chicago, 1927), p. 100.

[5]G. G. Struble, "A Study of School Board Personnel," American School Board Journal, LXV (October, 1922), 49.

L. F. Battles[6] submitted a study to the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, in 1929, that assumed the hypothesis that North Central Schools have better school boards than schools of lesser standing, and he sought to prove his point with a comparison of the (1) age, (2) sex, (3) occupation, (4) education, (5) property ownership, (6) length of school board service, and (7) socio-economic standing in the community of the board members involved in that study.

Dennis H. Cooke,[7] of George Peabody College for Teachers, devised an instrument for rating the effectiveness of school board members in the late thirties and made two different studies with small samplings in middle Tennessee. Cooke studied the relationship of (1) age, (2) occupation, (3) number of member's children, (4) having children in school, (5) teaching experience, (6) length of school board service, (7) service club affiliation, (8) church activity, (9) income, (10) property ownership, (11) education, and (12) political activity to a school board member's effectiveness. The studies of Cooke would have been more valuable if they had evaluated the statistical significance of the differences between his good members and his remainder; nevertheless in this report references to and comparisons with the Cooke findings are made.

There was an outburst of formal study of school board members at Indiana University in 1952-1953, when four doctoral dissertations on the subject were submitted to the same adviser. (This adviser was Secretary of the National School Boards Association). Although none of these studies

---

[6] L. F. Battles, "A Study of the Personnel of School Boards in Cities With Population From 2,000 to 5,000, Inclusive," (Unpub. Masters thesis, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1927), p. 70.

[7] D. H. Cooke, "Portrait of a Good School Board Member," The Nation's Schools, XXVII (February, 1951), 58.

followed the procedure of this study, they probably should be mentioned here. Barnhart[8] associated administrators' ratings of board members' effectiveness with five different socio-economic factors. Brubaker[9] evaluated the operations of Indiana's school boards (the evaluations were secured from administrators). McGhehey[10] compared the policies of board member selection and orientation in communities where the superintendent rated the school board "effective" with communities where the superintendent rated the school board "ineffective." Whalen[11] compared the effectiveness of elected and appointed school board members (administrators' ratings were used).

The studies much like the present study are the Struble[12] and Cooke[13] studies. This study differs from the Struble and Cooke studies in that (1) several more socio-economic factors are studied, (2) the territorial unit (Arizona) is different, (3) the ineffective members are considered along with the effective members, (4) the statistical significance of differences is given, and (5) the Struble study is thirty-three years old, and the Cooke studies are fifteen and seventeen years old, respectively.

---

[8] R. E. Barnhart, "The Critical Requirements For School Board Membership Based Upon an Analysis of Critical Incidents," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1952), p. 112.

[9] H. B. Brubaker, "An Evaluation of the Operation of Individual School Boards and an Investigation of Related Areas," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1953), p. 93.

[10] M. A. McGhehey, "A Comparison of School Board Selection and Orientation Procedures," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1952) p. 110.

[11] R. E. Whalen, "Effectiveness of Elected and Appointed School Board Members," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1953), p. 97.

[12] Struble, p. 58.

[13] Cooke, p. 58.

Procedure

The development of a bibliography of literature related to the problem was the first step. The bibliography was assembled largely by (1) examining all books where the titles, as listed in the library card catalog, indicated a relationship, (2) examining all periodical articles where the titles, as listed in the education index, indicated a relationship, and (3) examining all available studies, abstracts, and other accounts of formal studies where the titles, as listed, indicated a relationship. The investigator acquainted himself with the work already accomplished in the field by reading the bibliographical literature.

The determination of the socio-economic factors to be studied was the second step. This was determined by giving first consideration to the socio-economic factors that Struble[14] and Cooke[15] had studied. Cooke studied five of the six socio-economic factors that Struble studied and seven additional factors. The Cooke studies considered the relationship of (1) age, (2) occupation, (3) number of board member's children, (4) having children in school, (5) teaching experience, (6) length of school board service, (7) service club affiliation, (8) church activity, (9) income, (10) property ownership, (11) education, and (12) political activity to a board member's effectiveness. The present investigator was satisfied with the inclusion of Cooke's twelve factors, inasmuch as Cooke had already found these factors related to effectiveness, and his findings could very well be compared with the findings of this study. Additional

---

[14]Struble, p. 58.

[15]Cooke, p. 58.

socio-economic factors of interest to the investigator were (1) sex, (2) marital status,[16] (3) community's respect for member's spouse, (4) school success of member's children, (5) political affiliation, (6) fraternal affiliation, (7) church affiliation, and (8) length of residence in the community, and they were included with the Cooke factors in this study.

Twenty factors have been mentioned, but inasmuch as school success of member's children was somewhat a repetition of Cooke's having children in school, only nineteen factors emerged for study. Each of these nineteen factors was divided into either graduated classes or classes appropriate to the particular factor; then they were arranged and organized into the form hereafter referred to as the "Checklist For Board Member's Socio-Economic Identity" (see Appendix B). This checklist was part one of the data gathering instrument.

The development of a checklist for the superintendent to follow when scoring the effectiveness of his board members was the third step. Charles Everand Reeves[17] had such a checklist in the appendix of his 1954 edition of School Boards. A copy of the rating scale used by Cooke[18] in his studies was available from a report on his studies. Neither the Reeves checklist nor the Cooke scale seemed to meet fully the need for this study. After considerable thought, the investigator decided to develop a checklist especially for this study. Salient features of the Reeves' checklist and of the Cooke scale became the nucleus of this new checklist, which from the beginning was an attempt at an abbreviated checklist that

---

[16]Struble studied this; Cooke did not.

[17]C. E. Reeves, School Boards: Their Status and Functions (New York, 1954), pp. 345-349.

[18]D. H. Cooke, "Rating School Board Members," The Nation's Schools XXI (February, 1939), 34.

left out nothing of importance. Related matters were combined into one point, and points of little importance, which were mentioned infrequently in the bibliography, were discarded, in order that the responding superintendents would not be hampered with trivia. The result was a fourteen-point checklist, each point weighted in numerical value in proportion to the number of authors in the bibliographical literature who held that point important in the rating of a school board member's effectiveness. Point one was held important in the rating of a school board member's effectiveness by sixty-four authors in the bibliography and was assigned a possible numerical value of 64 points (see Appendix E). The succeeding points in the checklist descended in numerical value according to the number of authors who held them important in the rating of a school board member's effectiveness. Point fourteen had only sixteen authors to support its inclusion in the checklist and was assigned a possible numerical value of 16 points. All points that were held important in the rating of a school board member's effectiveness by less than sixteen authors were eliminated in the interest of brevity. The fourteen-point checklist fell a little short of a possible score of 500 in its first draft but was brought up to a possible score of 500 by rounding out numerical values for certain points. Each point was given qualitative levels of competence that could be checked on a graduated line scale. The final product resembled the Cooke scale more than the Reeves checklist.

The question was raised whether this carefully devised fourteen-point checklist would gain a different result from a single-point rating scale that would mention only the all-round ability of each board member. This question aroused the interest of the investigator to the degree that a fifteenth point (mentioning only all-round ability) was added to the

checklist, and it was so arranged that separate and comparable scores (500 possible points for each) were available for the fourteen-point checklist and the one-point rating scale. The end result of this sub-study was that the one-point rating scale yielded an average score of effectiveness for all members in the study of 388.045 and that the fourteen point checklist yielded an average score of effectiveness for all members in the study of 393.925. Variance calculations showed greater variance among the one-point rating scale scores; but the Pearson "r" calculated for this sub-study was .854, which shows a very high relationship between the results of the one-point rating scale and the fourteen-point checklist. The one-point rating scale came close to getting the same result as the more discriminating fourteen-point checklist. Had the investigator known in advance that this correlation was going to be as high as it was, he could possibly have added to the validity of his scores of effectiveness by combining the one-point rating scale with the fourteen-point checklist. As it was, the scores derived from the one-point rating scale were used only in the sub-study and are not mentioned again. All scores of effectiveness mentioned hereafter come from the more discriminating fourteen-point checklist. The fourteen-point checklist, with allowance for qualitative levels of competence (graduated line scale for checking each point), became the "Checklist For Board Member's Effectiveness" (see Appendix B) and part two of the data-gathering instrument. The investigator believed that more valid appraisals would be forthcoming if the numerical values were removed from the graduated line scales and leave only qualitative level terminology (inferior, fair, average, good, and superior) on the fourteen graduated line scales for the respondents to check (see Appendix B). Thus the respondent was spared the confusion

that different numerical values might have caused. This consideration for the respondent necessitated the development of the "Key of Weighted Values" (see Appendix E), which contained the numerical values heretofore mentioned and enabled the investigator to score each return and arrive at a score of effectiveness for each return (each return represented a particular member). The score of effectiveness for each of the 333 board members in this study was gained by the investigator's applying the "Key of Weighted Values" in this manner.

The data-gathering instrument, in its final form, was long but served the purposes of this study by furnishing a socio-economic identity and a score of effectiveness for each of the 333 members in the study. Each particular member had his own socio-economic identity and his own score of effectiveness associated together on his own individual return.

The data-gathering instruments were sent to the responding superintendents in mid-August, with a letter of explanation and an appeal for their cooperation. On September 1 a second letter of appeal for cooperation was sent out (this was a personal appeal, not a form letter, to only those who had not responded as yet). By October 1 a 95.25 per cent return was received, and much interest in the study was expressed by enclosed notes and letters. Out of this return, 97.65 per cent of the responses were adjudged usable for the study. Instruments were sent out for 358 board members. There were 341 completed instruments returned, and 333 of these completed instruments were adjudged usable for the study. Since the data-gathering instrument was admittedly long, the indications are that mid-August is a good time to gather information from public school superintendents and that a follow-up or second letter of appeal a week or so after the first is good procedure.

The board member's socio-economic identity and his score of effectiveness were both on the return that represented him. Scores of effectiveness were divided into four categories: (1) Very High (more than one standard deviation above the mean), (2) High (between the mean and one standard deviation above the mean), (3) Low (between the mean and one standard deviation below the mean), (4) Very Low (more than one standard deviation below the mean) and were cross-tabulated with the classes of the nineteen different socio-economic factors (see Appendix C). Thus (1) Very High, (2) High, (3) Low, and (4) Very Low scores were associated with their counterpart in the socio-economic classes. The scores of effectiveness were also divided into fourths and cross-tabulated with the classes of the nineteen factors so that the observed cell frequencies could be compared with the expected one fourth (see Appendix D). Thus two different tabulations of the data for illustrative purposes, plus an opportunity for statistical calculations, were provided.

The first tabulation (scores categorized by mean and standard deviation) was considered the official tabulation, and all statistical calculations for statistical significance of differences were figured from it. The second tabulation (in fourths) serves the purpose of a second illustration of the classified data.

A Defense of the Data-Gathering Method

There has been some censure of studies in the past where the superintendent of schools has been permitted to be the sole appraiser of the board members for whom he worked. The main censure has been that the superintendent, whose own employment is subject to the pleasure of the board, could very well be biased, either favorably or unfavorably,

according to his relationship with the member under appraisal.

On the other hand, the investigator submits the professionally trained superintendent of schools as the best prepared person in the community to render an appraisal of a board member's effectiveness. The superintendent of schools is the only person in the community who sees the board member in all of his official action and then follows through and sees the end result of this action. The superintendent, in his official capacity, is a constant student of school board members and their actions. The superintendent should normally be as free from bias, prejudice, and emotion as any other mature professional person. All too often the superintendent of schools is the only man in the community who has the necessary information and background on which to base an appraisal of a board member's effectiveness.

Charters[19] in his review of all research on school board members was unable to suggest a criterion to evaluate board members that did not have shortcomings. Three criteria that he found in use were: (1) the voting record of board members (he refers to two Stanford dissertations that used this criterion), (2) the social attitudes of board members (he refers to the Counts and Struble studies), (3) administrators' ratings of board members (he refers to the work of Cooke).

The Stanford investigators gained access to board minutes and classified each ballot cast as either sound or unsound. A board member's competence was determined by the proportion of sound ballots he cast. The social characteristics of the competent members were then compared with

---

[19]Charters, p. 327.

the social characteristics of the less competent members. Charters does not believe that voting is the only service of a board member or even the most important service that a board member performs; further, he does not believe that the soundness of a ballot cast can be determined from board minutes. He cites a case where over ninety per cent of the ballots cast by a board were unanimous. He thinks there is a strong tendency for the minority to throw in with the majority just for the record.

Charters is less caustic with the methodology of the Counts study but he lets the reader know that Counts is merely stating personal beliefs and opinions. His censure of the Struble study was limited to the fact that no statistical analysis was given.

Charters believes that the "halo effect" may have entered into the administrators' ratings of board members used by Cooke. Charters expresses regret in that Cooke failed to evaluate the statistical significance of differences in his study and believes that Cooke made conclusions on the basis of differences that could have arisen by chance.

Charters overlooked the Indiana studies in his search for all studies on school boards, but it was just as well, for all four of the Indiana dissertations utilized superintendents' ratings of board members.

Charters found the least amount of fault with analytical studies that evaluate the statistical significance of differences.

This study was analytical and it did give the statistical significance of differences. The investigator made an attempt to remove the "halo effect" criticism from this study by urging the superintendents to be strictly impersonal in their appraisals.

A Brief History of School Boards

During the early Middle Ages in England the church had little opposition in exercising control over the education of that day. In the later Middle Ages the various religious, merchant, municipal, and craft guilds took an interest in education and occasionally maintained schools under the supervision of lay people from their group. By the late Fifteenth Century many schools in England were supported and controlled by town governments. By the early Nineteenth Century, Parliament was granting national aid to schools supported by churches and other groups. This aid was for supplies and equipment at first but was later used for just about everything except the erection of new buildings. In 1870 England divided itself into school districts under the jurisdiction of elected school boards and maintained public education by assessing taxes for their support.

In the original thirteen colonies of this country, as in England, the first schools were maintained by religious groups. In New England, where the people were of a common religious faith, the church first relinquished control of the schools to town government. In Massachusetts a law was passed in 1647 whereby it was mandatory for the town selectmen to maintain a school in every town. As the number of schools increased and the non-school problems of the town selectmen grew, the separate school committee came into existence. At first this separate school committee remained responsible to the town selectmen, but gradually the school committee evolved into a separate status. As in England, the tax-supported free public school district, governed by an elected school board, finally evolved. Each state that joined the original thirteen colonies provided in one way or another, for public tax-supported schools, governed by an

elected lay school board.

The early school boards performed not only the legislative functions of the school district but the executive and judicial as well. The early school boards soon found themselves unable to give to the schools the time required to do the job. So from this situation evolved the principal teacher, then the supervising principal, and finally the superintendent of schools.

Even though school systems today, except for the very small, are administered by a superintendent of schools, the laws of the state still vest nearly all authority in school boards. The superintendent, while administering the schools, is the agent of the board. The superintendent is the professional employee of the board, delegated to administer the schools, as directed by the board.

Although the laws of the states vest nearly all of the authority over school districts in the school board and although the superintendent assumes only that power delegated to him by the board, the administration and operation of schools are today well recognized as highly specialized skills that can be entrusted only to professionally trained personnel.

In practice today boards usually hire a superintendent of schools to administer the schools within a framework of written "Rules, Regulations, and Policies of the Board of Education." The board of education is today considered a legislative-appraisal body, and the superintendent is its executive officer. A board of education's assuming any of the executive functions still guaranteed it by existing law is an infraction of the required standards that regional accrediting associations set up for their member schools. In practice, an infraction of this type can be so serious that regional accrediting associations will remove member schools from their

approved lists if the board insists on its legal right to carry out executive functions.

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIC-ECONOMIC STATUS OF ARIZONA'S SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

The purpose of this chapter is to determine the socio-economic status of Arizona's school board members at the time of this study. There has been no concern in this chapter for determining a socio-economic status that might provide more effective school board members. This chapter merely shows the socio-economic status as it was and leaves to a later chapter the task of associating status with effectiveness.

The nineteen socio-economic factors under study are dealt with in this chapter in the same order in which they appear on the data-gathering instrument.

Sex. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to sex was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
Male	306	91.9
Female	27	8.1
Totals	333	100.0

Only 8.1 per cent of Arizona's school board members were women. Men remain the predominant choice for the office of school board member in the school districts of Arizona.

One nationwide study[1] showed that about 10 per cent of all school

---

[1]National Education Association, "Status and Practices of Boards of Education," XXIV (1946), 75.

board members were women. Counts,[2] in 1927, found 14.3 per cent of the city board members he studied were women, and he predicted that this percentage would increase substantially in the years to come.

Age. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to age was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
3. Less than thirty years of age	7	2.1
4. Thirty to forty years of age	115	34.5
5. Forty to fifty years of age	146	43.9
6. Fifty to sixty years of age	47	14.1
7. Sixty years of age and over	18	5.4
Totals	333	100.0

School board members in Arizona were predominantly from the middle age group. Nearly four out of five members (78.4 per cent) were between thirty and fifty years of age.

Nationwide[3] the average board member was forty-eight and a half years old, and the average citizen was forty-four years old. Cooke,[4] in his studies, found board members' average age to be in the early fifties. Struble,[5] in 1922, found that his average board member was forty-eight-plus years old. Counts,[6] in 1926, found that his average board member

---

[2]G. C. Counts, The Social Composition of School Boards (Chicago), 1927), pp. 42-43.

[3]National Education Association, p. 54.

[4]D. H. Cooke, "Portrait of a Good School Board Member," Nation's Schools, XXVII (February, 1941), 58.

[5]G. G. Struble, "A Study of School Board Personnel," American School Board Journal, LXV (September, 1952), 49.

[6]Counts, p. 36.

was forty-eight-plus years old. The median age for this study was forty-three years old.

Marital Status. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to marital status was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
8. Married and never divorced	303	91.
9. Divorced and remarried	18	5.4
10. Widowed	12	3.6
11. Never married	0	.0
Totals	333	100.0

Out of the 333 responses for this factor, there were no unmarried school board members. In 1922 Struble[7] found 4 per cent of the members in his study were unmarried; and in 1933 a nationwide study[8] showed 4-plus per cent of the members in that study were unmarried.

Education. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to education was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
12. Less than eighth grade diploma	13	3.9
13. Eighth grade diploma but less than high school diploma	46	13.8
14. High school diploma but less than bachelor's degree	185	55.6
15. Bachelor's degree and above	89	26.7
Totals	333	100.0

Less than one in five (17.7 per cent) of Arizona's school board

---

[7]Struble, p. 49.

[8]National Education Association, p. 51.

members had less than a high school diploma. This leaves 82.3 per cent of Arizona's school board members with a minimum of a high school education.

The National Education Association,[9] in 1946, reported that 30 per cent of the board members that they studied had bachelor's degrees or above; whereas less than 4 per cent of the adult public at that time had that much education. They further reported that 72 per cent of the board members that they studied had a high school diploma or above; whereas approximately 25 per cent of the adult public at that time had that much education.

Hoel and McCracken,[10] in 1927, in their study of Ohio school board members, found one member in six with a bachelor's degree or above.

Counts,[11] also in 1927, feared that a favored class would eventually gain control of the schools and operate them for their own interests.

The figures quoted show than an educationally select group has been in control of our public schools for some time.

Occupation. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to occupation was as follows:

---

[9] Ibid., p. 51.

[10] C. E. Hoel and C. C. McCracken, "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members in Ohio," American School Board Journal, LXXV (December, 1927), 75.

[11] Counts, p. 51.

Class		Number	Per Cent
16.	Agricultural (farming, ranching, etc.)	87	26.3
17.	Banker (officer with financial interest)	5	1.5
18.	Clerical	8	2.4
19.	Doctor (medicine or dentistry)	9	2.7
20.	Lawyer	10	3.
21.	Manager (of another's business)	39	11.7
22.	Proprietor (of his own business)	111	33.5
23.	Retired	3	.9
24.	Union protected employee	26	8.
25.	Other	33	10.
	Totals	331	100.0

Three classes (proprietors, managers, and agriculturists) made up 71.5 per cent of the school board members in this study. The same three classes made up less than 20 per cent of the major occupation group[12] in the United States and a much smaller per cent of the adult public (women and men) who were eligible for the office of school board member.

This disproportion of proprietors, managers, and agriculturists is in keeping with other investigations in this area. The National Education Association[13] study showed that proprietors, executives, farmers, and professionals made up 73 per cent of the board members it studied. Struble[14] found that business people, professionals, and farmers made up nearly 84

---

[12] Harry Hansen, ed., The World Almanac and Book of Facts (New York, 1935), p. 259.

[13] National Education Association, p. 53.

[14] Struble, p. 49.

per cent of the board members that he studied. Cooke[15] found that agriculturists and proprietors made up nearly 80 per cent of the members that he studied. Hoel and McCracken[16] found that farmers and business men made up 68.6 per cent of the board members that they studied.

Teaching Experience. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to teaching experience was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
26. Was in the teaching profession at one time	28	8.4
27. Was never in the teaching profession	304	91.6
Totals	332	100.0

The Struble study,[17] in 1922, found about one member in five with teaching experience. This study found only one member in twelve with teaching experience.

Family Income. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to family income was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
28. Above average for this community	236	70.9
29. Average for this community	94	28.2
30. Below average for this community	3	.9
Totals	333	100.0

Most of Arizona's school board members in 1955 came from the above-average family income group. Over 99 per cent of the school board members

---

[15]Cooke, p. 58.

[16]Hoel and McCracken, p. 40.

[17]Struble, p. 49.

in this study had average or above-average family incomes.

The National Education Association study[18] found the average school board member had an income of $3,986.00 for the year 1946. Only about 25 per cent of the families in the United States[19] rated that much income in that same year.

Counts,[20] in 1927, expressed the fear that a favored class would gain control of the public schools and direct them to their advantage. The evidence for this factor indicates that the above-average family income class was in control of Arizona's public schools in 1955.

Property Ownership. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to property ownership was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
31. Above average for this community	184	55.4
32. Average for this community	134	40.4
33. Below average for this community	14	4.2
Totals	332	100.0

The above-average property owners and the average property owners made up 95.8 per cent of Arizona's school board members. There are many company towns in Arizona where the company owns all or most of the property. This circumstance could tend to reduce board members in these communities to the status of the average property owner or the below-average property owner.

Community's Respect for Member's Spouse. The distribution of Arizona's

---

[18]National Education Association, p. 53.

[19]Golenpaul, p. 78.

[20]Counts, p. 50.

school board members according to community's respect for member's spouse was as follows:

Class		Number	Per Cent
34.	Above average for this community	165	50.8
35.	Average for this community	148	45.5
36.	Below average for this community	12	3.7
	Totals	325	100.0

Over a half of Arizona's school board members have spouses who rate above-average respect in their community. Nearly all (96.3 per cent) rated average or above-average respect in their community.

Number of Member's Children. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to number of member's children was as follows:

Class		Number	Per Cent
37.	No children	4	1.2
38.	One or two children	151	45.4
39.	Three or four children	140	42.
40.	Five or six children	28	8.4
41.	Seven or more children	10	3.
	Totals	333	100.0

One to four children (87.4 per cent) was the rule. Only four members out of the 333 in this study had no children.

The National Education Association study[21] found that 14 per cent of the board members that they studied had never had children in school during their board service. Only 1.2 per cent of the board members in this study have no children at all.

---

[21]National Education Association, p. 54.

Struble,[22] in 1922, found that the median number of children of board members in his study was 2.74. The median for this study was 2.66 children.

School Success of Member's Children. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to school success of member's children was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
42. Were (or are) successful at school	203	62.9
43. Were (or are) average at school	118	36.5
44. Were (or are) unsuccessful at school	2	.6
Totals	323	100.0

Almost two-thirds (62.9 per cent) of Arizona's board members had children who were successful in their school endeavors. Almost all (99.4 per cent) of Arizona's board members had children who were average or successful in their school endeavors.

Political Activity. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to political activity was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
45. Has a reputation as a politician	31	9.3
46. Has a normal interest in politics	278	83.5
47. Has less than normal interest in politics	24	7.2
Totals	333	100.0

The great majority (83.5 per cent) of Arizona's school board members had a normal interest in politics. Less than 10 per cent were reputedly politicians, and only 7.2 per cent had less than a normal interest in

---

[22]Struble, p. 49.

politics.

Political Affiliation. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to political affiliation was as follows:

	Class	Number	Per Cent
48.	Democrat	250	78.
49.	Republican	70	21.7
50.	Other	1	.3
	Totals	321	100.0

Democratic school board members outnumbered Republican school board members almost four to one. In this study only one board member was classified other than a Democrat or a Republican.

Fraternal Affiliation. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to fraternal affiliation was as follows:

	Class	Number	Per Cent
51.	Knights of Columbus	7	2.3
52.	Odd Fellows	7	2.3
53.	Masons	90	29.2
54.	Other	26	8.4
55.	No fraternal affiliation	178	57.8
	Totals	308	100.0

The Masonic order was well represented on Arizona's school boards. Nationwide the Masons outnumber the Odd Fellows about two to one, and the Knights of Columbus about four to one. Masons outnumbered all other fraternal orders combined on Arizona's school boards. Less than a half (42.2 per cent) of Arizona's school board members has a fraternal affiliation.

---

[23]Harry Hansen, ed., p. 598.

Service Club Affiliation. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to service club affiliation was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
56. Kiwanis	27	8.4
57. Lions	45	13.9
58. Rotary	61	18.8
59. Other	29	8.9
60. No service club affiliation	162	50.
Totals	324	100.0

Exactly a half of Arizona's school board members (50 per cent) was not affiliated with a service club.

The Arizona board members who had service club affiliation were inclined toward (1) Rotary, (2) Lions, and (3) Kiwanis, in that order. In order of size in the nation[24] the ranking is (1) Lions, (2) Rotary, and (3) Kiwanis.

Hoel and McCracken[25] found that 70 per cent of the board members that they studied belonged to some type of civic club or organization (please note that this classification is broader than service club).

Church Affiliation. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to church affiliation are shown below. Almost one member in six (15.4 per cent) had no church affiliation.

Although the Catholic church has more affiliates nationwide[26] than any other church listed, there is a surprising lack of Catholic school

---

[24] Ibid., p. 597.

[25] Hoel and McCracken, p. 41.

[26] Hansen, p. 482.

board members in Arizona. On the other hand, the Methodist church, which has considerably less membership nationwide[27] than the Baptists or the Catholics, was very well represented in this study and in the Hoel and McCracken[28] study.

Class	Number	Per Cent
61. Baptist	43	13.2
62. Catholic	25	7.7
63. Latter Day Saints	44	13.5
64. Methodist	84	25.9
65. Other	79	24.3
66. No church affiliation	50	15.4
Totals	325	100.0

Hoel and McCracken[29] found 84 per cent of the members that they studied were affiliated with some church, which is in keeping with the results of this study (84.6 per cent).

Religious Activity. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to religious activity was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
67. Overzealous and partisan	18	5.4
68. Non-partisan--normal interest	226	67.9
69. Less than normal interest	89	26.7
Total	333	100.0

The majority of Arizona's school board members has a non-partisan

---

[27]Ibid., p. 482.

[28]Hoel and McCracken, p. 40.

[29]Ibid.

and normal interest in religious activity; but a surprising 26.7 per cent of Arizona's school board members have less than a normal interest in religious activity. Only 5.4 per cent of the board members in this study were listed as overzealous and partisan.

Length of Residence in Community. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to length of residence in the community was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
70. Less than ten years	62	18.6
71. Ten to twenty years	120	36.
72. Twenty years or more	151	45.4
Totals	333	100.0

About a half of Arizona's school board members (45.4 per cent) had resided in their community twenty years or more. This fact grows in importance when one considers that Arizona is a rapidly-growing state, where a 50 per cent increase in population in a decade is not considered unusual.[30]

Length of School Board Service. The distribution of Arizona's school board members according to length of school board service was as follows:

Class	Number	Per Cent
73. Less than five years	161	48.4
74. Five to ten years	122	36.6
75. Ten years and more	50	15.
Totals	333	100.0

Almost a half (48.4 per cent) of Arizona's school board members had served less than five years on the school board, and exactly 85 per cent

---

[30]Hansen, p. 397.

had served less than ten years on the school board.

Struble[31] found that 81.6 per cent of the members in his study had less than ten years of school board service.

Hoel and McCracken[32] found that 80.5 per cent of the board members that they studied had less than ten years' service, and the mean average period of service for all members in their study was 6.4 years.

The National Education Association study[33] found that 74 per cent of their members had less than ten years' service and that the mean average period of service for all board members was 6.7 years.

Counts,[34] in his 1926 study, found that the average period of service for his members was 4.1 years.

The median length of school board service for this study was 5.25 years.

Summary

The socio-economic status of Arizona's school board members was: (1) Sex--The membership was 91.9 per cent male, and there was no indication that the percentage of women in school board service was on the increase; (2) Age--The membership was largely from the thirty-to-forty years class (34.5 per cent) and the forty-to fifty years class (43.9 per cent); (3) Marital Status--The entire membership had married (7 per cent of the U. S. citizenry never marries), and only 9 per cent of the

---

[31] Struble, p. 49.

[32] Hoel and McCracken, p. 41.

[33] National Education Association, p. 77.

[34] Counts, p. 23.

membership had a divorce on their record (one out of four U. S. marriages end in divorce); (4) Education--There were 82.3 per cent of the members who had a high school diploma or better (in 1946 approximately 25 per cent of the adult public was in that category), and 26.7 per cent had bachelor's degrees or above (in 1946 less than 4 per cent of the adult public was in that category); (5) Occupation--Proprietors, managers, and agriculturists made up 71.5 per cent of the membership (the same three categories made up less than 20 per cent of the nation's major occupation group and a still smaller percentage of the eligibles for the school board office); (6) Teaching Experience--Only 8.4 per cent of the membership had teaching experience; (7) Family Income--Most of the membership (70.9 per cent) had above-average incomes in their community; (8) Property Ownership--The above-average property owners (55.4 per cent) and average property owners (40.4 per cent) made up 95.8 per cent of the membership; (9) Community's Respect for Member's Spouse--The above-average respect class (50.8 per cent) and the average respect class (45.5 per cent) made up 96.3 per cent of the membership; (10) Number of Member's Children--The one-or-two-chilcren class (45.4 per cent) and the three-or-four-children class (42 per cent) made up 87.4 per cent of the membership; (11) School Success of Member's Children--The members whose children were successful at school (62.9 per cent) and the members whose children were average at school (36.5 per cent) made up 99.4 per cent of the membership; (12) Political Activity--The majority (83.5 per cent) had a normal interest in this area; (13) Political Affiliation--The membership was 78 per cent Democratic; (14) Fraternal Affiliation--A majority of the members had no fraternal affiliation (57.8 per cent). The Masons (29.2 per cent) were well represented; (15) Service Club

Affiliation--Exactly 50 per cent of the membership had no service club affiliation. Rotary (18.8 per cent), Lions (13.9 per cent), and Kiwanis (8.4 per cent) clubs had the largest number of affiliates; (16) Church Affiliation--Methodist (25.9 per cent), Latter Day Saints (13.5 per cent), and Baptist (13.2 per cent) had the largest number of affiliates; (17) Religious Activity--The non-partisan-normal interest class (67.9 per cent), and the less than normal interest class made up 94.6 per cent of the membership; (18) Length of Residence in Community--The twenty years or more class (45.4 per cent) and the ten-to-twenty years class made up 81.4 per cent of the membership; (19) Length of School Board Service--The large majority (85 per cent) had served less than ten years.

CHAPTER III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO CERTAIN SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the relationship of the effectiveness of school board members to certain socio-economic factors.

The data-gathering instrument had two parts: (1) the "Checklist For Board Members' Socio-Economic Identity" and (2) the "Checklist For Board Members' Effectiveness." Thus the data-gathering instrument provided that each of the 333 board members in the study had his own socio-economic identity and his own score of effectiveness associated on his own individual return. The respondent superintendent furnished the socio-economic identity by checking the "Checklist For Socio-Economic Identity" and furnished the measure of effectiveness by checking the "Checklist For Board Member's Effectiveness." The actual score of effectiveness resulted from the application of the "Key of Weighted Values" to the completed checklist by the investigator. The scores of effectiveness were divided into four categories: (1) Very High (higher than one standard deviation above the mean), (2) High (between the mean and one standard deviation above the mean), (3) Low (between the mean and one standard deviation below the mean), (4) Very Low (lower than one standard deviation below the mean). These four categories were cross-tabulated with the classes of the nineteen factors (as shown in Chapter II) in such manner as to associate the very high, high, low, and very low scores with their counterpart in the socio-economic classes (see Appendix C). The classified data provided by the tabulation permitted

calculation of statistical significance of differences (relationship) for each factor. The null hypothesis was assumed to be tenable in any case where the statistical significance of differences failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

The nineteen socio-economic factors are dealt with in this chapter in the same order in which they appeared on the data-gathering instrument.

Sex. It was the opinion of Cubberley,[1] in 1916, that women were not fitted to deal with the problems that face school board members. Table I illustrates the findings concerning the relationship of sex to a board member's effectiveness:

TABLE I

SEX AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Sex	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
1. Male	38	131	94	43	306
2. Female	5	13	7	2	27
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

The females have five very high scores as compared with two very low scores and eighteen scores above the mean as compared with nine scores below the mean.

The mean scores of effectiveness for the female and the male, respectively, were 411 and 393, a difference of eighteen points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 1.00 was found.

---

[1] E. P. Cubberley, Public School Administration (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1916), p. 125.

Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that sex was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table II is in fourths (permitting comparison of an observed frequency with the expected one fourth) and gives a second view of the same data.

TABLE II

SEX AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Sex	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
1. Male	76	72	79	79	306
2. Female	7	11	4	5	27
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

Hoel and McCracken[2] found evidence, in 1927, that indicated that women were poor risks as board members.

Age. Chancellor[3] believed that inexperienced young men and old men retired from business seldom made good board members. Table III presents the data regarding the relationship of age to the effectiveness of school board members.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 20.81 was found. Since, for this table, a chi-square

---

[2]C. E. Hoel and C. C. McCracken, "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members in Ohio," American School Board Journal, LXXV (December, 1927), 40.

[3]W. E. Chancellor, Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision (New York, 1915), p. 13.

value of 19.68 was necessary for the .02 level of significance, it was concluded that age was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

TABLE III

AGE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Age	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
*3-4. Less than forty	20	49	37	16	122
5. Forty to fifty	14	74	37	21	146
6. Fifty to sixty	5	11	24	7	47
7. Sixty and older	4	10	3	1	18
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

*Small tally in class 3 prompted its combination with class 4.

The coefficient of contingency (testing relationship) calculated for this table was .245 (.866 was maximum or unity for this calculation). This was a negative relationship, with the less than forty and the forty to fifty classes making the better scores and the fifty to sixty class making the lower scores. The sixty and older class made a good showing on the surface, but the small tally (only 18) does not permit full confidence in the result.

Table IV (in fourths) gives a second illustration of the classified data for this factor.

The Struble study[4] found forty to fifty years of age as the best age.

[4]G. G. Struble, "A Study of School Board Personnel," American School Board Journal, LXV (October, 1922), 49.

Barnhart[5] found that retired people and people over sixty years of age tend toward ineffectiveness. Cooke[6] found little relationship between the ages of board members and their effectiveness.

TABLE IV

AGE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Age	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
3-4. Less than forty	31	25	33	33	122
5. Forty to fifty	41	43	26	36	146
6. Fifty to sixty	5	9	20	13	47
7. Sixty and older	6	6	4	2	18
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

Marital Status. Struble[7] believed that unmarried people do not make desirable board members. Table V presents the data regarding the effectiveness of school board members and their marital status.

This study failed to find an unmarried person serving on a school board. The married and never divorced class had a mean score of effectiveness of 394, and the divorced and re-married class had a mean score of effectiveness of 381, a difference of thirteen points.

---

[5]R. E. Barnhart, "The Critical Requirements For School Board Membership Based Upon an Analysis of Critical Incidents, " (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1952), p. 33

[6]D. H. Cooke, "Portrait of a Good School Board Member," The Nation's Schools, XXVII (February, 1941), 58.

[7]Struble, p. 49.

TABLE V

MARITAL STATUS AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Marital Status	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
8-10. Married and never divorced	40	138	94	43	315
9. Divorced and re-married	3	6	7	2	18
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

When the significance of the difference was tested, a t-ratio of .69 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that marital status was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table VI shows the scores of effectiveness in fourths and permits comparison of an observed frequency with the expected one fourth.

TABLE VI

MARITAL STATUS AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Marital Status	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
8-10. Married and never divorced	78	80	79	78	315
9. Divorced and re-married	5	3	4	6	18
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

Education. Most of the students who have investigated this area have believed that a relationship exists between education and a board member's effectiveness. Previous investigators have not fully determined the degree of the relationship. Table VII presents the classified data

regarding the effectiveness of school board members and their education.

TABLE VII

EDUCATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Education	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
12. Less than eighth grade diploma	2	4	5	2	13
13. Eighth grade diploma but less than high school diploma	6	6	19	15	46
14. High school diploma but less than bachelor's degree	21	83	59	22	185
15. Bachelor's degree and above	14	41	18	6	89
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

The bachelor's degree and above class had fourteen very high scores as compared with six very low scores and fifty-five members with scores of effectiveness above the mean as compared with twenty-four members with scores of effectiveness below the mean.

When the chi-square test for independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 28.54 was found. Since, for this table, a chi-square value of 22.50 was necessary for .001 level of significance, it was concluded that education was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The coefficient of contingency (testing relationship) was .265 (.866 being maximum or unity for this calculation). This was a positive relationship with high scores of effectiveness associated with high educational attainment and low scores of effectiveness associated with low educational attainment.

Table VIII, shown in fourths, permits comparison of an observed cell frequency and the expected one fourth and has been prepared to illustrate further the degree of relationship existing between this factor and a school board member's effectiveness.

TABLE VIII

EDUCATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Education	Scores of Effectiveness				Total
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	
12. Less than eighth grade diploma	2	4	4	3	13
13. Eighth grade diploma but less than high school diploma	7	5	12	22	46
14. High school diploma but less than bachelor's degree	40	48	50	47	185
15. Bachelor's degree and above	34	26	17	12	89
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

The bachelor's degree and above class had thirty-four scores in the upper fourth as compared with twelve scores in the lower fourth and sixty scores in the upper half as compared with twenty-nine scores in the lower half.

As early as 1916 it was the opinion of Cubberley[8] that the uneducated and the relatively ignorant made ineffective board members. Hoel

[8] Cubberley, p. 125.

and McCracken[9] found that their best board members had an average of 11.88 years of education and that their remainder averaged 10.40 years of education. They further found that twenty per cent of their best board members were college graduates and that thirteen per cent of their remainder were college graduates.

Cooke[10] found that his best board members had more education than did the remainder of the members he studied.

Barnhart[11] found there was a definite relationship between the level of educational attainment and effectiveness as a school board member, with the lower level tending toward ineffectiveness and the upper level tending toward effectiveness.

Occupation. Moehlman[12] says that members of the professions rank much higher than merchants and businessmen as school board members. The classified data for the analysis of the relationship of occupation to a school board member's effectiveness are presented in Table IX.

---

[9]Hoel and McCracken, p. 39.

[10]Cooke, p. 59

[11]Barnhart, p. 33.

[12]A. B. Moehlman, School Administration (New York, 1940), p. 213.

TABLE IX

OCCUPATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Occupation	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Mean	Total
16. Agricultural (farming, ranching, etc.)	13	35	27	12	394	87
17. Banker (officer with financial interest)	0	2	2	1	384	5
18. Clerical	0	4	2	2	331	8
19. Doctor (medicine or dentistry)	3	3	3	0	429	9
20. Lawyer	3	5	2	0	438	10
21. Manager (of another's business)	3	20	11	5	394	39
22. Proprietor (of his own business)	10	56	35	10	402	111
23. Retired	1	1	0	1	406	3
24. Union protected employee	3	8	9	6	376	26
25. Other	6	10	9	8	373	33
Totals	42	144	100	45		331*

*Two omissions by respondents brought the total response for this factor down to 331.

A number of the occupational classes (lawyers, doctors, clerical, retired, and bankers) did not occur in large enough numbers to give full confidence in the findings regarding them.

When the significance of the differences between means was tested, an F-ratio of 1.68 was found. Since, for this table, an F-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that occupation was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The agriculturist class (farmers and ranchers) occupied 26.3 per cent of Arizona's school board posts. Nationwide[13] farmers and farm managers (ranchers not listed separately) made up only 6.4 per cent of the major occupation group; thus they made up a still smaller percentage of the eligibles for the school board office because housewives, retired people, and categories not listed in the major occupation group are eligible for the school board. The agriculturist class made only average scores of effectiveness.

Proprietors and managers occupied 45.2 per cent of the school board posts in Arizona. Nationwide[14] proprietors and managers made up about ten per cent of the major occupation group; they made up a still smaller percentage of the eligibles for the school board office. Managers made average scores of effectiveness, and proprietors made slightly above average scores of effectiveness.

Table X has the scores of effectiveness for this factor, divided into fourths, and this permits comparison of observed frequencies with the expected one fourth

The small number of lawyers and doctors in the study made good scores of effectiveness.

Cooke[15] found that professional people and proprietors were good board members. Hoel and McCracken[16] found that physicians, lawyers, business men, and bankers were good board members.

---

[13]Harry Hansen, ed., The World Almanac and Book of Facts (New York, 1955), p. 259.

[14]Ibid., p. 259.

[15]Cooke, p. 58.

[16]Hoel and McCracken, p. 40.

TABLE X

OCCUPATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Occupation	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
16. Agricultural (farming, ranching, etc.)	21	24	20	22	87
17. Banker (officer with financial interest)	0	1	3	1	5
18. Clerical	0	3	2	3	8
19. Doctor (medicine or dentistry)	5	1	2	1	9
20. Lawyer	5	3	1	1	10
21. Manager (of another's business)	10	7	13	9	39
22. Proprietor (of his own business)	28	28	31	24	111
23. Retired	1	1	0	1	3
24. Union protected employee	4	7	5	10	26
25. Other	9	7	5	12	33
Totals	83	82	82	84	331

Struble[17] found that manufacturers, real estate agents, insurance agents, journalists, contractors, business executives, doctors, and lawyers were good school board members. Barnhart[18] found that professional people tend toward being effective members and that unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled workers tend toward being ineffective members. It was believed

[17]Struble, p. 48.

[18]Barnhart, p. 33.

by Cubberley[19] that men in minor business positions made poor board members.

Teaching Experience. Moehlman[20] says that board members who are ex-teachers are helpful in planning educational policies. The classified data regarding teaching experience and scores of effectiveness are presented in Table XI:

TABLE XI

TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Education	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
26. Was in the teaching profession at one time	1	16	8	3	28
27. Was never in the teaching profession	42	128	92	42	304
Totals	43	144	100	45	332*

*One omission by a respondent brought the total response for this factor down to 332.

The with teaching experience class had an average score of effectiveness of 385, and the without teaching experience class had an average score of effectiveness of 395, a difference of ten points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of .62 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that teaching experience was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XII presents the data with the scores of effectiveness divided

---

[19]Cubberley, p. 125.

[20]Moehlman, p. 213.

into fourths, and this permits comparison of an observed frequency and the expected one fourth.

TABLE XII

TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching Experience	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
26. Was in the teaching profession at one time	5	12	4	7	28
27. Was never in the teaching profession	78	71	78	77	305
Totals	83	83	82	84	332

Struble,[21] in 1922, found that those with teaching experience made unusually good board members. Hoel and McCracken[22] found that 35 per cent of their most valuable board members had teaching experience and that 17 per cent of their least valuable board members had teaching experience. Cooke,[23] in one of his studies, found that board members with teaching experience were more effective than those without teaching experience.

Family Income. Chancellor[24] believed that men who were accustomed to handling large amounts of money made good board members. The classified data regarding a board member's effectiveness and his family income are presented in Table XIII.

---

[21] Struble, p. 49.

[22] Hoel and McCracken, p. 40.

[23] Cooke, p. 59.

[24] Chancellor, p. 12.

TABLE XIII

FAMILY INCOME AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Family Income	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
28. Above average for this community	35	113	69	19	236
*29-30. Average or below average for this community	8	31	32	26	97
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

*Lack of tally in class 30 prompted its combination with class 29.

The above-average class had thirty-five very high scores compared with nineteen very low scores, and 148 members with scores of effectiveness above the mean as compared with eighty-eight members with scores of effectiveness below the mean. The average or below-average class had eight very high scores as compared with twenty-six very low scores.

The mean score of effectiveness for the above-average class was 408, and the mean score of effectiveness for the average or below class was 359, a difference of forty-nine points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 5.35 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of only 3.32 was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that family income was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XIV presents the data for this factor with the scores of effectiveness divided into fourths:

The above-average class had seventy-one scores in the upper fourth as compared with forty-four scores in the lower fourth and 132 scores in the upper half as compared with 104 scores in the lower half.

TABLE XIV

FAMILY INCOME AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Family Income	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
28. Above average for this community	71	61	60	44	236
29-30. Average or below average for this community	12	22	23	40	97
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

The average or below class had twelve scores in the upper fourth as compared with forty scores in the lower fourth and thirty-four scores in the upper half as compared with sixty-three scores in the lower half.

Cooke[25] found in his study that his best board members had incomes on the average almost double the average of his remainder. Cubberley[26] believed that unsuccessful men made poor board members. Hoel and McCracken[27] found that the better board members in their study enjoyed success in their vocations.

Property Ownership. Chancellor[28] believed that men who handled large amounts of property made good board members. The classified data regarding a board member's effectiveness and his property ownership are presented in Table XV:

---

[25]Ibid., p. 59.

[26]Cubberley, p. 125.

[27]Hoel and McCracken, p. 40.

[28]Chancellor, p. 12.

TABLE XV

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Family Income	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
31. Above average for this community	27	86	53	19	184
*32-ss. Average or below average for this community	16	58	48	26	148
Totals	43	144	101	45	332**

*Lack of tally in class 33 prompted its combination with class 32.
**One omission by a respondent brought the total response down to 332.

Table XV associated above-average ownership with above-average scores of effectiveness and average or below-average ownership with average or below average scores of effectiveness.

The mean score of effectiveness for the above-average class was 403, and the mean score of effectiveness for the average or below-average class was 382, a difference of twenty-one points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 2.48 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 2.35 was necessary for the .02 level of significance, it was concluded that property ownership was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XVI presents the data for this factor with the scores of effectiveness divided into fourths.

The presence of "company towns" in Arizona, where the company owns all or most of the property, may have lessened the degree of relationship that might ordinarily exist between the effectiveness of a board member and this factor.

TABLE XVI

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Property Ownership	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
31. Above average for this community	54	50	42	38	184
32-33. Average or below for this community	28	33	41	46	148
Totals	82	83	83	84	332

Cooke[29] found that the average property ownership of his best board members was almost double the average property ownership of the remainder of the board members in his study.

Community's Respect for Member's Spouse. Community's respect for member's spouse was included for study because to the best of this investigator's knowledge this factor has never before been investigated by an educator. The classified data regarding a board member's effectiveness and respect for his spouse are presented in Table XVII.

The above-average class had twenty-nine very high scores as compared with six very low scores, and 124 members with scores of effectiveness above the mean as compared with forty-one members with scores of effectiveness below the mean. The average or below class had thirteen very high scores as compared with thirty eight very low scores, and fifty-nine members with scores of effectiveness above the mean as compared with 101 members with scores of effectiveness below the mean.

[29]Cooke, p. 59.

TABLE XVII

COMMUNITY'S RESPECT FOR MEMBER'S SPOUSE
AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Community's Respect for Member's Spouse	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
34. Above average for this community	29	95	35	6	165
*35-36. Average or below for this community	13	46	63	38	160
Totals	42	141	98	42	325**

*Classes 35 and 36 have been combined.
**Eight omissions by respondents brought the total response for this factor to 325.

The mean score of effectiveness for the above-average class was 424, and the mean score of effectiveness for the average or below class was 362, a difference of sixty-two points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 7.75 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of only 3.32 was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that the community's respect for member's spouse was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XVIII is in fourths and permits a second illustration of the data for this factor in tabular form.

The above-average class had fifty-seven scores in the upper fourth as compared with seventeen scores in the lower fourth, and 113 scores in the upper half as compared with fifty-two scores in the lower half.

TABLE XVIII

COMMUNITY'S RESPECT FOR MEMBER'S SPOUSE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Community's Respect for Member's Spouse	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
34. Above average for this community	57	56	35	17	165
35-36. Average or below average for this community	25	24	46	65	160
Totals	82	80	81	82	325

The average or below-average class had twenty-five scores in the upper fourth as compared with sixty-five scores in the lower fourth, and forty-nine scores in the upper half as compared with 111 scores in the lower half.

Number of Member's Children. Struble[30] found that a board member's value grows in proportion to the number of children he has up to and including four children. The classified data regarding a board member's effectiveness and the number of his children are presented in Table XIX.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 6.43 was found. Since, for this table, a chi-square value of 12.59 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that the number of member's children was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

[30]Struble, p. 49.

TABLE XIX

NUMBER OF MEMBER'S CHILDREN AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Number of Member's Children	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
*37-38. Two children or less	20	66	47	22	155
39. Three or four children	19	66	41	14	140
*40-41. Five or more children	4	12	13	9	38
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

*Lack of tally in classes 37 and 41 made combinations advisable.

A second illustration of the classified data for this factor was gained by dividing the scores of effectiveness into fourths (permitting comparison of observed frequencies and the expected one fourth).

TABLE XX

NUMBER OF MEMBER'S CHILDREN AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Number of Member's Children	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
37-38. Two children or less	34	40	44	37	155
39. Three or four children	45	34	28	33	140
40-41. Five or more children	4	9	11	14	38
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

The five or more children class had four scores in the upper fourth as compared with fourteen scores in the lower fourth, and thirteen scores in the upper half as compared with twenty-five scores in the lower half.

Hoel and McCracken[31] found that having children in school had a tendency to make a board member more effective.

School Success of Member's Children. School success of member's children was included for study because to the best of this investigator's knowledge this factor has never been studied before. The classified data regarding a school board member's effectiveness and the school success of his children are presented in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

SCHOOL SUCCESS OF MEMBER'S CHILDREN AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

School Success of Member's Children	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
42. Were (or are) successful at school	35	96	59	13	203
*43-44. Were (or are) average or unsuccessful at school	6	42	41	31	120
Totals	41	138	100	44	323**

*Small tally in class 44 prompted its combination with class 43.
**Ten omissions by respondents brought the total for this factor down to 323.

The successful at school class had thirty-five very high scores as compared with thirteen very low scores, and 131 members with scores of effectiveness above the mean as compared with seventy-two members with scores of effectiveness below the mean. The average or unsuccessful at school class had six very high scores as compared with thirty-one very low scores.

---

[31]Hoel and McCracken, p. 40.

The mean score of effectiveness for the successful at school class was 411, and the mean score of effectiveness for the average or unsuccessful at school class was 365, a difference of forty-six points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 5.37 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of only 3.32 was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that school success of member's children was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XXII is in fourths (permitting comparison of an observed cell frequency with the expected one fourth) and has been prepared to illustrate further the degree of relationship existing between this factor and a board member's effectiveness:

TABLE XXII

SCHOOL SUCCESS OF MEMBER'S CHILDREN AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

School Success of Member's Children	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
42. Were (or are) unsuccessful at school	65	54	52	32	203
43-44. Were (or are) average or unsuccessful at school	15	27	28	50	120
Totals	80	81	80	82	323

The successful at school class had sixty-five scores in the upper fourth as compared with thirty-two scores in the lower fourth, and 119 scores in the upper half as compared with eighty-four scores in the lower half. The average or unsuccessful at school class had fifteen scores in the upper fourth as compared with fifty scores in the lower fourth and

fifty-two scores in the upper half as compared with seventy-eight scores in the lower half.

Political Activity. Chancellor[32] believed that politicians made poor board members. The classified data regarding a board member's effectiveness and his political activity are presented in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

POLITICAL ACTIVITY AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Political Activity	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
45. Has a reputation as a politician	3	10	8	10	31
46. Has a normal interest in politics	37	124	89	28	278
47. Has less than normal interest in politics	3	10	4	7	24
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to the table, a chi-square value of 18.09 was found. Since, for this table, a chi-square value of 16.81 was necessary for the .01 level of significance, it was concluded that political activity was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The coefficient of contingency (testing relationship) for this table was .235 (.816 was maximum or unity for this calculation). This was a positive relationship with the normal interest in politics class making better scores than the reputation as a politician class or the less than

---

[32]Chancellor, p. 14.

normal interest in politics class.

Table XXIV has the scores of effectiveness for this factor divided into fourths and gives another illustration of the classified data.

TABLE XXIV

POLITICAL ACTIVITY AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Political Activity	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
45. Has a reputation as a politician	4	8	4	15	31
46. Has a normal interest in politics	73	71	72	62	278
47. Has less than normal interest in politics	6	4	7	7	24
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

The normal interest in politics class made better scores of effectiveness than the other two classes.

Cooke[33] found that being active in politics was not associated with effectiveness as a school board member. It was Cubberley's[34] opinion, in 1916, that politicians were undesirable as board members. The findings of this study do not disagree with the opinion of Cubberley or the findings of Cooke.

Political Affiliation. Cubberley[35] believed that a progressive school board should be free from political influences. The classified

[33] Cooke, p. 59.

[34] Cubberley, p. 125.

[35] Ibid.

data regarding a board member's effectiveness, and his political affiliation, are presented in Table XXV.

TABLE XXV

POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Political Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
48. Democrat	32	104	78	36	250
49. Republican	10	31	21	8	70
*50. Other					
Totals	42	135	99	44	320**

*Class 50 was dropped because only one member belonged.
**Thirteen omissions by respondents brought the total for this factor down to 320.

Table XXV reveals a slightly better record of effectiveness for the Republicans. The Republicans had a mean score of effectiveness of 398, and the Democrats had a mean score of effectiveness of 390, a difference of eight points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of .74 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that political affiliation was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The evidence indicates that one's political affiliation has little or no association with one's effectiveness as a school board member.

A second tabular illustration of the classified data for this factor was made possible by dividing the scores of effectiveness into fourths. Table XXVI presents the data in that form.

TABLE XXVI

POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Political Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
48. Democrat	59	64	62	65	250
49. Republican	20	15	17	18	70
Totals	79	79	79	83	320

Fraternal Affiliation. Cubberley[36] believed that progressive school boards should be free from fraternal influences. Table XXVII presents the classified data regarding a board member's effectiveness and his fraternal affiliation.

TABLE XXVII

FRATERNAL AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Fraternal Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Mean Score	Total
51. Knights of Columbus	0	2	2	4	250	8
52. Odd Fellows	1	2	3	1	390	7
53. Masons	13	38	30	9	399	90
54. Other	5	10	7	4	399	26
55. No fraternal affiliation	18	78	52	29	388	177
Totals	37	130	94	47*		308**

*An examination of the original data revealed that several members with low scores of effectiveness belonged to more than one order. This fact accounts for the very low column having a larger total than the very high column.

**Twenty-five omissions by respondents brought this total down to 308.

[36]Cubberly, p. 125.

When the significance of the differences between the means was tested, an F-ratio of 5.62 was found. Since, for this table, an F-ratio of 4.75 was all that was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that fraternal affiliation was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

In another search for significant differences between the means of any two classes (using the confidence interval technique), it was found that the Knights of Columbus differed from all other classes except the Odd Fellows (this difference was at the .05 level of significance), at the .01 level of significance.

Table XXVIII is in fourths (permitting comparison of an observed cell frequency with the expected one fourth) and has been prepared to illustrate further the degree of relationship existing between this factor and a board member's effectiveness.

TABLE XXVIII

FRATERNAL AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Fraternal Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
51. Knights of Columbus	0	1	1	5	7
52. Odd Fellows	1	2	1	3	7
53. Masons	26	20	21	23	90
54. Other	6	8	5	7	26
55. No fraternal affiliation	38	44	47	49	178
Totals	71	75	75	87	308

The Knights of Columbus made the lowest scores among the classes.

Service Club Affiliation. Cooke[37] found that best board members were active in service clubs. The classified data regarding a school board member's effectiveness and his service club affiliation are presented in Table XXIX.

TABLE XXIX

SERVICE CLUB AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Fraternal Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness					
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Mean Score	Total
56. Kiwanis	4	17	3	3	423	27
57. Lions	6	24	13	2	412	45
58. Rotary	13	22	19	7	398	61
59. Other	4	10	13	2	395	29
60. No service club affiliation	15	68	48	31	381	162
Totals	42	141	96	45		324*

*Nine omissions by respondents brought the total response for this factor down to 324.

When the significance of the differences between means was tested, an F-ratio of 2.50 was found. Since, for this table, an F-ratio of 2.41 was necessary for .05 level of significance, it was concluded that service club affiliation was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

In a search for significant differences between the means of any two classes, it was found that the Kiwanis class differed from the no service club affiliation class at the .05 level of significance.

---

[37]Cooke, p. 59.

Table XXX presents the scores of effectiveness in fourths, and this permits comparison of the observed cell frequency with the expected one fourth.

TABLE XXX

SERVICE CLUB AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Service Club Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
56. Kiwanis	12	8	1	6	27
57. Lions	15	11	12	7	45
58. Rotary	16	14	15	16	61
59. Other	6	6	12	5	29
60. No service club affiliation	31	43	40	48	162
Totals	82	82	80	82	324

Hoel and McCracken[38] found an association between a school board member's effectiveness and membership in service and civic clubs.

Church Affiliation. Cubberley[39] believed that progressive school board members should be free from denominational influences. The classified data regarding a school board member's effectiveness and church affiliation are presented in Table XXXI.

When the significance of the differences between means was tested, an F-ratio of 3.44 was found. Since, for this table, an F-ratio of 3.17 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that

---

[38]Hoel and McCracken, p. 41.

[39]Cubberley, p. 125.

church affiliation was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

TABLE XXXI

CHURCH AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Church Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness					
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Mean Score	Total
61. Baptist	11	16	14	2	422	43
62. Catholic	4	8	6	7	357	25
63. Latter Day Saints	2	17	16	9	371	44
64. Methodist	7	42	27	8	399	84
65. Other	13	37	21	8	403	79
66. No church affiliation	5	20	14	11	382	50
Totals	42	140	98	45		325*

*Eight omissions by respondents brought the total response for this factor down to 325.

In a search for significant differences between the means of any two classes (using the confidence interval technique), the following differences were found: The Baptists differed from both the Catholics and the Latter Day Saints at the .05 level of significance.

Table XXXII is in fourths (permitting comparison of an observed cell frequency and the expected one fourth) and has been prepared to illustrate further the degree of relationship existing between this factor and a board member's effectiveness.

The Baptists have eighteen scores in the upper fourth as compared with six scores in the lower fourth and twenty-six scores in the upper half as compared with seventeen scores in the lower half.

TABLE XXXII

CHURCH AFFILIATION AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Church Affiliation	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
61. Baptist	18	8	11	6	43
62. Catholic	6	5	3	11	25
63. Latter Day Saints	5	11	10	18	44
64. Methodist	18	22	27	17	84
65. Other	25	21	16	17	79
66. No church affiliation	10	12	14	14	50
Totals	82	79	81	83	325

At the other extreme, the Catholics have six scores in the upper fourth as compared with eleven scores in the lower fourth, and the Latter Day Saints have five scores in the upper fourth as compared with eighteen scores in the lower fourth.

Religious Activity. Chancellor[40] believed that preachers, priests, and extremists as a whole do not make good board members. The classified data regarding a school board member's effectiveness and his religious activity are presented in Table XXXIII.

The non-partisan--normal interest class had thirty-five very high scores as compared with twenty very low scores and 141 scores above the mean as compared with eighty-five scores below the mean.

---

[40] Chancellor, p. 14.

TABLE XXXIII

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Religious Activity	Scores of Effectiveness					
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Mean Score	Total
67. Overzealous and partisan	1	2	9	6	322	18
68. Non-partisan--normal interest	35	106	65	20	407	226
69. Less than normal interest	7	36	27	19	375	89
Totals	43	144	101	45		333

When the significance of the differences between means was tested, an F-ratio of 14.09 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 7.15 was all that was necessary for .001 level of significance, it was concluded that religious activity was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

In another search for significant differences between any two means (using the confidence interval technique) it was found that (1) the non-partisan--normal interest class differed from the overzealous and partisan class at the .01 level of significance, and (2) the non-partisan--normal interest class differed from the less than normal interest class at the .05 level of significance.

In Table XXXIV the scores of effectiveness are divided into fourths and this provides an opportunity for comparing observed frequencies for this factor with the expected one fourth.

TABLE XXXIV

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Religious Activity	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
67. Overzealous and partisan	1	2	3	12	18
68. Non-partisan--normal interest	69	57	55	45	226
69. Less than normal interest	13	24	25	27	89
Totals	83	84	83	84	333

The overzealous and partisan class had one score in the upper fourth as compared with twelve scores in the lower fourth and three scores in the upper half as compared with fifteen scores in the lower half.

Length of Residence in Community. Moehlman[41] believes the electorate tends to support people who are well established in the community. The classified data regarding the effectiveness of school board members and the length of residence in the community are presented in Table XXXV.

The less than ten years class had twelve very high scores as compared with five very low scores and forty-one members whose scores of effectiveness were above the mean as compared with twenty-one members whose scores of effectiveness were below the mean. The twenty years or more class had thirteen very high scores as compared with twenty-four very low scores.

---

[41] Moehlman, p. 217.

TABLE XXXV

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN COMMUNITY AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Length of Residence in Community	Scores of Effectiveness: Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
70. Less than ten years	12	29	16	5	62
71. Ten to twenty years	18	50	36	16	120
72. Twenty years or more	13	65	49	24	151
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 7.45 was found. Since, for this table, a chi-square value of 12.59 was necessary for .05 level of significance, it was concluded that length of residence in the community was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XXXVI is in fourths (permitting comparison of an observed cell frequency with the expected one fourth) and has been prepared to illustrate further the degree of relationship existing between the effectiveness of a board member and this factor.

TABLE XXXVI

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN COMMUNITY AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Length of Residence in Community	Scores of Effectiveness: Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
70. Less than ten years	18	18	15	11	62
71. Ten to twenty years	32	27	31	30	120
72. Twenty years and more	33	38	37	43	151
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

Length of School Board Service. Struble[42] believed that board members tend to become more conservative and less useful the longer they serve. The classified data on the effectiveness of school board members and the length of their school board service are presented in Table XXXVII.

TABLE XXXVII

LENGTH OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Length of School Board Service	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
73. Less than five years	18	67	50	26	161
74. Five to ten years	18	52	36	16	122
75. Ten years and more	7	25	15	3	50
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

The ten years and more class had seven very high scores as compared with three very low scores and thirty-two members whose scores of effectiveness were above the mean as compared with eighteen members whose scores of effectiveness were below the mean.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 4.34 was found. Since, for this table, a chi-square value of 12.59 was necessary for .05 level of significance, it was concluded that length of school board service was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Table XXXVIII presents the scores of effectiveness divided into fourths and gives a second illustration of the data for this factor.

---

[42]Struble, p. 49.

TABLE XXXVIII

LENGTH OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE AND SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Length of School Board Service	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
73. Less than five years	37	37	41	46	161
74. Five to ten years	30	31	30	31	122
75. Ten years and more	16	15	12	7	50
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

In this tabulation the ten years and more class had sixteen scores in the upper fourth as compared with seven scores in the lower fourth and thirty-one scores in the upper half as compared with nineteen scores in the lower half.

Barnhart[43] found that board members with six or more years of board service were more effective. Hoel and McCracken[44] found that their most valuable members had an average of 7.4 years of service on the board and that their least valuable members had an average of 4.7 years of service on the board. Cooke[45] found that his best board members had more service on the board than his remainder. The median length of service for this study was 5.20 years.

Summary

The relationship of the effectiveness of school board members to

---

[43]Barnhart, p. 33.

[44]Hoel and McCracken, p. 41.

[45]Cooke, p. 59.

certain socio-economic factors varied in degree from the .001 level of significance to the .60 level of significance.

Six factors showed statistical significance of differences existing at the .001 level of significance: (1) Education (high scores of effectiveness were associated with high educational attainment and low scores of effectiveness were associated with low educational attainment); (2) Family Income (higher scores of effectiveness were associated with above-average family incomes and lower scores of effectiveness were associated with the average or below-average family incomes); (3) Community's Respect for Member's Spouse (above-average scores of effectiveness were associated with those members whose spouses rated above-average respect and average or below-average scores of effectiveness were associated with these members whose spouses rated average or below-average respect); (4) School Success of Member's Children (higher scores of effectiveness were associated with members whose children were successful at school and lower scores of effectiveness were associated with members whose children were average or unsuccessful at school); (5) Fraternal Affiliation (low scores of effectiveness were associated with only one class, the Knights of Columbus); (6) Religious Activity (higher scores of effectiveness were associated with a normal interest in this area, and lower scores of effectiveness were associated with the overzealous and partisan and those with less than normal interest.)

Two factors showed statistical significance of differences existing at the .01 level of significance: (1) Political Activity (higher scores of effectiveness were associated with normal interest in the area, and lower scores of effectiveness were associated with politicians and these with less than normal interest) and (2) Church Affiliation (the Baptists

had better scores, and the Catholics and Latter Day Saints had lower scores).

Two factors showed differences existing at the .02 level of significance: (1) Age (this was a negative relationship, with the younger members making better scores of effectiveness than the older members) and (2) Property Ownership (above average scores of effectiveness were associated with above-average property owners and average and below-average scores of effectiveness were associated with average or below-average property owners).

One factor showed differences existing at the .05 level of significance and it was Service Club Affiliation (higher scores were associated with the service club affiliate and lower scores with the unaffiliated).

The remaining eight factors had varying degrees of association with effectiveness: (12) Occupation (.10 level of significance; lawyers and doctors made good scores); (13) Sex (.30 level of significance; females made better scores); (14) Length of Residence in Community (.30 level of significance; long-time residents made lower scores); (15) Number of Member's Children (.40 level of significance; members with five or more children made lower scores); (16) Political Affiliation (.45 level of significance; slight trend in favor of Republicans); (17) Teaching Experience (.50 level of significance; apparently teaching experience does not make board members more effective); (18) Marital Status (.50 level of significance; the never divorced were slightly more effective); (19) Length of School Board Service (.60 level of significance; the ten years or more class was slightly more effective).

CHAPTER IV

THE DIFFERENCES IN SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS EXISTING BETWEEN THE BOARD MEMBERS OF LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND THE BOARD MEMBERS OF SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THIS STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to determine the differences in scores of effectiveness existing between the board members of large school districts and the board members of small school districts in this study.

Some people speak in favor of the unity and neighborliness found existing within the school boards of small communities.[1] Some believe that the very best people are attracted to the school board in the small community.[2] Others simply reason in numbers and state that the small community elects the same number of school board members and has fewer people from which to choose. This chapter hopes to remove some of the conjecture on this point.

All school districts in Arizona with ten or more teachers were invited to participate in this study. All members from school districts with a population of 7,500 or more people were assumed to be board members of large school districts, and all members from school districts with a population of less than 7,500 were assumed to be board members of small school districts.

Table XXXIX illustrates the differences in scores of effectiveness

---

[1]B. Durbin, "In Defense of Small Town Boards," School Executive, LII (November, 1938), 22.

[2]J. Burnham, "Makeup of the Small Town School Board," American School Board Journal, CV (August, 1942), 37.

that existed between the board members of large school districts and the board members of small districts in this study:

TABLE XXXIX

BOARD MEMBERS OF LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND THEIR SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Board Members of Large and Small School Districts	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
1. Board members of large school districts	23	50	30	7	110
2. Board members of small school districts	20	94	71	38	223
Totals	43	144	101	45	333

The board members of large school districts had twenty-three very high scores as compared with seven very low scores and eighty-three members with scores of effectiveness above the mean as compared with thirty-seven members with scores of effectiveness below the mean. The board members of small school districts had twenty very high scores as compared with thirty-eight very low scores.

The mean score of effectiveness for the board members of large school districts was 418, and the mean score of effectiveness for the board members of small school districts was 382, a difference of thirty-six points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 3.81 was found. Since, for this table, a t-ratio of 3.32 was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that a very significant difference existed between the mean scores of effectiveness of the board members of large school districts and the board members of small school districts.

Table XL presents the scores of effectiveness for this experiment in fourths and provides an opportunity for comparing observed frequencies with the expected one fourth:

TABLE XL

BOARD MEMBERS OF LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND THEIR SCORES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Board Members of Large and Small School Districts	Scores of Effectiveness				
	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth	Total
1. Board members of large school districts	45	22	25	18	110
2. Board members of small school districts	38	61	58	66	223
Totals	83	83	83	84	333

The board members of large school districts had forty-five scores in the upper fourth as compared with eighteen scores in the lower fourth and sixty-seven scores in the upper half as compared with forty-three scores in the lower half. The board members of the small school districts had thirty-eight scores in the upper fourth as compared with sixty-six scores in the lower fourth and ninety-nine scores in the upper half as compared with 124 scores in the lower half.

Hoel and McCracken[3] found that the board members of larger districts (1) had a higher average educational attainment than the members of smaller districts, (2) were more open-minded than the members from smaller districts, and (3) had longer tenure on the school board than members from smaller districts.

---

[3]C. E. Hoel and C. C. McCracken, "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members in Ohio," American School Board Journal, CXXV (December, 1927), 39-41.

The National Education Association study[4] found 70-75 per cent of the school boards in districts with a population of 2,500 or more to be rated "distinctly above average;" whereas only twenty-eight per cent of the school boards in smaller districts rated "distinctly above average."

Summary

Using a school district population of 7,500 as the dividing line, this investigator found that there were 110 board members of large school districts and 223 board members of small districts in this study. The board members of large school districts had a mean score of effectiveness of 418, and the board members of small school districts had a mean score of effectiveness of 382, a difference of thirty-six points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio was found that was significant at the .001 level of significance.

---

[4]National Education Association, Status and Practices of Boards of Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (Washington, D. C., 1946), p. 75.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to (1) report the socio-economic status of Arizona's school board members, (2) determine the relationship of the effectiveness of school board members to certain socio-economic factors, and (3) determine the differences in scores of effectiveness existing between the board members of large school districts and the board members of small school districts in this study.

The data-gathering instrument had two parts: (1) the "Checklist For Board Members Socio-Economic Identity" and (2) the "Checklist For Board Members Effectiveness." Thus the data-gathering instrument provided that each of the 333 board members in this study had his own socio-economic identity and his own score of effectiveness associated together on his own individual return. The responding superintendents furnished all of the data for this study. The scores of effectiveness were divided into four categories: (1) Very High (higher than one standard deviation above the mean); (2) High (between the mean and one standard deviation above the mean); (3) Low (between the mean and one standard deviation below the mean); (4) Very Low (lower than one standard deviation below the mean). These four categories were cross-tabulated with the classes of the nineteen socio-economic factors in such manner as to associate the very high, high, low, and very low scores with their counterpart in the socio-economic classes (see Appendix C). The classified data provided by the tabulation permitted calculation of statistical significance of

differences (relationship) for each factor. The null hypothesis was assumed tenable in any case where the statistical significance of differences failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

Summary

Sex. The membership of this study was very predominantly male (91.9 per cent).

The mean scores of effectiveness for the female and the male respectively was 411 and 393, a difference of eighteen points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 1.00 was found. Since for the sex table a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that sex was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Age. The forty to fifty years of age class was largest (43.9 per cent), and the thirty to forty years of age class was next largest (34.5 per cent).

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to the age table, a chi-square value of 20.81 was found. Since for the age table a chi-square value of 19.58 was necessary for the .02 level of significance, it was concluded that age was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members. This was a negative relationship, with the younger members making better scores than the older members. The sixty years and over class made a good record, but the tally for the class was so little (18) that it had little effect on the result.

Marital Status. All of the membership had married, and 91 per cent had never been divorced.

The married and never divorced class had a mean score of effectiveness

of 394 as compared with a mean score of 381 for the divorced class, a difference of thirteen points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of .69 was found. Since for the marital status table a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that marital status was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Education. The great majority of the membership (82.3 per cent) had a high school diploma or above, and 26.7 per cent had a bachelor's degree or above. In 1946 approximately 25 per cent of the adult public had a high school diploma, and less than 4 per cent of the adult public had a bachelor's degree.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 28.54 was found. Since for the education table a chi-square of 22.50 was all that was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that education was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members. This was a positive relationship, with the higher levels of educational attainment being associated with higher scores of effectiveness and the lower levels of educational attainment being associated with lower scores of effectiveness.

Occupation. Proprietors, managers, and agriculturists made up 71.5 per cent of the membership of this study. These same three occupations made up less than 20 per cent of the nation's major occupation group and a still smaller percentage of the people eligible for the school board office.

The mean scores of effectiveness ranged from lawyers (438) and doctors (429) to clerical workers (330). When the significance of the mean differences was tested, an F-ratio of 1.68 was found. Since for

the occupation table an F-ratio of 1.91 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that occupation was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Teaching Experience. The vast majority of the membership (91.6 per cent) of this study did not have teaching experience.

The mean score of effectiveness of the class with teaching experience was 385, and the mean score for the class without teaching experience was 395, a difference of ten points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of .62 was found. Since for the teaching experience table a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that teaching experience was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Family Income. Most of Arizona's school board members came from the above-average income class (70.9 per cent), and a substantial number (28.2 per cent) came from the average income class.

The above-average class had a mean score of effectiveness of 408, and the remainder had a mean score of 359, a difference of forty-nine points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 5.35 was found. Since for the family income table a t-ratio of 3.32 was all that was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that family income was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Above-average family income was associated with above-average scores of effectiveness and the remainder was associated with average and below-average scores of effectiveness.

Property Ownership. The above-average property owners were 55.4 per cent of the membership, and the average property owners were 40.4

per cent of the membership.

The mean score of effectiveness of the above-average property owners was 403, and the mean score for the remainder was 382, a difference of twenty-one points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 2.48 was found. Since for the property ownership table a t-ratio of 2.35 was necessary for the .02 level of significance, it was concluded that property ownership was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The above-average property owners were associated with above-average scores of effectiveness and the remainder was associated with average and below-average scores of effectiveness.

Community's Respect for Member's Spouse. The above-average respect class made up 50.8 per cent of the membership of this study, and the average respect class had 45.5 per cent of the membership.

The mean score of effectiveness for the above-average class was 424, and the mean score for the remainder was 362, a difference of sixty-two points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 7.75 was found. Since for this table a t-ratio of 3.32 was all that was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that the community's respect for the member's spouse was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The above-average respect class was associated with above-average scores of effectiveness and the remainder was associated with average and below-average scores of effectiveness.

Number of Member's Children. Only four members out of the 333 in in this study had no children. The one or two children class (45.4 per cent) and the three or four-children class (42 per cent) made up the

vast majority of the membership.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 6.43 was found. Since for this table a chi-square value of 12.59 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that the number of the member's children was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

* School Success of Member's Children. The successful at school class made up 62.9 per cent of the membership, and the average at school class made up 36.5 per cent of the membership.

The mean score of effectiveness for the successful at school class was 411, and the mean score for the remainder was 365, a difference of forty-six points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 5.37 was found. Since for this table a t-ratio of 3.32 was all that was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that the school success of the member's children was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The successful at school class was associated with the better scores of effectiveness and the remainder was associated with lower scores of effectiveness.

* Political Activity. The vast majority of the membership (83.5 per cent) had a normal interest in politics. Only 9.3 per cent were reputedly politicians, and 7.2 per cent reputedly had less than a normal interest in politics.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to the political activity table, a chi-square value of 18.09 was found. Since for this table a chi-square value of 16.81 was all that was necessary for the .01 level of significance, it was concluded that political activity was a

determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members. This relationship was positive, with normal interest in politics being associated with better scores of effectiveness and the politicians and those with less than normal interest being associated with lower scores of effectiveness.

Political Affiliation. The Democrats (78 per cent of the membership) outnumbered the Republicans almost four to one. Only one member out of the 333 in the study was classified other than Democrat or Republican.

The mean scores of effectiveness for the Democrats and the Republicans were 390 and 398 respectively, a difference of eight points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of .74 was found. Since for the political affiliation table a t-ratio of 1.97 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that political affiliation was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Fraternal Affiliation. A majority of the members (57.8 per cent) had no fraternal affiliation. Among the fraternal orders only the Masons were well represented (29.2 per cent).

The differences of the mean scores of effectiveness among the classes would not have been great except that the Knights of Columbus made poor scores of effectiveness. When the significance of the differences between the classes was tested, an F-ratio of 5.62 was found. Since for the fraternal affiliation table an F-ratio of 4.75 was all that was necessary for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that fraternal affiliation was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Service Club Affiliation. Exactly 50 per cent of the membership had no service club affiliation. The service clubs with largest representation were: Rotary (18.8 per cent), Lions (13.9 per cent), and Kiwanis (8.4 per cent).

The mean scores of effectiveness among the classes of this factor ranged from 423 to 381. When the significance of these mean differences was tested, an F-ratio of 2.50 was found. Since for this table an F-ratio of 2.41 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that service club affiliation was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

In a search for significant differences between any two means, it was found that the Kiwanis class differed from the no service club affiliation class at the .05 level of significance.

Service club affiliates made slightly better scores of effectiveness than the unaffiliated. Kiwanians and Lions made the best scores.

Church Affiliation. A substantial majority (84.6 per cent) were affiliated with some church. The churches with the largest representation were: Methodist (25.9 per cent), Latter Day Saints (13.5 per cent), and Baptist (13.2 per cent).

The mean scores of effectiveness for the classes ranged from the Baptists (422) to the Catholics (357). When the significance of these mean differences was tested, an F-ratio of 3.44 was found. Since for the church affiliation table an F-ratio of 3.17 will qualify for the .01 level of significance, it was concluded that church affiliation was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

In another search for differences between any two means (using the confidence interval technique), the investigator found that the Baptists

differed from the Catholics and the Latter Day Saints at the .05 level of significance.

, Religious Activity. A majority of the membership (67.9 per cent) had a non-partisan--normal interest in this area. A surprising 26.7 per cent had less than normal interest in religious activity, and 5.4 per cent were overzealous and partisan.

The mean scores of effectiveness for (1) the non-partisan--normal interest class, (2) the less than normal interest class, and (3) the overzealous and partisan class were 407, 375, and 322 respectively. When the significance of these differences was tested, an F-ratio of 14.09 was found. Since for the religious activity table an F-ratio of 7.15 will qualify for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that religious activity was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The non-partisan--normal interest class was associated with the better scores of effectiveness and the overzealous and partisan and the less than normal interest classes were associated with the lower scores of effectiveness.

Length of Residence in Community. A substantial majority (81.4 per cent) had resided in their home community more than ten years. Almost a half (45.4 per cent) had twenty or more years residence in their home community.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 7.45 was found. Since for this table a chi-square value of 12.59 was necessary for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that length of residence in the community was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

Length of School Board Service. Most of the membership (85 per cent) had less than ten years of board service. Almost a half (48.4 per cent) of the membership had less than five years service.

When the chi-square test of independence was applied to this table, a chi-square value of 4.37 was found. Since for this table a chi-square value of 12.59 was required for the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that length of school board service was not a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The Differences in the Scores of Effectiveness Between the Board Members of the Large School Districts and the Board Members of the Small School Districts in This Study. Using a school district population of 7,500 as the dividing line, the investigator found 110 board members from large school districts and 223 board members from small school districts in this study.

The mean score of effectiveness for the members from the large school districts was 418, and the mean score of the members from the small school districts was 382, a difference of thirty-six points. When the significance of this difference was tested, a t-ratio of 3.81 was found. Since for this table a t-ratio of 3.32 will qualify for the .001 level of significance, it was concluded that size of school district was a determining factor in relation to the effectiveness of school board members.

The board members from the large school districts were associated with better scores of effectiveness and the board members from the small school districts were associated with lower scores of effectiveness.

Conclusions

Regarding Status. The membership of this study for the most part

came from a select socio-economic group. The membership, in general, had normal interests, participated in community activities in a normal manner, and affiliated themselves with worthwhile community organizations. The membership was above average in most respects and was successful in most of their endeavors.

Regarding Relationships. At the .001 level of significance the effectiveness of school board members was concluded to be related to the following six socio-economic factors: (1) Education, (2) Family Income, (3) Community's Respect for Member's Spouse, (4) School Success of Member's Children, (5) Fraternal Affiliation, and (6) Religious Activity.

At the .01 level of significance the effectiveness of school board members was concluded to be related to the following two socio-economic factors: (1) Political Activity and (2) Church Affiliation.

At the .02 level of significance the effectiveness of school board members was concluded to be related to the following two socio-economic factors: (1) Age and (2) Property Ownership.

At the .05 level of significance the effectiveness of school board members was concluded to be related to "Service Club Affiliation."

The remaining eight factors studied were associated with effectiveness in varying degrees of lesser significance as follows: (1) Occupation (.10 level), (2) Sex (.30 level), (3) Length of Residence in Community (.30 level), (4) Number of Member's Children (.40 level), (5) Political Affiliation (.45 level), (6) Teaching Experience (.50 level), (7) Marital Status (.50 level), and (8) Length of School Board Service (.60 level).

Regarding Differences in Effectiveness Between Members From Large Districts and Members From Small Districts. The 110 members from large districts had a mean score of effectiveness of 418, and the 223 members

from small districts had a mean score of 382, a difference of thirty-six points. When the significance of this difference was tested, it was observed at the .001 level of significance. Thus, it was concluded that differences in effectiveness did exist between the members from large districts and the members from small districts.

Recommendations

Nominating committees and other groups who have the responsibility of proposing candidates for the school board could very well examine this study and related studies. Determination of the best methods for utilizing the conclusions of this study and related studies would make a good problem for another investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association. The School Board Member in Action. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1949.

American Association of School Administrators. School Boards in Action (Twenty-Fourth Yearbook). Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1946.

American Association of School Administrators. School Board-Superintendent Relationships (Thirty-Fourth Yearbook). Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956.

Almack, J. C. The School Board Member. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Barr, Arvil, Robert A. Davis, and Palmer O. Johnson. Educational Research and Appraisal. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953.

Campbell, R. F. Administration of Public Education. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1952.

*Chancellor, W. E. Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision. New York: D. C. Heath Company, 1908.

*Cubberley, E. P. Public School Administration. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1916.

*Counts, G. C. The Social Composition of Boards of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Davies, D. R., and F. W. Hosler. The Challenge of School Board Membership. New York: Chartwell House, 1949.

Davies, D. R., and E. L. Prestwood. Practical School Board Procedures. New York: Chartwell House, 1951.

Garrett, H. E. Statistics in Education and Psychology. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1946.

*Golenpaul, Dan, ed. Information Please Almanac. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.

Hagman, H. L. A Handbook For The School Board Member. Topeka, Kansas: School Activities Publishing Company, 1941.

*Hansen, Harry, ed. The World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: The World Telegram and Sun, 1952.

*Hansen, Harry, ed. The World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: The World Telegram and Sun, 1955.

Hunkins, R. V. Superintendent and School Board. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1949.

Meece, L. E., and C. R. Spain. Manual For School Board Members. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1949.

*Moehlman, A. B. School Administration. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1940.

*National Educational Association, Research Division. "Status and Practices of Boards of Education." Research Bulletin, XXIV (April, 1946), 83.

Reeder, W. G. School Boards and Superintendents. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.

*Reeves, C. E. School Boards: Their Status and Functions and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall Company, 1954.

*Material referred to in the text.

Periodicals

A Board Member. "My Score is On the School Board." American School Board Journal, CXV (February, 1947), 22.

A Mother. "What is Your Score?" American School Board Journal, CXV (September, 1947), 22

Arnett, C. E. "Social Beliefs and Attitudes of Board Members." School and Society, (August, 1946), 255.

Barnhart, Richard E. "Six Characteristics of a Good School Board Member." The Nation's Schools, LII (February, 1954), 82-83.

Bills, R. E. "Selecting Better School Board Members." School Executive, (February, 1954), 19-21.

Birch, C. E. "School Board Members Nobody Wants." American School Board Journal, CI (July, 1940), 27.

Bowden, R. D. "Test Your Ability to Serve." The Nation's Schools, XXXII (November, 1943), 45.

Brown, R. H. "Composition of School Boards." American School Board Journal, CXXIX (August, 1954), 23-24.

*Burnham, J. "Makeup of the Small Town School Board." American School Board Journal, CV (August, 1942), 37.

Campbell, R. F. "Methods Used to Nominate and Elect Local School Boards." American School Board Journal, CXX (March, 1950), 27-28.

Chambers, M. M. "Educational Qualifications For School Board Members." The Nation's Schools, XXII (December, 1943), 23.

*Charters, W. W., Jr. "Research on School Board Personnel: Critique and Prospectus." Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (January, 1954), 321-335.

Clifford, J. M. "Function of the School Board." American School Board Journal, CXXIII (September, 1951), 21-24.

Connecticut Department of Education. "Self Rating Checklist For School Board Members." American School Board Journal, CVIII (April, 1944), 23.

Cooper, John M., and W. Earl Brown. "Orienting the New School Board Member." American School Board Journal, CXXVIII (May, 1954), 31-32.

Cooke, D. H. "He is a Good Board Member." The Nation's Schools, XXI (June, 1938), 31-33.

*Cooke, D. H. "Portrait of a Good School Board Member." The Nation's Schools, XXVII (February, 1941), 58-59.

*Cooke, D. H. "Rating School Board Members." The Nation's Schools, XXI (February, 1938), 34.

*Durbin, B. "In Defense of Small Town Boards." The School Executive, LII (November, 1938), 22.

Edmonson, J. B. "Qualifications Which Make For School Board Success." American School Board Journal, XCV (July, 1937), 27.

Edwards, Newton. "Role of the Board of Education in a Democratic Society." School Management, XVII (January, 1948), 18-19.

Elsbree, W. "Efficient School Board Member." American School Board Journal, XCIII (September, 1936), 77.

Ganders, H. S. "Should Board Members be Educators." American School Board Journal, XCII (April, 1936), 17.

Gragg, W. L. "Nominating Candidates For School Boards." American School Board Journal, CXXVIII (April, 1954), 56-57.

Grieder, Calvin. "School Boards." School Executive, LXXIV (January, 1955), 72-73.

Hagman, Harlan L., and Alfred Schwartz. "Boards of Education." Review of Educational Research, XXII (October, 1952), 280-282.

Heugh, W. C. "How to Get a Good School Board Member." The Nation's Schools, XL (November, 1947), 26-27.

Hickey, M. A. "How Good is Yours?" Ladies Home Journal, LXVI (October, 1949), 23.

*Hoel, C. E., and C. C. McCracken. "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members." American School Board Journal Journal, LXXV (December, 1927), 39.41.

Irwin, W. B. "Who's Who On The School Board." School Executive, LX (August, 1941), 13.

Jardine, A. "How Does Your Board Rate?" American School Board Journal, CXXIX (August, 1954), 25-26.

Jardine, A. "Selection and Composition of School Boards." American School Board Journal, CXXVI (February, 1953), 25-26.

Jimerson, J. A. "Qualities of a Good School Officer." American School Board Journal, CI (August, 1940), 25.

Johnston, T. C. "Do Sound Principles Guide Board Members?" American School Board Journal, CXXVII (November, 1953), 57.

Jones, H. R. "Bill of Rights For School Board Members." Education Digest, XVII (February, 1953), 28-31.

Jones, H. R. "Characteristics of a Good School Board Member." American School Board Journal, CXXX (February, 1955), 61.

Jones, J. W. "Social and Civic Composition of South Dakota Boards of Education." American School Board Journal, XCIII (August, 1936), 30.

*Judd, Charles H. "School Boards As An Obstruction to Good Administration." The Nation's Schools, XIII (February, 1934), 13-15.

Kumpf, W. H. "If Educators Could Choose School Boards." American School Board Journal, XCV (March, 1936), 32.

Kirk, P. L. "Do You Have a Good Board of Education?" American School Board Journal, CXXIV (April, 1952), 33-34.

Lamers, W. M. "Are You a Superior School Board Member?" American School Board Journal, CXXIV (May, 1952), 34-37.

Lane, P. W. "Effective School Boards." American School Board Journal, SCVIII (June, 1939), 31.

McFarland, K. W. "Qualifications For Successful Membership." School Executive, LXVI (August, 1947), 40-41.

Mulford, H. B. "Wanted: A Fresh Factual Study of American School Boards." School and Society, LVIII (October, 1943), 281.

Nichols, W. B. "Schoolmen Make Poor Board Members." American School Board Journal, CVII (December, 1943), 26.

Routh, R. A. "Personal and Professional Qualifications of School Board Members in Indiana." American School Board Journal, XCIII (December, 1936), 21.

Sears, W. M. "Board of Education Business Efficiency Rating Cards." American School Board Journal, XCI (December, 1935), 28.

Shannon, J. R. "What 1000 Terre Haute Citizens Look For in Voting For School Board Members." American School Board Journal, CXIV (February, 1947), 29-30.

*Struble, G. G. "A Study of School Board Personnel." American School Board Journal, LXV (October, 1922), 48-49.

Stumpf, W. A., and W. Starr Miller. "Boards of Education: Elective or Appointive?" American School Board Journal, CXXV (August, 1952), 19.

Tope, R. E. "Superintendents View of the School Board." American School Board Journal, XCV (November, 1937), 49.

Weeks, Ila D. "Nine Rules For Working Effectively With The School Board." The Nation's Schools, XLVIII (August, 1951), 39-40.

Whalen, R. E. "Who Makes An Effective Board Member?" Phi Delta Kappan, XXXV (June, 1954), 392.

Wymm, L. "Qualifications of a School Board Member." American School Board Journal, XCII (March, 1936), 32.

*Material referred to in the text.

Unpublished Materials

*Barnhart, R. E. "The Critical Requirements For School Board Membership Based Upon an Analysis of Critical Incidents." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1952.

*Battles, L. F. "A Study of the Personnel of Oklahoma School Boards in Cities with Population from 2000 to 5000 Inclusive." Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1929.

Brown, B. F. "A Critical Analysis of the Functions of the Board of Trustees in the Administration of the County School Systems in Florida." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, University of Florida, 1954.

*Brubaker, H. B. "An Evaluation of the Operation of Indiana School Boards and an Investigation of Related Areas." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, University of Missouri, 1950.

Crowell, R. A. "Regulations Pertaining to Missouri's Teachers, Principals and Superintendents as Defined by Written Rules and Regulations of the Local Board of Education." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, University of Missouri, 1950.

Gould, W. E. "A Study of School Board Elections in Santa Clara County." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Stanford University, 1954.

Hazelbaker, N. D. "An Analysis of Certain Methods and Procedures Used by Local Board of Education in Arkansas." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1953.

*McGhehey, M. A. "A Comparison of School Board Selection and Orientation Procedures." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1952.

Poindexter, R. J. "The Selection of School Board Members in the Forty-Eight States." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1950.

*Whalen, R. E. "Effectiveness of Elected and Appointed School Board Members." Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1953.

*Material referred to in the text.

APPENDIX

A. Letter of Explanation to Respondents

B. Data-Gathering Instrument

C. Official Tabulation of Data

D. Tabulation of Data in Fourths

E. Key of Weighted Values

APPENDIX "A"

Dear Fellow Superintendent:

A very few minutes of your time will help me work toward the solution of one of our common professional problems.

This study hopes to identify to some extent the type of people who perform best as board members and, conversely, who perform worst. The forms do not ask for names of people or schools and the study will be so conducted that embarrassment cannot arise for anyone. The study will be submitted to a midwestern institution and a general report of findings will be sent to all who furnish data.

You will note that Part One of the form requests you to check each of your board members through a socio-economic checklist. The information sought in this checklist is relatively objective. Part Two of the form requests you to check each of your board members through a checklist for effectiveness. You can give validity to this checklist by being as impersonal as human nature will permit.

I shall be very grateful if you will complete these forms and send them to me at your early convenience in the stamped and addressed envelope enclosed.

Respectfully,

W. F. Pittman, Superintendent
Holbrook Public Schools
Holbrook, Arizona

APPENDIX "B"

Board Member # . . . . . .

Part One

CHECKLIST FOR BOARD MEMBER'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC IDENTITY

Directions: You are asked to provide the following information on the board member by placing checkmarks (✓) in the appropriate squares.

I. Sex (check one only)

1. Male . . . . . ☐
2. Female . . . . . ☐

II. Age (check one only)

3. Less than thirty years of age . . . . . ☐
4. Thirty to forty years of age . . . . . ☐
5. Forty to fifty years of age . . . . . ☐
6. Fifty to sixty years of age . . . . . ☐
7. Sixty years of age and older . . . . . ☐

III. Marital Status (check one only)

8. Married and never divorced . . . . . ☐
9. Divorced and remarried . . . . . ☐
10. Widowed . . . . . ☐
11. Never married . . . . . ☐

IV. Education (check one only . . . . . ☐

12. Less than eighth grade diploma . . . . . ☐
13. Eighth grade diploma, but less than high school diploma . ☐
14. High School diploma, but less than bachelor's degree . . ☐
15. Bachelor's degree and greater . . . . . ☐

V. Occupation (check one only)

16. Agricultural (farming, ranching, etc.) . . . . . ☐
17. Banker (bank officer with financial interest) . . . . . ☐
18. Clerical . . . . . ☐
19. Doctor (medicine or dentistry) . . . . . ☐
20. Lawyer . . . . . ☐
21. Manager (of another's business) . . . . . ☐
22. Proprietor (of his own business) . . . . . ☐
23. Retired . . . . . ☐
24. Union protected employee . . . . . ☐
25. Other (state which) . . . . . ☐

VI. Teaching Experience (check one only)

26. Was in the teaching profession at one time . . . . . ☐
27. Was never in the teaching profession . . . . . ☐

APPENDIX "B" (Continued

VII. Family Income (check one only)
28. Above average for this community . . . . . ☐
29. Average for this community . . . . . ☐
30. Below average for this community . . . . . ☐

VIII. Property Ownership (check one only)
31. Above average for this community . . . . . ☐
32. Average for this community . . . . . ☐
33. Below Average for this community . . . . . ☐

IX. Community's Respect For Member's Spouse (check one only)
34. Above average for this community . . . . . ☐
35. Average for this community . . . . . ☐
36. Below average for this community . . . . . ☐

X. Number of Member's Children (check one only)
37. No children . . . . . ☐
38. One or two children . . . . . ☐
39. Three or four chilcren . . . . . ☐
40. Five or six children . . . . . ☐
41. Seven or more children . . . . . ☐

XI. School Success of Member's Children (check one--if applicable)
42. Were (or are) successful at school . . . . . ☐
43. Were (or are) average at school . . . . . ☐
44. Were (or are) unsuccessful at school . . . . . ☐

XII. Political Activity (check one only)
45. Has a reputation as a politician . . . . . ☐
46. Has a normal interest in politics . . . . . ☐
47. Has less than normal interest in politics . . . . . ☐

XIII. Political Affiliation (check one only)
48. Democrat . . . . . ☐
49. Republican . . . . . ☐
50. Other (state which) . . . . . ☐

XIV. Fraternal Affiliation (check one only)
51. Knights of Columbus . . . . . ☐
52. Odd Fellows . . . . . ☐
53. Masons . . . . . ☐
54. Other (state which) . . . . . ☐
55. No fraternal affiliation . . . . . ☐

XV. Service Club Affiliation (check one only)
56. Kiwanis . . . . . ☐
57. Lions . . . . . ☐
58. Rotary . . . . . ☐
59. Other (state which) . . . . . ☐
60. No service club affiliation . . . . . ☐

XVI. Church Affiliation (check one only)

61. Baptist . . . . . ☐
62. Catholic . . . . . ☐
63. Latter Day Saints . . . . . ☐
64. Methodist . . . . . ☐
65. Other (state which) . . . . . ☐
66. No church affiliation . . . . . ☐

XVII. Religious Activity (check one only)

67. Overzealous and partisan . . . . . ☐
68. Non-partisan--normal interest . . . . . ☐
69. Less than normal interest . . . . . ☐

XVIII. Length of Residence in Community (check one only)

70. Less than ten years . . . . . ☐
71. Ten to twenty years . . . . . ☐
72. Twenty years or more . . . . . ☐

XIX. Length of School Board Service (check one only)

73. Less than five years . . . . . ☐
74. Five to ten years . . . . . ☐
75. Ten years and more . . . . . ☐

PART TWO--CHECKLIST FOR BOARD MEMBER'S EFFECTIVENESS

Directions: You are asked to judge the board member on the basis of his actual performance on each of the following items by indicating his standing with a checkmark ( ) at the appropriate position on the scale.

1. Recognizes superintendents as the school executive and supports him

Superior — Good — Average — Fair — Inferior

2. Recognizes the nature and importance of his own legislative-appraisal capacity.

Superior — Good — Average — Fair — Inferior

3. Plans for the future--has a progressive outlook on district's problems

Superior — Good — Average — Fair — Inferior

4. Has intelligence, judgment, common sense, and is open-minded

Superior — Good — Average — Fair — Inferior

5. Represents all children--does not seek favors for family or friend

Superior — Good — Average — Fair — Inferior

6. Allows professional employees freedom and security, but holds them accountable for results

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

7. Believes in the best employees and facilities that the district can afford

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

8. Enjoys being a board member, builds good will, absorbs criticism graciously

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

9. Is cooperative, courteous, tolerant, tactful, loyal, and confidential

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

10. Is free of undesirable affiliations (personal, business, religious, fraternal, or political)

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

11. Has an enthusiastic interest and belief in public schools and their worth

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

12. Has character and reputation--is honest and sincere

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

13. Has no prejudice--will not pledge his support for anything in advance

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

14. Has a deep interest in the community as a whole

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

15. Has a high degree of effectiveness in general as a board member

Superior Good Average Fair Inferior

APPENDIX "C"

OFFICIAL TABULATION

$\bar{X}$ = Mean Average S = Standard Deviation	Very High More Than $\bar{X}+S$	High $\bar{X}+S$	Low $\bar{X}-S$	Very Low Less Than $\bar{X}-S$
I. Sex (check one only)				
1. Male	38	131	94	43
2. Female	5	13	7	2
II. Age (check one only)				
3. Less than thirty years of age	2	1	4	0
4. Thirty to forty years of age	18	48	33	16
5. Forty to fifty years of age	14	74	37	21
6. Fifty to sixty years of age	5	11	24	7
7. Sixty years of age and older	4	10	3	1
III. Marital Status (check one only)				
8. Married and never divorced	37	132	92	42
9. Divorced and remarried	3	6	7	2
10. Widowed	3	6	2	1
11. Never married	0	0	0	0
IV. Education (check one only)				
12. Less than eighth grade diploma	2	4	5	2
13. Eighth grade diploma, but less than high school diploma	6	6	19	15
14. High school diploma, but less than bachelor's degree	21	83	59	22
15. Bachelor's degree and greater	14	41	18	6
V. Occupation (check one only)				
16. Agricultural,(farming, ranching, etc.)	13	35	27	12
17. Banker (bank officer with financial interest)	0	2	2	1
18. Clerical	0	4	2	2
19. Doctor (medicine or dentistry)	2	4	3	0
20. Lawyer	2	6	2	0
21. Manager (of another's business)	2	21	11	5
22. Proprietor (of his own business)	10	56	35	10
23. Retired	1	1	0	1
24. Union protected employee	3	8	9	6
25. Other (state which)	5	11	9	8
VI. Teaching Experience (check one only)				
26. Was in the teaching profession at one time	1	16	8	3
27. Was never in the teaching profession	42	128	92	42

APPENDIX "C" (Continued)

OFFICIAL TABULATION (Continued)

$\bar{X}$ = Mean Average S = Standard Deviation	Very High More Than $\bar{X}+S$	High $\bar{X}+S$	Low $\bar{X}-S$	Very Low Less Than $\bar{X}-S$
VII. Family Income (check one only)				
28. Above average for this community	35	113	69	19
29. Average for this community	8	30	31	25
30. Below average for this community	0	1	1	1
VIII. Property Ownership (check one only)				
31. Above average for this community	27	86	53	19
32. Average for this community	16	52	45	21
33. Below average for this community	0	5	4	5
IX. Community's Respect for Member's Spouse (check one only)				
34. Above average for this community	29	95	35	6
35. Average for this community	13	46	59	30
36. Below average for this community	0	0	4	8
X. Number of Member's Children (check one only)				
37. No children	1	2	1	0
38. One or two children	19	64	46	22
39. Three or four children	19	66	41	14
40. Five or six children	3	9	11	5
41. Seven or more children	1	3	2	4
XI. School Success of Member's Children (check one--if applicable)				
42. Were (or are) successful at school	35	96	59	13
43. Were (or are) average at school	6	42	41	29
44. Were (or are) unsuccessful at school	0	0	0	2
XII. Political Activity (check one only)				
45. Has a reputation as a politician	3	10	8	10
46. Has a normal interest in politics	37	124	89	28
47. Has less than normal interest in politics	3	10	4	7
XIII. Political Affiliation (check one only)				
48. Democrat	32	104	78	36
49. Republican	10	31	21	8
50. Other (state which)	1	0	0	0

APPENDIX "C" (Continued)

OFFICIAL TABULATION (Continued)

$\bar{X}$ = Mean Average S = Standard Deviation	Very High More Than $\bar{X}+S$	High $\bar{X}+S$	Low $\bar{X}-S$	Very Low Less Than $\bar{X}-S$
XIV. Fraternal Affiliation (check one only)				
51. Knights of Columbus	0	2	2	4
52. Odd Fellows	1	2	3	1
53. Masons	13	38	30	9
54. Other (state which)	5	10	7	4
55. No fraternal affiliation	18	78	52	29
XV. Service Club Affiliation (check one only)				
56. Kiwanis	4	17	3	3
57. Lions	6	24	13	2
58. Rotary	13	22	19	7
59. Other (state which)	4	10	13	2
60. No service club affiliation	15	68	48	31
XVI. Church Affiliation (check one only)				
61. Baptist	11	16	14	2
62. Catholic	4	8	6	7
63. Latter Day Saints	2	17	16	9
64. Methodist	7	42	27	8
65. Other (state which)	13	37	21	8
66. No church affiliation	5	20	14	11
XVII. Religious Activity (check one only)				
67. Overzealous and partisan	1	2	9	6
68. Non-partisan--normal interest	35	106	65	20
69. Less than normal interest	7	36	27	19
XVIII. Length of Residence in Community (check one only)				
70. Less than ten years	12	29	16	5
71. Ten to twenty years	18	50	36	16
72. Twenty years or more	13	65	49	24
XIX. Length of School Board Service (check one only)				
73. Less than five years	18	67	50	26
74. Five to ten years	18	52	36	16
75. Ten years and more	7	25	15	3

APPENDIX "D"

TABULATION BY FOURTHS

	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth
I. Sex (check one only)				
1. Male	76	72	79	79
2. Female	7	11	4	5
II. Age (check one only)				
3. Less than thirty years of age	2	1	2	2
4. Thirty to forty years of age	29	24	31	31
5. Forty to fifty years of age	41	43	26	36
6. Fifty to sixty years of age	5	9	20	13
7. Sixty years of age and older	6	6	4	2
III. Marital Status (check one only)				
8. Married and never divorced	75	74	78	76
9. Divorced and remarried	5	3	4	6
10. Widowed	3	6	1	2
11. Never married	0	0	0	0
IV. Education (check one only)				
12. Less than eighth grade diploma	2	4	4	3
13. Eighth grade diploma, but less than high school diploma	7	5	12	22
14. High school diploma, but less than bachelor's degree	40	48	50	47
15. Bachelor's degree and greater	34	26	17	12
V. Occupation (check one only)				
16. Agricultural (farming, ranching, etc.)	21	24	20	22
17. Banker (bank officer with financial interest)	0	1	3	1
18. Clerical	0	3	2	3
19. Doctor (medicine or dentistry)	5	1	2	1
20. Lawyer	5	3	1	1
21. Manager (of another's business)	10	7	13	9
22. Proprietor (of his own business)	28	28	31	24
23. Retired	1	1	0	1
24. Union protected employee	4	7	5	10
25. Other (state which)	9	7	5	12
VI. Teaching Experience (check one only)				
26. Was in the teaching profession at one time	5	12	4	7
27. Was never in the teaching profession	78	71	78	77
VII. Family Income (check one only)				
28. Above average for this community	71	61	60	44
29. Average for this community	12	21	23	38
30. Below average for this community	0	1	0	2

APPENDIX "D" (Continued)

TABULATION BY FOURTHS (Continued)

	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth
VIII. Property Ownership (check one only)				
31. Above average for this community	54	50	42	38
32. Average for this community	28	29	37	40
33. Below average for this community	0	4	4	6
IX. Community's Respect for Member's Spouse (check one only)				
34. Above average for this community	57	56	35	17
35. Average for this community	25	24	43	56
36. Below average for this community	0	0	3	9
X. Number of Member's Children (check one only)				
37. No children	1	1	1	1
38. One or two children	33	39	43	36
39. Three or four children	45	34	28	33
40. Five or six children	3	7	9	9
41. Seven or more children	1	2	2	5
XI. School Success of Member's Children (check one--if applicable)				
42. Were (or are) successful at school	65	54	52	32
43. Were (or are) average at school	15	27	28	48
44. Were (or are) unsuccessful at school	0	0	0	2
XII. Political Activity (check one only)				
45. Has a reputation as a politician	4	8	4	15
46. Has a normal interest in politics	73	71	72	62
47. Has less than normal interest in politics	6	4	7	7
XIII. Political Affiliation (check one only)				
48. Democrat	59	64	62	65
49. Republican	20	15	17	18
50. Other (state which)	1	0	0	0
XIV. Fraternal Affiliation (check one only)				
51. Knights of Columbus	0	1	1	5
52. Odd Fellows	1	2	1	3
53. Masons	26	20	21	23
54. Other (state which)	6	8	5	7
55. No fraternal affiliation	38	44	47	49

APPENDIX "D" (Continued)

TABULATION BY FOURTHS (Continued)

	Upper Fourth	Third Fourth	Second Fourth	Lower Fourth
XV. Service Club Affiliation (check one only)				
56. Kiwanis	12	8	1	6
57. Lions	15	11	12	7
58. Rotary	16	14	15	16
59. Other (state which)	6	6	12	5
60. No service club affiliation	31	43	40	48
XVI. Church Affiliation (check one only)				
61. Baptist	18	8	11	6
62. Catholic	6	5	3	11
63. Latter Day Saints	5	11	10	18
64. Methodist	18	22	27	17
65. Other (state which)	25	21	16	17
66. No church affiliation	10	12	14	14
XVII. Religious Activity (check one only)				
67. Overzealous and partisan	1	2	3	12
68. Non-partisan--normal interest	69	57	55	45
69. Less than normal interest	13	24	25	27
XVIII. Length of Residence in Community				
70. Less than ten years	18	18	15	11
71. Ten to twenty years	32	27	31	30
72. Twenty years or more	33	38	37	43
XIX. Length of School Board Service (check one only)				
73. Less than five years	37	37	41	46
74. Five to ten years	30	31	30	31
75. Ten years and more	16	15	12	7

APPENDIX "E"

KEY OF WEIGHTED VALUES
To be Applied to
PART TWO--CHECKLIST FOR BOARD MEMBER'S EFFECTIVENESS
To gain board member's effectiveness score

1. Recognizes superintendent as the school executive and supports him.

64	48	32	16	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

2. Recognizes the nature and importance of his own legislative-appraisal capacity.

60	45	30	15	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

3. Plans for the future--has a progressive outlook on district's problems.

48	36	24	12	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

4. Has intelligence, judgment, common sense and is open minded.

48	36	24	12	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

5. Represents all children--does not seek favors for family or friends.

36	27	18	9	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

6. Allows professional employees freedom and security, but holds them accountable for results.

36	27	18	9	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

7. Believes in the best employees and facilities that the district can afford.

32	24	16	8	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

8. Enjoys being a good board member, builds good will, absorbs criticism graciously.

32	24	16	8	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

9. Is cooperative, courteous, tolerant, tactful, loyal and confidential.

32	24	16	8	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

APPENDIX "E" (Continued)

10. Is free of undesirable affiliations (personal, business, religious, fraternal or political).

28	21	14	7	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

11. Has an enthusiastic interest and belief in public schools and their worth.

28	21	14	7	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

12. Has character and reputation--is honest and sincere.

24	18	12	6	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

13. Has no prejudice--will not pledge his support for anything in advance.

16	12	8	4	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

14. Has a deep interest in the community as a whole.

16	12	8	1	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

15. Has a high degree of effectiveness in general as a board member.

500	375	250	125	0
Superior	Good	Average	Fair	Inferior

500 Possible Points

VITA

Wesley Francis Pittman, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO CERTAIN SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal data: Born at Bluff City, Kansas, on October 14, 1913, the son of Wesley Francis and Bessie Hollingsworth Pittman.

Education: Attended grade school and high school at Waynoka, Oklahoma; graduated from Waynoka High School in 1932; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Northwestern State College in 1936; received the Master of Science degree from the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1943; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in May, 1957.

Professional experience: Twenty years in education; fourteen years as a superintendent of schools (in present superintendency since 1947).

THESIS TITLE: The Relationship of the Effectiveness of School Board Members to Certain Socio-Economic Factors

AUTHOR: Wesley Francis Pittman, Jr.

THESIS ADVISER: Dr. M. R. Chauncey

The content and form have been checked and approved by the thesis adviser. The Graduate School office assumes no responsibility for errors either in form or content. The copies are sent to the bindery just as they are approved by the author and faculty adviser.

TYPIST: Raymond Denny