

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POSITION OF OKLAHOMA  
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ON A SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL  
PROGRESSIVISM AND CERTAIN SOCIAL  
AND ECONOMIC FACTORS

By

BRIAN ALLEN LOTVEN

Bachelor of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1968

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
July, 1975

MAY 12 1976

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POSITION OF OKLAHOMA  
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ON A SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL  
PROGRESSIVISM AND CERTAIN SOCIAL  
AND ECONOMIC FACTORS

Thesis Approved:

*Daniel Selakovich*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Bill F. Elson*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Neil [unclear]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Thomas [unclear]*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*N. N. Duden*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

938959

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Dan Selakovich, who served as Chairman of his advisory committee, for his invaluable counseling, assistance, and guidance in writing this dissertation. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Billy Elsom, Dr. Thomas Karman, and Dr. Neil Hackett, for their council and assistance.

Special appreciation is expressed to Mr. J. O. Bumpus and Mr. Preston O. Stanley for their contributions without which this dissertation would likely not have been written.

Acknowledgment would be incomplete without my sincere gratitude to my wife, Carol, my children, Jenny and Amy, and my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Morris Lotven, for their constant support, encouragement and understanding.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Assumptions of the Study . . . . .	3
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	3
Review of Selected Literature. . . . .	4
Summary and Organization of the Study . . . . .	14
II. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY. . . . .	15
Selection of the Sample . . . . .	15
Data Collection Procedures . . . . .	16
Instrumentation . . . . .	16
Hypotheses . . . . .	18
Statistical Treatment . . . . .	19
Summary . . . . .	20
III. THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS . . . . .	21
IV. A COMPARISON OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC POSITIONS OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPRESENTING SCHOOLS IN LARGE AND SMALL COMMUNITIES . . . . .	35
Introduction . . . . .	35
Social and Economic Factors . . . . .	35
Summary . . . . .	40
V. RESULTS OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS . . . . .	42
Introduction . . . . .	42
Findings . . . . .	42
Summary . . . . .	57
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH . . . . .	58
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	63

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	65
APPENDICES . . . . .	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. A Summary of the Sample . . . . .	16
II. A Summary of Returned Questionnaires . . . . .	17
III. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Length of Residence in the School District . . . . .	21
IV. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Years of School Board Service . . . . .	22
V. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Education Level . . . . .	23
VI. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Occupation . . . . .	24
VII. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Sex . . . . .	25
VIII. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Age . . . . .	26
IX. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Primary Reason for Serving on the School Board . . . . .	27
X. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Prior Teaching Experience . . . . .	28
XI. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Religious Preference . . . . .	29
XII. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Number of Their Children Currently Enrolled in Public Schools . . . . .	31
XIII. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Race . . . . .	31
XIV. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Income . . . . .	32

Table	Page
XV. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Political Affiliation . . . . .	33
XVI. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members By Future Political Plans . . . . .	34
XVII. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members From Schools in Small and Large Communities According to Education . . . . .	38
XVIII. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members From Schools in Small and Large Communities According to Occupation . . . . .	39
XIX. Distribution of Oklahoma School Board Members From Schools in Small and Large Communities According to Annual Income . . . . .	40
XX. Educational Progressivism and Length of Residence in the School District . . . . .	43
XXI. Educational Progressivism and School Board Service . . . . .	43
XXII. Educational Progressivism and Educational Level . . . . .	44
XXIII. Educational Progressivism and Occupation . . . . .	45
XXIV. Educational Progressivism and Sex . . . . .	46
XXV. Educational Progressivism and Age . . . . .	47
XXVI. Educational Progressivism and Reason for Seeking School Board Membership . . . . .	48
XXVII. Educational Progressivism and Teaching Experience. . . . .	49
XXVIII. Educational Progressivism and Religious Affiliation . . . . .	50
XXIX. Educational Progressivism and Children in Public School . . . . .	51
XXX. Educational Progressivism and Race . . . . .	52
XXXI. Educational Progressivism and Income . . . . .	53
XXXII. Educational Progressivism and Political Affiliation . . . . .	54

Table	Page
XXXIII. Educational Progressivism and Future Political Plans . . . . .	55
XXXIV. Educational Progressivism and Size of Community in Which Member's School Is Located . . . . .	56



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In a 1975 school board election less than seven per cent of the registered voters, in a community of over 400,000 citizens, exercised their voting privilege (1, p. 2). A recent survey found that 63 per cent of the 1,517 adults surveyed could not name anything their school board had done in the last year and 62 per cent did not know that the school board was responsible for public representation within the school system (2, p. 24).

Given the power which rests with the school board, the lack of interest and information regarding this powerful body is disturbing. Whether a school system is good or bad is, in part at least, attributable to the actions of the school board. It is the school board that hires the superintendent and the faculty. In addition, the school board makes policies and decisions regarding the general philosophy of the school, the curriculum, the approval and adoption of budgets, the recommendation of tax levies, building needs and school sites. In all of these tasks the board is charged with communicating local needs and wants to the school staff while interpreting the functions of the school personnel to the members of the community.

The governance of local public schools by locally elected lay citizens is a uniquely American phenomenon. School boards are, in effect, the heart of the local educational system and their actions

establish the pattern for each local school district. Since a democratic society is dependent upon an educated citizenry, it is crucial that those most responsible for the education of future citizens be continually scrutinized. Who are the people that are charged with running the public schools in Oklahoma? What are their social and economic backgrounds? What are their philosophies regarding educational policies and procedures? Are certain social or economic characteristics related to a particular position on educational policies and procedures? The purpose of this research is to investigate these questions.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research is to provide information regarding the social and economic positions of school board members in Oklahoma, as well as their positions on educational policy. Specifically, it seeks to (1) describe some aspects of the social and economic status of those citizens who were serving as public school board members in the state of Oklahoma in 1974 and 1975, (2) examine the relationships between the position of Oklahoma school board members on a scale of educational progressivism and selected social and economic factors, and (3) compare the responses of school board members from schools located in communities with a population of over 10,000 and board members from schools located in communities with populations of under 10,000.

The social and economic factors investigated were: (1) sex, (2) race, (3) age, (4) education, (5) occupation, (6) teaching experience, (7) family income, (8) children enrolled in public school, (9) political affiliation, (10) length of residence in the community, (11) length of

school board service, (12) future political plans, (13) primary reason for serving on the school board, (14) religious affiliation, and, (15) size of community in which the school is located.

#### Assumptions of the Study

For the purposes of this study, the following assumption was accepted by the investigator: that the school board members selected for the study were representative of school board members throughout the state of Oklahoma.

#### Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to a survey of a stratified, randomized sample of 133 school board members from incorporated communities in Oklahoma with a population of at least 500.

2. For purposes of this study, Educational Progressivism was defined as: (1) belief in expression and cultivation of individuality (as opposed to imposition from an authoritarian source), (2) belief in free activity (as opposed to external discipline), (3) belief in learning through experience (as opposed to texts and teachers), (4) belief in acquiring skills as a means of obtaining ends which have direct appeal (as opposed to drill), and (5) belief in making the most of the opportunities of the present (as opposed to preparation for a more or less remote future) (3, 4, 5, 6).

3. For this study, Educational Progressivism was operationally defined as a score of two or above on the scale of educational progressivism.

4. This study was limited by any inherent weaknesses of the instrument.

#### Review of Selected Literature

The review of literature related to this study is divided into two parts. The first part concerns surveys which have sought to investigate the social and economic backgrounds of school board members. The second part examines analytical studies which have attempted to relate the social and economic positions of school board members to some aspect of their performances as school board members.

#### Studies Establishing the Social and Economic Positions of the School Board Members

The first major study dealing with the social composition of school boards was conducted by Counts (7) in 1927. In his study, however, Counts (7) references two earlier works. One was by Nearing, in 1916, who found that 60 per cent of the 967 board members in his sample were from the occupational classifications of merchant, manufacturer, banker, broker, doctor, or lawyer (7, p. 92). Struble, in 1922, found from his sample of 761 school board members that 60 per cent were from the occupational categories of merchant, banker, lawyer, doctor, or business executive (7, p. 93). Counts (7) devised a typology of occupational categories and noted that some categories were poorly represented on school boards (7, p. 93). Fearing that the "favored" or "dominant" class had gained control of the schools and was in a position to legislate policies which would discriminate against the children of the laboring classes, he concluded that members of the employer class made

undesirable school board members because of their conservative outlook (7, p. 94). The conservatism of those school board members was an assumption on Count's (7) part, as was his fear that they might be tempted to run the schools to their own advantage.

Several subsequent studies duplicated Count's (7) findings. Goldhammer (8, p. 90) cited surveys conducted by Hines, 1944; Hunter, 1949; Brown, 1953; Albert, 1959; Holden, 1961; Garmire, 1962; and the National Education Association, 1964. Each of these studies conducted inquiries into the social composition of school boards, and each study concluded that school board members tend to come from the more privileged social and economic segments of the community (8, p. 90). Charters (9) made an exhaustive study which summarized research on school board personnel. According to his findings, over 100 surveys involving the social and economic status of school board members were conducted during the first half of this century (9, p. 449). He concluded, as a result, that any additional surveys would add nothing to the understanding of education (9, p. 449). Summarizing the surveys, he stated:

Every single study of the occupations of school board members, for example, "discovers" the same set of facts: school boards in urban areas are composed predominantly of business and professional people, and boards in rural areas are composed predominantly of farmers. Virtually every survey of the ages of board members finds that the average lies somewhere between 45 and 55 years. The proportion of women on school boards in any group of districts runs between zero and twenty per cent. The average income of board members varies considerably according to the region of the country, the urbanness of the districts, and the year in which the survey was conducted (9, p. 449).

Proudfoot (8, p. 93) illustrated, by use of a graph, the sameness of the various surveys dealing with school board social composition.

Analytical Studies Involving the Social and  
Economic Positions of School Board Members

Although considerable evidence exists concerning the social and economic positions of school board members in various parts of the United States, there has been very little inquiry into which, if any, of the various social and economic factors are related to the way in which a school board member approaches or performs his job. Some analytical studies have sought to answer the question: What kind of person is the most effective school board member? The procedure used in these studies involved the establishment of some criteria by which highly effective school board members can be singled out from the less qualified member. The social characteristics which distinguish the most effective board members from the others are then identified.

One method of determining the effectiveness of a school board member has been to examine his voting record on important school board issues. Both Campbell (10) and Gunn (11) took this approach. These investigators examined minutes of board meetings for important issues on which the boards had taken action by recorded vote. The ballots cast by each member were judged as representing a "sound" or an "unsound" vote, according to the criteria of the investigator. The proportion of "sound" votes cast by a member formed the basis for his assessment as an effective board member. The investigators then compared the "more effective" members with the "less effective" members to discover whether or not they differed with respect to their various social and economic characteristics.

Campbell (10) examined the school board minutes in 12 western cities and secured the verification of a panel of educators that board decisions over a ten year period were free of bias with regard to age, sex, education, income, occupation, length of school board service or parenthood on issues such as teacher welfare, freedom to teach and the use of school buildings by outside groups.

Gunn (11) examined the board minutes in Portland, Oregon, covering a 25-year span and, like Campbell (10), found no relationship between the voting records of board members and their various social characteristics.

Although these studies concluded that there were no relationships between the social and economic characteristics of a school board member and the member's voting record, the question as to whether or not a board member's voting record is a gauge of his effectiveness as a board member should be considered. There is evidence to indicate that a board member's vote does not necessarily indicate the stand he has taken on an issue. Charters (12, p. 328), for example, found 100 unanimous votes of a total of 107 votes recorded during a two year period in one school board. Another school board study found that out of 625 issues voted upon over a two year period, 609 were unanimous (12, p. 328). Charters (12, p. 328) states that, in at least some school boards, members feel obliged to go on record as being in agreement regardless of their stands preceding the vote.

The arbitrary nature of these studies must also be considered since the investigators made judgments concerning the "quality" of the board member's vote. Judgments of this kind, even when confirmed by professional opinion, represent a point of view which may or may not

be shared by fellow professionals or by persons in other institutions within the community.

Another method for determining the effectiveness of a school board member has been to have the board member rated on a list of traits by an administrator in the school system. Those who are rated high are compared with those rated lower. Through this procedure the investigators identify social and economic characteristics which identify the "good" members. Cooke (13) was one of the first to popularize this method. His study included a twenty-one factor scale of characteristics which he believed school board members should possess (13, p. 37). Superintendents were asked to rate board members on each trait. Cooke (13, p. 38) concluded from his study of 230 school board members in Tennessee that "good" board members have higher levels of education, higher incomes, own more property, and are more often members of churches and civic clubs than are those board members who were not classified as "good". Items on which board members were rated included: is intelligent, is honest and sincere, has a good character, is willing to learn, is open minded, is a community leader (13, p. 37). Although Cooke (13), by furnishing administrators with a list of traits upon which they could rate their board members, tried to obtain an objective view of the effectiveness of the board members, an examination of his scale reveals that his criteria might relate more to the degree to which school board members are liked by administrators. In addition, the fact that superintendents are serving at the pleasure of the board members they are rating would make their overall objective rating suspect.



Pittman (14) conducted a study of the effectiveness of school board members. His population consisted of 333 school board members in Arizona, and the subjects were rated by local superintendents according to a scale much like the Cooke (13) model. Pittman (14) found age, educational level, family income, property ownership, community respect for spouse, school success of member's children, the board member's fraternal affiliations and his religious affiliation to be significantly related to the effectiveness of the school board member. Because Pittman (14) borrowed heavily from the Cooke (13) model, the general criticisms made concerning Cooke's (13) study can also be applied to Pittman (14).

In one of several studies coordinated by Stapley (15), Barnhart surveyed public school superintendents and school board members for written descriptions of incidents in which the behaviors of school board members were critical in the sense that those behaviors were major factors in determining effective or ineffective participation in school board actions. From a sample of 459 subjects, he received 741 written descriptions of which 423 were judged to be examples of effective behavior and 434 were judged to be examples of ineffective behavior (15, p. 20).

Barnhart grouped the incidents into six major categories: (1) acceptance of the principle of board unity and the subordination of the member's interests to that unity, (2) demonstrating initiative, informed leadership, and insight in board planning and policy making, (3) effective understanding of the executive function and willingness to support it when administering board policies, (4) effectiveness of personal relationships, (5) effectiveness in staff and group

relationships, and (6) courageous action for the good of the schools despite outside pressures and influences (15, p. 21). These criteria were used to evaluate 1,848 school board members in eleven midwestern states with the evaluation for each district carried out by the local superintendent. The results indicated that school board effectiveness is related to the board member's formal education, length of service on the school board, his economic success, and the amount of time he can devote to public service (15, p. 3).

The most serious weakness of the studies which seek to determine the effectiveness of school board members is that they fail to recognize the diversity of tasks required of a school board member. It may well be impossible to designate any single kind of person as the most effective school board member. The person most competent in running a small, rural school board might not be at all comfortable or competent in the milieu of a large, cosmopolitan district. It would seem entirely possible that, within a school board, different board members might excel in different aspects of the position of school board member.

Another group of analytical studies has centered around the relationships which might exist between the social and economic positions of a school board member and the member's attitudes on school related issues. Although considerable agreement exists concerning the social and economic positions of school board members in various parts of the United States, there has been little inquiry into which, if any, of the various social or economic factors is related to a particular view concerning educational policy. Counts (7), for example, feared that democracy was endangered as a result of the narrow segment

of society which comprised a large per cent of school board membership. He did not, however, explore the actual values of individuals; rather he stereotyped them as being representative of their social and economic class.

Some of these assumptions were refuted by Hunter (16), who conducted a study involving 456 school board members in Louisiana. His sample contained no breakdown of racial membership of school boards in Louisiana. Less than six per cent of the board members were women (16, p. 17). The average age was slightly over fifty-one, and the economic status of the board members was, according to Hunter (16, p. 18), quite high. In view of this, it is interesting that Hunter concluded that Louisiana school board members are "constituted by a cross section of the population. A reasonable conclusion would be that no specific social class dominates" (16, p. 18). While assuming that the maturity and economic positions of the board members would make them politically conservative, (Hunter 16, p. 18) stated that the values exemplified by the school board members did not reflect the values of any specific class. As a result, he concluded that the Louisiana school board member was well suited to serve society in his official capacity (16, p. 18). The glaring weakness of the Hunter (16) study is that he conducted a survey and assumed the existence of relationships. Although his findings refute those of Counts (7), his evidence is based only on personal opinion rather than on defensible evidence.

Sullivan (17) cited the school board studies of Leonard Garmire and Sidney Tiedt. Garmire found that in Oregon, a predominantly Democratic state, the majority of the school board members were registered Republicans and tended towards political conservatism (17,

p. 16). Tiedt administered a series of scales which supported Garmire's findings but which also determined that, on educational values, school board members tend to be evenly divided along the liberal-conservative scale (17, p. 18). As a result, Tiedt concluded that political conservatism does not necessarily indicate educational conservatism (17, p. 18).

Coughran (18, 19) also sought to determine relationships between the social and economic backgrounds of school board members and their attitudes on specific educational issues. From his sample, which included 683 school board members in the state of Illinois, he found that it was not possible to correlate social or economic status with any particular attitude toward the educational issues covered in the study (19, p. 34). Specific educational questions in the study included: (1) the necessity for federal financial aid to education, (2) a feeling that the schools were doing a better job of teaching the "three R's" than did schools of 25 to 50 years ago, (3) the desirability of helping teachers plan the curriculum, (4) teachers disregarding childrens' interests and desires when planning curriculum, (5) ending compulsory education for children upon completion of the eighth grade, (6) promoting children solely on the basis of how well they perform on achievement tests, (7) values derived from having teachers take loyalty oaths, (8) board members tending to represent their own socio-economic classes rather than representing the community at large, and (9) the necessity for board members, upon occasion, voting against their personal convictions in order to present an apparently united front to the community when ruling upon a controversial issue (18, p. 34).

Gross (20) cited the difficult nature of trying to analyze the relationships between the social and economic characteristics of board members and their positions on the almost limitless and ever-changing educational programs and policies. Instead, he created a scale which differentiated school board members according to whether they held a more or less "progressive" opinion with respect to the policies and programs of their school system (21, p. 362). From his sample, which included 517 school board members in the state of Massachusetts, Gross (20, p. 78) found that a school board member's level of education and level of income were both significantly related to educational progressivism. Those school board members with higher incomes tended to be more progressive than those with lower incomes. Those with higher levels of education scored higher on the progressivism scale than those with lower levels of education. It is interesting to note that the findings of the Gross (20) study were opposite of Count's (7) assumptions.

Goldhammer (22), however, in a study of a single school board, found that school board members were:

. . . anchored in the interests, values, and perspectives of groups in which their own social concepts, orientations, and objectives provided a common acceptance. For the most part minority groups failed to achieve consistent representation, and their interests were frequently looked upon either as hostile or unimportant (22, p. 25).

Similar conclusions were reached by Hollingshead (23, p. 124) who interviewed members of one board of education and found the board members concerned primarily with the promotion of conservative values in the school program.

The existing evidence indicates that school board members tend to come from the more prestigious social and economic segments of the community and that they tend to be politically conservative. The question for which there is no conclusive evidence is whether or not there is any relationship between the social and economic position of a school board member and that member's position on educational policies.

#### Summary and Organization of the Study

Chapter I of this study has provided background information to the study. The problem under investigation has been identified. The assumptions and limitations basic to this study have been stated. Selected literature relative to this study has been reviewed. The format for succeeding chapters is as follows: Chapter II relates the methodology and design of this study. Chapter III relates the social and economic positions of Oklahoma school board members. Chapter IV will relate the differences existing between Oklahoma school board members representing schools in small (population under 10,000) and large (population over 10,000) communities. Chapter V presents the analysis of data collected for this study. Chapter VI summarizes the findings and makes recommendations for further research.

## CHAPTER II

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### Selection of the Sample

The parameters of this study include all school board members in the state of Oklahoma from schools located in towns with a population of at least 500. A stratified random sample of 200 school board members was selected. Van Dalen (25, p. 299) makes the following comment on this technique:

Since a random sample may by chance have an undue proportion of one type of unit in it, an investigator may use stratified random sampling to get a more representative sample. When employing this technique, he divides his population into strata by some characteristic and from each of these smaller homogeneous groups draws at random a predetermined number of units.

The strata were as follows: (1) communities with populations under 2,500, (2) between 2,500 and 9,999, (3) between 10,000 and 45,000, and (4) over 45,000. These strata were determined by the writer after examining the 1970 census data for the state of Oklahoma (24). After communities in each strata were numbered, selection was made by using a table of random numbers.

The number of communities in each stratum and the actual sample size are shown in Table I.

TABLE I  
A SUMMARY OF THE SAMPLE

Stratified Group	Communities in Population	Communities in Sample	Per Cent of Population
Under 2,500	190	15	7.8
Between 2,500-9,999	70	10	14.3
Between 10,000-45,000	25	10	40.0
Over 45,000	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	290	40	13.8

#### Data Collection Procedures

The data for the study were secured from a sample population of 200 Oklahoma school board members. An introductory letter, questionnaires and appropriate return material were mailed to the home of each participating school board member. A total of 135 usable responses were returned. The total response represents 69 per cent of the sample population.

Table II presents a summary of the number of questionnaires returned from the total sample.

#### Instrumentation

The instrument enclosed in the correspondence to the sample board members was divided into two sections. The first section consisted of questions relating to the social and economic positions of the board



TABLE II  
A SUMMARY OF RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES

Stratified Group	Total Number of Board Members In Group	Number of Returned Questionnaires	Percent of Returned Questionnaires In Total Sample Population
Under 2,500	71	35	49
2,500-9,999	50	40	80
10,000-45,000	50	42	84
Over 45,000	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	45
Total	200	130	

member. Section two was the Gross Scale of Educational Progressivism (21, p. 353). The scale consists of 15 statements. The 15 statements on the scale were classified as being "Progressive" or "Traditional" on the basis of their categorization by a panel of five faculty members at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Among the judges there was 96 per cent agreement regarding the categorizations (21, p. 353). The instrument has a Likert-type scale for each question ranging from zero to three. A three meant that the respondent believed the statement to be highly desirable and a zero meant the respondent found the statement to be highly undesirable. In scoring this scale, a mean score of two or above was interpreted to represent high educational progressivism (21, p. 353). A copy of the questionnaire may be found in the appendix.

## Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were investigated:

1. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's sex.
2. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's age.
3. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's race.
4. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's educational level.
5. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's occupation.
6. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's teaching experience.
7. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the number of member's children in public school.
8. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's family income.

9. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's political affiliation.

10. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's future political plans.

11. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the length of the member's residence in the community.

12. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the length of the member's school board service.

13. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's reason for seeking school board membership.

14. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's religious affiliation.

15. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the size of the community in which the member's school is located.

#### Statistical Treatment

The questionnaires received were data coded onto computer cards. The interface was written and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (26) was employed. One-way frequency distributions were obtained for all variables and two-way cross tabulations were produced.

Selected pairs of variables were tested using the  $X^2$  test. Siegel (27) comments on the use of  $X^2$ :

When frequencies in discrete categories (either nominal or ordinal) constitute the data of research, the  $X^2$  test may be used to determine the significance of the differences among  $k$  independent groups (27, p. 61).

#### Summary

Chapter II has presented the procedures utilized in conducting the research study. A general description of the population sample, data collection, and instrumentation procedures was presented. The hypotheses were stated and the statistical treatment was described. Chapter III will describe the social and economic positions of Oklahoma school board members.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the social and economic positions of Oklahoma school board members. The social and economic factors are presented in the same order in which they appear on the data-gathering instrument.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to their length of residence in the school district was as follows:

TABLE III  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BY  
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Class	Number	Per Cent
0 to 15 Years	39	30
16 to 30 Years	47	36.2
Over 30 Years	<u>44</u>	<u>33.8</u>
Total	130	100.0

The mean number of years of residence in the school district was slightly over 26 years. Seventy per cent of the school board members had resided in the school district for at least 16 years. It is obvious that a large portion of the board members are long time residents in their school districts.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to length of school board service was as follows:

TABLE IV  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
BY YEARS OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

Class	Number	Per Cent
1 Year or Less	26	20
2 to 5 Years	59	45.4
6 or More Years	<u>45</u>	<u>34.6</u>
Total	130	100.0

The mean length of school board service for the sample of Oklahoma school board members was 5.2 years. Proudfoot's study of ten well-known school board surveys throughout the United States produced a mean of 5.8 for length of school board service (8, p. 93). More than one-third (34.6 per cent) of the Oklahoma board members had served for six or more years. In Oklahoma, board members serving schools with an

average daily attendance of less than 50,000 are elected for terms of five years. Board members from Oklahoma City and Tulsa schools, average daily attendance over 50,000, serve four year terms. In view of this it appears that, having once been elected to the school board, an Oklahoma school board member will likely serve more than one term of office.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to education was as follows:

TABLE V  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD  
MEMBERS BY EDUCATION LEVEL

Class	Number	Per Cent
Elementary or Some High School	6	4.6
High School Graduate	23	17.7
Some College	34	26.2
College Graduate	24	18.5
Some Graduate School	14	10.8
Advanced Degree	<u>29</u>	<u>22.3</u>
Total	130	100.0

Of the school board members 51.6 per cent held at least a bachelors degree and another 26.2 per cent had attended college. The Proudfoot (8, p. 93) study showed 48.4 per cent of the school board members in the sample with a college degree. In terms of educational level, the fears expressed by Counts (7, p. 93) that the schools were in danger of being controlled by a narrow segment of society were probably quite plausible in 1927. Today, however, any similar categorization would be very difficult to justify.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to occupation was as follows:

TABLE VI  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
BY OCCUPATION

Class	Number	Per Cent
Farming and Ranching	27	20.9
Proprietor of Business	12	9.3
Clerical	10	7.8
Housewife	4	3.1
Professional	57	43.4
Salesman	3	2.3
Blue Collar	<u>17</u>	<u>13.2</u>
Total	130	100.0



Proudfoot (8, p. 93) classified 54.6 per cent of the school board members as being professionals or holding managerial positions. In this study, 43.1 per cent were classified as professionals, and 9.3 per cent were proprietors of their own business. This total of 52.4 per cent and Proudfoot's (8, p. 93) total of 54.6 per cent are very similar to the data presented by Charters (9) in summarizing the findings of over 100 school board surveys. The 17 per cent representation among laboring occupations, however, is somewhat higher than the eight per cent figures cited by Counts (7) and Sullivan (17).

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to sex was as follows:

TABLE VII  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL  
BOARD MEMBERS BY SEX

Class	Number	Per Cent
Male	123	94.6
Female	<u>7</u>	<u>5.4</u>
Total	130	100.0

Only 5.4 per cent of the members were women. All of the other surveys examined revealed a higher percentage of woman school board members. Hunter (16) found six per cent of the board members in

Louisiana to be women. Pittman (14) found that eight per cent of the board members in Arizona were women. Proudfoot (8, p. 93) showed an average representation of women on school boards of ten per cent. Upon examining the existing evidence, it would appear that Counts (7, p. 91) was wrong in his prediction that women would play an increasingly more significant role in school board representation. His 1929 study found 15 per cent of the school board members to be women (7, p. 91).

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to age was as follows:

TABLE VIII  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD  
MEMBERS BY AGE

Class	Number	Per Cent
Under 40	40	30.8
41 - 50	51	39.2
Over 50	<u>39</u>	<u>30.0</u>
Total	130	100.0

The mean age for the Oklahoma school board members in this study was 45.2 years. Every study examined has reported the mean age for school board members as being in the middle forties (7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20).

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to their primary reason for serving on the school board was as follows:

TABLE IX  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BY PRIMARY  
REASON FOR SERVING ON THE SCHOOL BOARD

Class	Number	Per Cent
Dissatisfaction with Children's Education	11	8.5
Disapprove of School's Priorities	11	8.5
Interested in Gaining Political Experience	1	0.8
Get School Expenditures Increased	3	2.3
Get School Expenditures Decreased	1	0.8
Represent a Particular Group in the Community	5	3.8
Civic Duty	<u>98</u>	<u>75.4</u>
Total	130	100.0

The most striking aspect of this distribution was that 75.4 per cent of the school board members indicated that their primary reason for serving on the school board was "civic duty". "Civic duty" was not a stated option on the questionnaire. There was a choice which read

"other (please specify)". That 98 out of 130 Oklahoma school board members ignored the stated choices to write in their own reason is perhaps an indication that many school board members do consider their position on the school board to be a civic duty. Gross (20, p. 73) found that 80 per cent of his sample which included 508 school board members in Massachusetts cited "civic duty" as one of the reasons for serving on the school board. Gross (20), however, used a check list procedure in which "civic duty" was a stated option. Because "civic duty" was listed as a choice, it is possible that a greater percentage of board members would check it on a list than would expressly write it in.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to their prior teaching experience was as follows:

TABLE X  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
BY PRIOR TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Class	Number	Per Cent
Prior Teaching Experience	18	13.8
No Teaching Experience	<u>112</u>	<u>86.2</u>
Total	130	100.0

Pittman (14, p. 23) found that 8.4 per cent of the school board members in his Arizona study had prior teaching experience. Counts

(7, p. 49) cited a study by Struble in which 20 per cent of the board members had teaching experience. Most of the studies, however, have not investigated this aspect of a school board member's background.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to their religious preference was as follows:

TABLE XI  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

Class	Number	Per Cent
Baptist	35	26.9
Protestant	19	14.6
Church of Christ	16	12.3
Methodist	37	28.5
Nazarene	2	1.5
Catholic	9	6.9
Episcopal	2	1.5
Presbyterian	6	4.6
Christian Science	2	1.5
No Preference	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>
Total	130	100.0

The most noticeable aspect of the distribution is that only two board members indicated no religious affiliation. In a state where Baptists and Methodists are numerous, it is not surprising that 55.4 per cent of the board members indicated membership in those denominations.

Almost one-third (32.3 per cent) of the school board members in this sample do not have any children enrolled in school. Proudfoot (8, p. 93) indicated that 34.5 per cent of his sample had no children enrolled in school. A logical question would be, "Why would a person with no children in school want to serve on a school board?" Upon examining evidence which has been already presented, two possibilities appear likely: (1) Many board members consider serving on the school board to be a civic duty. If this is the case, the condition of not having any children in school would not diminish the civic responsibility. (2) Many school board members serve multiple terms on the school board. It is possible that some board members who were elected to the school board while their children were enrolled in school remained on the board after their children graduated.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to the number of their children enrolled in school is presented in Table XII.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to race is presented in Table XIII.

Previous surveys have not investigated the racial composition of school boards. In view of the civil rights legislation over the last 20 years, it is somewhat surprising that racial minorities are so poorly represented on the school boards.

TABLE XII  
 DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BY  
 NUMBER OF THEIR CHILDREN CURRENTLY  
 ENROLLED IN PUBLIC SCHOOL

Class	Number	Per Cent
1 Child	26	20.0
2 Children	30	23.1
3 Children	18	13.8
4 Children	10	7.7
5 Children	1	0.8
6 Children	3	2.3
0 Children	<u>42</u>	<u>32.3</u>
Total	130	100.0

TABLE XIII  
 DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD  
 MEMBERS BY RACE

Class	Number	Per Cent
Caucasian	116	89.2
Negro	3	2.3
American Indian	3	2.3
No Response	<u>8</u>	<u>6.2</u>
Total	130	100.0

Due to constantly changing economic conditions, previous statements regarding the specific incomes of school board members are meaningless. The earlier studies have, however, indicated that school board members tend to have rather high incomes. These findings are supported by the current data which indicated that nearly 50 per cent (48.4 per cent) of the Oklahoma school board members earn in excess of \$20,000 annually.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to income was as follows:

TABLE XIV  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD  
MEMBERS BY INCOME

Class	Number	Per Cent
Below \$10,000	12	9.8
\$10,000 - \$14,999	23	17.7
\$15,000 - \$19,999	25	19.2
\$20,000 - \$29,999	38	29.2
\$30,000 - \$50,000	22	16.9
Above \$50,000	3	2.3
No Response	<u>7</u>	<u>5.4</u>
Total	130	100.0



The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to political affiliation was as follows:

TABLE XV  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
BY POLITICAL AFFILIATION

Class	Number	Per Cent
Democrat	79	60.8
Republican	37	28.5
Independent	<u>14</u>	<u>10.7</u>
Total	130	100.0

It was not surprising that, in a state which is predominantly Democratic, the majority of the school board members would be registered Democrats. Because the mere fact of being a registered Democrat or Republican is not proof of any particular political philosophy, it would be impossible to draw conclusions based on political affiliation.

Since evidence was presented to indicate that Oklahoma school board members tend to serve multiple terms in office, it was not surprising that 39.2 per cent of the board members indicated plans to run for re-election.

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members according to future political plans was as follows:

TABLE XVI  
DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
BY FUTURE POLITICAL PLANS

Class	Number	Per Cent
Plan to Run for Re-Election	51	39.2
Do Not Plan to Run for Re-Election or for Any Other Political Office	45	34.6
Plan to Run for Another Political Office	2	1.5
Undecided	<u>32</u>	<u>24.7</u>
Total	130	100.0

Chapter III has described the social and economic positions of Oklahoma school board members with regard to sex, race, age, education, occupation, teaching experience, income, children in public school, political affiliation, length of residence in the school district, length of school board service, future political plans, primary reason for seeking school board membership and religious affiliation.

Chapter IV will examine the differences in the social and economic backgrounds of school board members representing schools in large and small communities.

## CHAPTER IV

### A COMPARISON OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC POSITIONS OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPRESENTING SCHOOLS IN LARGE AND SMALL COMMUNITIES

#### Introduction

Chapter III presented data which describe the social and economic background of Oklahoma school board members. This chapter examines the differences in the social and economic backgrounds of board members representing schools located in large (population over 10,000) and in small (population under 10,000) communities.

Although it is not possible to evaluate the comparative advantages of schools in small and large communities, it is possible to compare the social and economic backgrounds of the people most responsible for establishing the policies and procedures for their respective schools. Counts (7), Charters (12), Stapley (15), and Gross (20) have all presented evidence indicating that some social and economic differences exist between board members of small and of large communities.

#### Social and Economic Factors

Social and economic factors in which the small and the large community members were similar included:

1. Length of Residence in the School District: The mean number of years was 25.547 for the small community board members and 26.650 for the large community members.

2. Length of School Board Service: The mean number of years was 5.27 for the small community members and 5.09 for the members of the large communities.

3. Sex of School Board Members: Two women (2.7 per cent) were serving on small community school boards. Five women (9.1 per cent) were serving on large community school boards.

4. Age of School Board Members: The mean age for the small community board members was 45.41, and for the large community members it was 45.09.

5. Primary Reason for Serving on the School Board: Civic duty was cited by 76 per cent of the small community board members and by 74.5 per cent of the large community board members as their primary reason for serving on the school board.

6. Prior Teaching Experience: Nine (12 per cent) of the small community board members and nine (16.4 per cent) of the large community board members had prior teaching experience.

7. Religious Preference: Religious preference was indicated by 95 per cent of the small community board members and by 75 per cent of the large community board members to be one of the following: Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, or Protestant.

8. Number of Children in Public School: Of the small community board members, 33 per cent had no children currently enrolled in public school, and 25.6 per cent of the large community board members had no children currently in public school.

9. Race of School Board Members: Two Negroes and two American Indians (5.8 per cent) were members of small community school boards. One Negro and one American Indian (3.8 per cent) were members of large community boards.

10. Political Affiliation of School Board Members: Of the small community board members, 70.6 per cent were registered Democrats and 25 per cent were registered Republicans, while 59.6 per cent of the large community members were registered Democrats and 38.5 per cent were registered Republicans.

11. Future Political Plans: An intention to run for re-election to the school board was indicated by 49 per cent of the small community board members and by 51 per cent of the large community board members.

Although the school board members of small and large communities exhibited similarities in many aspects, they revealed a distinct lack of similarity with regards to income, occupation, and educational level. The distribution of Oklahoma school board members from schools located in small and in large communities, according to education, is shown in Table XVII.

Of the small community board members, 34 per cent had not attended college, while only 7.3 per cent of the large community members were without some college experience. Of the large community members, 74.5 per cent were college graduates, while only 34.7 per cent of the small community members were college graduates. These findings are in agreement with Counts (7, p. 48) who discovered that, "The tendency is somewhat stronger in the larger cities than in the smaller cities to choose as board members individuals who have enjoyed unusual educational opportunities."

TABLE XVII  
 DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM  
 SCHOOLS IN SMALL AND LARGE COMMUNITIES  
 ACCORDING TO EDUCATION

Class	Communities with a Population Less Than 10,000	Communities with a Population Greater Than 10,000
Elementary or Some High School	5	1
High School Graduate	20	3
Some College	24	10
College Graduate	11	13
Some Graduate School	7	7
Advanced Degree	<u>8</u>	<u>21</u>
Total	75	55

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members from schools located in small and in large communities, according to occupation, is presented in Table XVIII.

Almost one-third (31.1 per cent) of the small community board members were farmers and ranchers as compared with 7.3 per cent of the large community members. Of the large town members, 70.9 per cent were professionals or proprietors of a business. Only 39.2 per cent of the small town members were in these categories. These findings are very similar to Charter's (12, p. 449) summary of over 100 school board studies.

TABLE XVIII  
 DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM  
 SCHOOLS IN SMALL AND LARGE COMMUNITIES  
 ACCORDING TO OCCUPATION

Class	Communities with a Population Less Than 10,000	Communities with a Population Greater Than 10,000
Farming and Ranching	23	4
Proprietor of a Business	5	7
Clerical	8	2
Housewife	1	3
Professional	24	32
Salesman	1	2
Blue Collar	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	74	55

The distribution of Oklahoma school board members from schools located in small and in large communities, according to annual income, is shown in Table XIX.

That there would be some differences in the income levels between the small and the large community board members appeared likely after examining their respective occupational categories. More of the large community members enjoy higher incomes, with 62.9 per cent having incomes over \$20,000 annually and 25.9 per cent having incomes in excess of \$30,000 yearly. This compares with a total of 42 per cent of the small community board members with incomes over \$20,000 annually

TABLE XIX  
 DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM  
 SCHOOLS IN SMALL AND LARGE COMMUNITIES  
 ACCORDING TO ANNUAL INCOME

Class	Communities with a Population Less Than 10,000	Communities with a Population Greater Than 10,000
Below \$10,000	9	3
\$10,000 - \$14,999	18	5
\$15,000 - \$19,999	13	12
\$20,000 - \$29,999	20	18
\$30,000 - \$50,000	8	14
Over \$50,000	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	69	54

and 11.6 per cent with annual incomes over \$30,000. Both groups, however, had the highest percentages of members in the \$20,000 to \$29,999 category.

#### Summary

Approximately one-half of the population of Oklahoma lives in communities with a population of less than 10,000 (24). With a community population of 10,000 as the dividing line, there were 75 board members from schools located in small communities and 55 from schools located in large communities in this study. The groups were very similar in terms of length of residence in the school district,



length of school board service, sex, age, and race of school board members, prior teaching experience, primary reason for serving on the school board, religious preference, political affiliation, future political plans, and number of member's children in public school.

They differed markedly, however, in terms of education, occupation, and income. In general, large community members possessed a higher level of education and a higher income. In terms of occupation, over 70 per cent of the large community members were professionals or proprietors of businesses, while less than one-third of their small community counterparts were in these occupational areas.

Chapter V will present the results of the statistical analysis.

## CHAPTER V

### RESULTS OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

#### Introduction

The results of the statistical analysis are presented in this chapter. The statistical confidence level pre-selected for rejection of the hypothesis is set at the .05 level. Each hypothesis investigated is stated and the results of the statistical analysis follow.

#### Findings

1. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the length of the member's residence in the school district. (see Table XX).

The computed  $X^2$  yields a value of 2.33. With 2 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 5.99 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the length of the board member's residence in the school district.

2. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of

TABLE XX  
 EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND LENGTH OF RESIDENCE  
 IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
0 - 15 Years	31	8	39
16 - 30 Years	41	6	47
Over 30 Years	<u>40</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 2.33$$

$$DF = 6$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

educational progressivism and the length of the member's school board service.

TABLE XXI  
 EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
1 Year or Less	20	6	26
2.5 Years	53	6	59
6 or More Years	<u>39</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>45</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 2.53$$

$$DF = 2$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 2.53 with 2 degrees of freedom. A value equal to or greater than 5.99 was required to reject null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the length of the member's school board service.

3. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's educational level.

TABLE XXII  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Elementary or Some High School	6	0	6
High School Graduate	21	2	23
Some College	32	2	34
College Graduate	21	3	24
Some Graduate School	11	3	14
Advanced Degree	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>29</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$X^2 = 8.58$   
DF = 5

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 8.58. With 5 degrees of freedom a value equal to or greater than 11.17 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational preparation and the board member's educational level.

4. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's occupation.

TABLE XXIII  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND OCCUPATION

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Farming and Ranching	25	2	27
Proprietor of Business	9	3	12
Clerical	8	2	10
Housewife	3	1	4
Professional	47	9	56
Salesman	3	0	3
Labor	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>17</u>
Totals	111	19	130

$$X^2 = 4.54$$

$$DF = 6$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yields a value of 4.54. With 7 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 14.07 was required to reject the null hypothesis. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the school board member's occupation.

5. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's sex.

TABLE XXIV  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND SEX

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Male	108	15	123
Female	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 2.96$$

$$DF = 1$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

A corrected  $X^2$  was computed in keeping with Siegel (27, p. 66) who stated that the correction is necessary when expected frequencies are less than five. The corrected  $X^2$  yielded a value of 2.96. With 1 degree of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 3.84 was required to

reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism, and the member's sex.

6. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's age.

TABLE XXV  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND AGE

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Under 40	35	5	40
41 - 50	44	7	51
Over 50	<u>33</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>39</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 0.14$$

$$DF = 2$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 0.14. With 2 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 5.99 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the

position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's age.

7. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's primary reason for seeking school board membership.

TABLE XXVI  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND REASON FOR  
SEEKING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Dissatisfaction with Children's Education	11	0	11
Disapprove of School's Priorities	8	3	11
Interested in Gaining Political Experience	1	0	1
Get School Expenditures Increased	3	0	3
Get School Expenditures Decreased	1	0	1
Represent a Particular Group in the Community	4	1	5
Civic Duty	<u>84</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>98</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 4.41$$

$$DF = 6$$

Not significant at the .05 level.



The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 4.41. With 6 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 12.59 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's primary reason for seeking school board membership.

8. Null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's teaching experience.

TABLE XXVII  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND  
TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Prior Teaching Experience	11	7	18
No Teaching Experience	<u>101</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>112</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 8.68$$

$$DF = 1$$

Significant at the .05 level.  
Significance = 0.003.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 8.68. With 1 degree of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 3.84 was required to reject the

null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Because the  $X^2$  yielded a value greater than 3.84, the null hypothesis was rejected. A relationship was found to exist between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's prior teaching experience.

9. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's religious affiliation.

TABLE XXVIII  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND  
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Baptist	31	4	35
Protestant	18	1	19
Church of Christ	13	3	16
Methodist	30	7	37
Nazarene	2	0	2
Catholic	8	1	9
Episcopal	1	1	2
Presbyterian	5	1	6
Christian Scientist	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Totals	110	18	128

$$X^2 = 5.32$$

$$DF = 8$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 5.32. With 8 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 15.51 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's religious affiliation.

10. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the number of the member's children in public school.

TABLE XXIX  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND  
CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOL

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
0 Children	38	4	42
1 Child	22	4	26
2 Children	26	4	30
3 Children	13	5	18
4 Children	9	1	10
5 Children	1	0	1
6 Children	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 4.41$$

$$DF = 6$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 4.41. With 6 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 12.59 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the number of the member's children in public school.

11. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's race.

TABLE XXX  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND RACE

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Caucasian	101	15	116
Negro	2	1	3
American Indian	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Totals	105	17	122

$$X^2 = 1.98$$

$$DF = 2$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 1.98. With 2 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 5.99 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it

was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's race.

12. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's family income.

TABLE XXXI  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND INCOME

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Below \$10,000	9	3	12
\$10,000 - \$14,999	21	2	23
\$15,000 - \$19,999	22	3	25
\$20,000 - \$29,999	35	3	38
\$30,000 - \$50,000	16	6	22
Above \$50,000	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Totals	106	17	123

$$X^2 = 6.78$$

$$DF = 5$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 6.78. With 5 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 11.07 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it

was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's income.

13. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's political affiliation.

TABLE XXXII  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND  
POLITICAL AFFILIATION

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Democrat	66	13	79
Republican	33	4	37
Independent	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	103	17	120

$$X^2 = 1.34$$

$$DF = 2$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 1.34. With 2 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 5.99 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's political affiliation.

14. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's future political plans.

TABLE XXXIII  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND  
FUTURE POLITICAL PLANS

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Plan to Run for Re-Election	45	6	51
Do not Plan to Run for Re-Election or for any Other Office	41	4	45
Plan to Run for Another Office	1	1	2
Undecided	<u>23</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>30</u>
Totals	110	18	128

$$X^2 = 5.49$$

$$DF = 3$$

Not significant at the .05 level.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 5.49. With 3 degrees of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 7.82 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. As a result, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the member's future political plans.

15. Null Hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the position of an Oklahoma school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the size of the community in which the member's school is located.

TABLE XXXIV  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND SIZE OF THE  
COMMUNITY IN WHICH THE MEMBER'S  
SCHOOL IS LOCATED

Class	Low Educational Progressivism	High Educational Progressivism	Totals
Communities with Populations under 10,000	70	5	75
Communities with Populations over 10,000	<u>42</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>55</u>
Totals	112	18	130

$$X^2 = 6.30$$

$$DF = 1$$

Significant at the .05 level.  
Significance = 0.01.

The computed  $X^2$  yielded a value of 6.30. With 1 degree of freedom, a value equal to or greater than 3.84 was required to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Because the  $X^2$  yielded a value greater than 3.84, the null hypothesis was rejected. A relationship was found to exist between the position of an Oklahoma



school board member on a scale of educational progressivism and the size of the community in which the member's school is located.

#### Summary

Chapter V has presented the statistical analysis of the data. Each hypothesis was presented with a discussion of the statistical treatment and the results. Statistical significance was specified at the .05 level. Prior teaching experience and the size of the community in which the member's school is located were found to be significantly related to the board member's position on the scale of Educational Progressivism.

Chapter VI will present a summary as well as the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research in areas related to this study.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study was designed to (1) describe some aspects of those citizens who are currently serving as public school board members, (2) examine the relationships existing between the position of Oklahoma school board members on a scale of educational progressivism and related social and economic factors, and (3) compare the responses of school board members from schools located in communities with populations of over 10,000 and board members from schools located in communities with populations of under 10,000.

The data gathering instrument consisted of two parts. The first part was a questionnaire relating to the social and economic position of the board member. Social and economic factors investigated included: sex, age, race, education, occupation, teaching experience, family income, number of children enrolled in public school, political affiliation, length of residence in school district, length of school board service, future political plans, primary reason for serving on the school board, religious affiliation, and size of community in which the school is located. The second part was the scale of educational progressivism, which consisted of 15 statements. Responses to each statement were recorded on a Likert type scale with choices ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". A score of two or above on

the scale was interpreted to indicate relatively high educational progressivism. Only 18 per cent of the sample scored two or above. All significant relationships cited in this study are based on educational progressivism scores and are, therefore, limited by any inherent weaknesses in the instrument.

The results of this study, with regards to the social and economic positions of school board members in Oklahoma, were not unlike those of similar studies in other localities. That a study conducted in 1975 could yield, basically, the same results as studies conducted up to 50 years earlier is, in itself, enlightening. It has, for instance, been asserted that we are now a more homogeneous society than we have been in the past. The various civil rights acts of the last twenty years have supposedly struck down the old barriers. If the social composition of Oklahoma school boards is any indicator, however, the results have not yet been observed. Although it is not known how many women and other minorities have sought election to Oklahoma school boards, it is readily apparent that Oklahoma school boards continue to be dominated by white males. Almost 90 per cent of the board members are caucasian and 94.6 per cent are male. Whether future school boards will reflect a more heterogeneous composition could be a topic for future research.

School board members in Oklahoma tend to be long-time residents of the school districts they are serving. With an average length of residence in the district of over 26 years, it appears that newcomers to a school are either not interested or not able to gain a spot on the school board. Given the mobility of the American population today, this is an important consideration. Does school board membership

involve some sort of unwritten seniority system? Taken together, the mean length residence in the school district (over 26 years), the age of the board members (mean of 45.1 years), and the fact that over 34 per cent of the board members in the sample had served more than one term, the picture of a semi-closed system in which native sons are elected and re-elected emerges. This possibility should certainly be a consideration for anyone planning a move to another school district.

These findings could also be instrumental in the conclusion that the size of the community in which the member's school is located is significantly related to the board member's position on educational progressivism. Although small communities may grow, may have an influx of new residents, and may become satellites to large cities, the control of the schools will likely remain in the hands of those long-term residents who will be prone to run the schools as they always have. Thus, the reluctance to adopt what to some might be considered "big city methods" would be a natural phenomena.

The "average" Oklahoma school board member might be characterized as 45 years old, white, male, protestant, college educated, a professional with an annual income of over \$20,000. Although this composite fits board members for schools in small as well as large communities, the large community members tend to be more highly educated and tend to have higher annual incomes. None of these factors, however, was found to be significantly related to any particular position regarding educational progressivism. Of the stated hypotheses, only numbers 6 (prior teaching experience) and 15 (size of community in which school is located) were rejected. All other factors were found to be not significantly related to educational progressivism. These findings refute the contentions of

those who have expressed fears that American public education was endangered due to the control of school boards by elite segments of society and of those who have maintained that only the higher social and economic segments of society were adequately prepared to handle the duties required of a school board member. This differs from Gross (20, p. 133) who found educational progressivism to be significantly related to educational level and income.

Many board members (over 75 per cent) cited "civic duty" reasons for serving on the school board. Certainly, for the one-third of the members who have no children in school, a feeling of "civic duty" would likely be a prime motivating force. On the surface this appears to be quite impressive. It is possible, however, that to some board members "civic duty" means to maintain the status quo in the schools. One respondent, in fact, stated that his primary reason for serving was related to "civic duty". He further explained that he was seeking to preserve the "same excellent standards" which have always existed in the school. Whether the "status quo" is good or bad in any given school is not the subject of this discussion. A person who is contemplating moving to a new district, however, might be well advised to examine the schools with the assumption that the schools will not likely change and that he will probably be powerless to affect changes.

Very few Oklahoma school board members have any prior teaching experience. This factor, however, was found to be significantly related to educational progressivism. It could be logically concluded that direct teaching experience may provide insights and perspectives which are not available to those board members who lack teaching experience. This could have far-reaching effects.

There has been a rather slow but steady movement towards teacher organization and activism. A common complaint of teachers is that they are not treated as professionals and that they have no voice in determining the policies by which they must abide. If it were determined that the educational philosophies of board members with teaching experience were more congruent with the philosophies of teachers, the case for electing board members with prior teaching experience might be enhanced. Teachers might react more positively toward the board, if former teachers were board members, thereby decreasing faculty-board friction. This could possibly serve the purposes of the school board by diffusing issues which have been driving teachers to militancy.

The overall professional posture of public education might be helped if it were determined that the most successful board members, in terms of staff relations, were former teachers. This could have the effect of eradicating the philosophy that any good citizen with a degree of common sense can run a school.

Some school districts, none in Oklahoma, now function with appointed rather than elected school boards. Current educational journals often publish articles calling for the abolishment of elected school boards in favor of appointed boards. If board members with prior teaching experience were found to be especially successful in dealings with faculties, the requirement of prior teaching experience might be made a prerequisite for appointment.

### Recommendations for Further Research

The following represent a few of the research topics which may be derived from this investigation:

1. A study could be conducted in which the position of classroom teachers on educational policies and procedures is compared to the responses of school board members with teaching experience and members without teaching experience.
2. A comparison of educational policies and procedures in small and in large communities in Oklahoma could be conducted in order to determine whether they differ significantly.
3. A study relating educational progressivism to successful and unsuccessful school board candidates could be conducted. This study might also investigate the sex and ethnic backgrounds of the successful and un-successful candidates.
4. A study could be conducted in which the position of school board members on educational policies and procedures could be determined through in-depth interviews.
5. A study could be conducted in which the educational progressivism of a newly appointed superintendent is compared with the educational progressivism of the school board members who appointed him.
6. A study comparing the social and economic positions as well as positions on educational progressivism of elected and appointed school boards could be conducted.

The American system of public education is based upon local citizen control of the schools. School boards, elected by the citizenry,

make final decisions concerning what is taught, how much will be paid to the faculty, what materials will be required and what values will be emphasized. The task of electing these people who serve such a critical function must not be taken lightly. Any research which will increase knowledge and understanding of the character, philosophies, abilities or tendencies of school board members should be encouraged.



#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) "Sparse Turnout for Election." The Daily Oklahoman (March 5, 1975), 2.
- (2) "Survey Finds Public In Dark On Schools." Tulsa Daily World (April 24, 1975), 24.
- (3) Archambault, Reginald D. Dewey on Education. New York: Random House, 1966.
- (4) Wirth, Arthur G. John Dewey as Educator. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- (5) Dewey, John. Moral Principles in Education. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1959.
- (6) Squire, James R. Progressive Education. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972.
- (7) Counts, George S. The Social Composition of School Boards. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1927.
- (8) Goldhammer, Keith. The School Board. New York: The Center for Applied Research, Inc., 1964.
- (9) Charters, W. W. "Beyond the Survey in School Board Research." Education Administration and Supervision, Vol. 41, No. 8 (December, 1955), 449-452.
- (10) Campbell, Roald F. "The Social Implications of School Board Legislation." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1942.)
- (11) Gunn, Henry M. "The Study of a Board in a Western City." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1941.)
- (12) Charters, W. W. "Research on School Board Personnel: Critique and Prospectus." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 47, No. 5 (January, 1954), 321-335.
- (13) Cooke, Dennis H., and Quill E. Cope. "Rating School Board Members." The Nation's Schools, Vol. 21, No. 34 (February, 1938), 34-36.

- (14) Pittman, Wesley Francis, Jr. "The Relationship of the Effectiveness of School Board Members to Certain Socio-Economic Factors." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1957.)
- (15) Stapley, Maurice E. School Board Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957.
- (16) Hunter, J. A. "Social Composition of Louisiana Parish School Boards." American School Board Journal, Vol. 119 (October and November, 1949), 17-19.
- (17) Sullivan, L. M. "A Study of the Attitudes of School Boards and Superintendents and Their Relationship to Innovation in Selected Oklahoma Schools." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968.)
- (18) Coughran, Roy W. "The School Board Member Today." American School Board Journal, Vol. 133 (November, 1956), 34-37.
- (19) Coughran, Roy W. "The School Board Member Today, Part II." American School Board Journal, Vol. 133 (December, 1956), 34-36.
- (20) Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- (21) Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- (22) Goldhammer, Keith. "Community Power Structure and School Board Membership." American School Board Journal, Vol. 130 (March, 1955), 23-25.
- (23) Hollingshead, August B. Elmtowns Youth. New York: Science Editions, 1949.
- (24) U. S. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1970. Vol. I, Number of Inhabitants, PC (1)-A38 Oklahoma. Washington, D. C.: United States Printing Office, 1970.
- (25) Van Dalen, Deobald B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- (26) Nie, Norman H., Dale H. Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull. Statistical Package for the Social Studies. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- (27) Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

- (28) Havighurst, Robert J., and Bernice L. Neugarten. Society and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.
- (29) McLuhan, Marshall. The Medium is the Massage. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1967.
- (30) Johnson, Irwin. "An Exploration of School Board Decisions." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1967.)
- (31) Jordan, Roy V. "What Makes a School Board Effective or Ineffective." American School Board Journal, Vol. 161 (July, 1974), 38-45.
- (32) Kerr, Norman D. "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation." Sociology of Education, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Fall, 1964), 34-59.
- (33) Campbell, Roald F. "The Folklore of Local Control." The School Review, Vol. 67, No. 1 (Spring, 1959), 1-16.
- (34) Bendiner, Robert. The Politics of Schools. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- (35) Salisbury, R. H. "Schools and Politics in the Big City." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 37 (1967), 3.
- (36) Kirst, Michael W., and Decker F. Walker. "An Analysis of Curriculum Policy Making." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 41, No. 5 (December, 1971).
- (37) Michel, George J. A Comparison Study of the Elected School Board in New York State. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1973. ED 091 836.
- (38) Steinberg, Lois S. The Revival of Local Control in Suburbia. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1973. ED 077 107.
- (39) Stelzer, Leigh. Electoral Competition and the Receptivity of School Board Members. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1972. ED 081 098.
- (40) Kanimann, Richard. Board and Superintendent: Building the Effective Team. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1972. ED 066 829.
- (41) Travers, Robert M. W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: MacMillan, 1961.
- (42) Ary, Donald, Lucy Cheser Jacobs, and Asghar Razavieh. Introduction To Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

## OKLAHOMA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Affiliated with National  
School Boards Association

Publishers of Oklahoma School Board Journal

---

March 27, 1975

To Whom It May Concern:

It is our sincere desire to fully endorse the dissertation proposal of Brian Lotven, and we do urge the full cooperation of all in promptly answering his questionnaire.

In fact, we are always cooperative in matters of this type, but especially so when they deal with timely subjects on the school board field. We are quite anxious to see the results of the final study.

It is our belief that the study has merit and is a worthy proposal in the literature of those interested in school boards.

Your prompt consideration and return of the questionnaire will be most appreciated by us.

Very sincerely,

J. O. BUMPUS  
Executive Director

APPENDIX B

FIRST LETTER TO SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

BRIAN A. LOTVEN  
2134 W. Arrowhead  
Stillwater, Okla. 74074

Dear School Board Member:

I am requesting your help in completing a very significant research project. The members of your school board have been selected, along with the members of forty-four other school boards throughout the state of Oklahoma, to participate in this project. It is crucial that you understand that all responses on the enclosed questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence. There can be no positive or negative value judgments placed upon your individual responses on the questionnaire.

A basic premise of this project is that school board members occupy the most important of the local policy making positions because the schools of today will greatly affect what the citizens of tomorrow will be. The purpose of this study is to determine the positions of Oklahoma school board members on selected educational issues.

I will be most grateful if you will complete the enclosed forms and send them to me as soon as possible in the stamped and addressed envelope enclosed. In order to maintain complete confidentiality, I will have no way of identifying the sources of completed questionnaires. If you wish to receive a summary of the research findings, please send your name and address in a separate envelope.

Respectfully,

Brian A. Lotven  
2134 W. Arrowhead  
Stillwater, Okla. 74074

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW UP LETTER TO SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS



BRIAN A. LOTVEN  
2134 W. Arrowhead  
Stillwater, OK 74074

Dear School Board Member:

I am truly gratified by the number of school board members who have responded to the questionnaire which I recently sent. If you have already returned your questionnaire, please accept my thanks for contributing to what I am certain will be a very significant research project. If you have not had an opportunity to return the questionnaire, I have enclosed another form and stamped envelope for your convenience.

This is the first major research in Oklahoma in which school board members have been asked to participate. Other studies, concerning schools and school board members, have relied entirely on Superintendents assessments of the board members and their attitudes. While this is an easier and less expensive approach, I believe that my research is much more honest. My feelings are shared by Mr. J. O. Bumpus, Executive Director of the Oklahoma State School Boards Association, who has endorsed my work.

This is not a survey funded through the University. It is, hopefully, the culmination of several years of school, a few hundred hours of work and several hundreds of borrowed dollars. It is the last step toward a Doctor of Education Degree and I sincerely thank you for your participation.

Respectfully,

Brian A. Lotven  
2134 W. Arrowhead  
Stillwater, OK 74074

APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENTS

Please answer the following questions. For those questions with more than one possible response, please check the most appropriate response.

1. Length of residence in the school district \_\_\_\_\_  
(8-9)
  2. Years of school board service \_\_\_\_\_  
(11-12)
  3. Education:
    - Elementary or some High School \_\_\_\_\_  
(14-1)
    - High School Graduate \_\_\_\_\_  
(14-2)
    - Some College \_\_\_\_\_  
(14-3)
    - College Graduate \_\_\_\_\_  
(14-4)
    - Some Graduate School \_\_\_\_\_  
(14-5)
    - Advanced Degree (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
(14-6)
  4. Occupation \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Sex:
    - Male \_\_\_\_\_  
(19-1)
    - Female \_\_\_\_\_  
(19-2)
  6. Age \_\_\_\_\_  
(21-22)
  7. Primary reason for serving on the school board.
    - Dissatisfaction with your childrens' education \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-1)
    - Disapprove of schools' priorities \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-2)
    - Interested in gaining political experience \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-3)
    - Get superintendent or others on school staff removed \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-4)
    - Get school expenditures increased \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-5)
    - Get school expenditures decreased \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-6)
    - Represent a particular group within the community \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-7)
    - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
(24-8)
-



## 14. Political Affiliation:

Democrat

(41-1)

Republican

(41-2)

American Party

(41-3)

Independent

(41-4)

Other (please specify)

(41-5)

## 15. Future political plans:

Plan to run for re-election to the school board

(48-1)Do not plan to run for re-election to the school board  
or for any other office(48-2)

Plan to run for another political office

(48-3)

SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM

For each of the following statements, please check the response which most nearly approximates your reaction to the statement.

	<u>Highly Desirable</u>	<u>Desirable</u>	<u>Undesirable</u>	<u>Highly Undesirable</u>
1. Pupils should be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes.	<u>50-1</u>	<u>50-2</u>	<u>50-3</u>	<u>50-4</u>
2. In the first six grades, pupils should meet specific academic standards in order to be promoted.	<u>51-1</u>	<u>51-2</u>	<u>51-3</u>	<u>51-4</u>
3. There should be a maximum class size of twenty-five in elementary schools.	<u>52-1</u>	<u>52-2</u>	<u>52-3</u>	<u>52-4</u>
4. There should be sex education in high schools.	<u>53-1</u>	<u>53-2</u>	<u>53-3</u>	<u>53-4</u>
5. There should be a great deal of emphasis on a program of extra-curricular activities.	<u>54-1</u>	<u>54-2</u>	<u>54-3</u>	<u>54-4</u>
6. There should be some kind of psychological guidance facilities available to pupils through the schools.	<u>55-1</u>	<u>55-2</u>	<u>55-3</u>	<u>55-4</u>
7. Numerical grading should be given on regular report cards in the first six grades.	<u>56-1</u>	<u>56-2</u>	<u>56-3</u>	<u>56-4</u>
8. There should be different salary schedules for elementary and high school teachers.	<u>57-1</u>	<u>57-2</u>	<u>57-3</u>	<u>57-4</u>
9. Teachers should act as advisers in extra-curricular activities.	<u>58-1</u>	<u>58-2</u>	<u>58-3</u>	<u>58-4</u>
10. More emphasis should be placed on developing individual interests of the pupils rather than on teaching subject matter.	<u>59-1</u>	<u>59-2</u>	<u>59-3</u>	<u>59-4</u>

SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM (CONTINUED)

	<u>Highly Desirable</u>	<u>Desirable</u>	<u>Undesirable</u>	<u>Highly Undesirable</u>
11. More emphasis should be placed on teaching subject matter rather than on developing individual interests of the pupils.	<u>60-1</u>	<u>60-2</u>	<u>60-3</u>	<u>60-4</u>
12. There should be teacher participation in policy formation.	<u>61-1</u>	<u>61-2</u>	<u>61-3</u>	<u>61-4</u>
13. Pupils should regularly form into lines on the way to and from classes.	<u>62-1</u>	<u>62-2</u>	<u>62-3</u>	<u>62-4</u>
14. There should be use of schools as neighborhood centers.	<u>63-1</u>	<u>63-2</u>	<u>63-3</u>	<u>63-4</u>
15. There should be extensive use of psychological and mental tests.	<u>64-1</u>	<u>64-2</u>	<u>64-3</u>	<u>64-4</u>

---

APPENDIX E

COMMUNITIES INVOLVED IN THE STUDY



## COMMUNITIES INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

Arnett	Bartlesville
Beggs	Bethany
Coweta	Duncan
Eufaula	Edmond
Fairfax	Miami
Grandfield	Moore
Granite	Okmulgee
Harrah	Sapulpa
Keyes	Shawnee
McLoud	Stillwater
Grove	Lawton
Noble	Midwest City
Okarche	Norman
Waukomis	Oklahoma City
Wellston	Tulsa
Checotah	
Claremore	
Fairview	
Madill	
Nowata	
Okemah	
Pawhuska	
Poteau	
Sulphur	
Wagoner	

APPENDIX F

COMPOSITE PROGRESSIVISM SCORES

## COMPOSITE PROGRESSIVISM SCORES

<u>Value</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
1.00	1	0.8
1.33	2	1.5
1.40	3	2.3
1.47	6	4.6
1.53	10	7.7
1.60	12	9.2
1.67	13	10.0
1.73	17	13.1
1.80	15	11.5
1.87	18	13.8
1.93	10	7.7
2.00	5	3.8
2.07	5	3.8
2.13	3	2.3
2.20	6	4.6
2.27	3	2.3
2.67	1	0.8

MEAN: 1.782  
MODE: 1.867  
MEDIAN: 1.771

APPENDIX G

COMPOSITE SCORING OF QUESTIONS ON THE  
PROGRESSIVISM SCALE

SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM

For each of the following statements, please check the response which most nearly approximates your reaction to the statement.

	Highly Desirable	Desirable	Undesirable	Highly Undesirable
1. Pupils should be separated into "bright" and "slow" classes. (T)	$\frac{20}{50-1}$	$\frac{68}{50-2}$	$\frac{28}{50-3}$	$\frac{14}{50-4}$
2. In the first six grades, pupils should meet specified academic standards in order to be promoted. (T)	$\frac{38}{51-1}$	$\frac{76}{51-2}$	$\frac{15}{51-3}$	$\frac{1}{51-4}$
3. There should be a maximum class size of twenty-five in elementary schools. (P)	$\frac{75}{52-1}$	$\frac{47}{52-2}$	$\frac{8}{52-3}$	$\frac{0}{52-4}$
4. There should be sex education in high schools. (P)	$\frac{30}{53-1}$	$\frac{71}{53-2}$	$\frac{20}{53-3}$	$\frac{9}{53-4}$
5. There should be a great deal of emphasis on a program of extra-curricular activities. (P)	$\frac{19}{54-1}$	$\frac{54}{54-2}$	$\frac{49}{54-3}$	$\frac{8}{54-4}$
6. There should be some kind of psychological guidance facilities available to pupils through the schools. (P)	$\frac{57}{55-1}$	$\frac{68}{55-2}$	$\frac{3}{55-3}$	$\frac{2}{55-4}$
7. Numerical grading should be given on regular report cards in the first six grades. (T)	$\frac{19}{56-1}$	$\frac{56}{56-2}$	$\frac{46}{56-3}$	$\frac{6}{56-4}$
8. There should be different salary schedules for elementary and high school teachers. (T)	$\frac{11}{57-1}$	$\frac{12}{57-2}$	$\frac{76}{57-3}$	$\frac{31}{57-4}$

SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM (CONTINUED)

	<u>Highly Desirable</u>	<u>Desirable</u>	<u>Undesirable</u>	<u>Highly Undesirable</u>
9. Teachers should act as advisers in extracurricular activities. (P)	$\frac{30}{58-1}$	$\frac{85}{58-2}$	$\frac{12}{58-3}$	$\frac{3}{58-4}$
10. More emphasis should be placed on developing individual interests of the pupils rather than on teaching subject matter. (P)	$\frac{19}{59-1}$	$\frac{48}{59-2}$	$\frac{52}{59-3}$	$\frac{11}{59-4}$
11. More emphasis should be placed on teaching subject matter rather than on developing individual interests of the pupils. (T)	$\frac{12}{60-1}$	$\frac{51}{60-2}$	$\frac{59}{60-3}$	$\frac{8}{60-4}$
12. There should be teacher participation in policy formation. (P)	$\frac{24}{61-1}$	$\frac{78}{61-2}$	$\frac{21}{61-3}$	$\frac{7}{61-4}$
13. Pupils should regularly form into lines on the way to and from classes. (T)	$\frac{2}{62-1}$	$\frac{27}{62-2}$	$\frac{65}{62-3}$	$\frac{36}{62-4}$
14. There should be use of schools as neighborhood centers. (P)	$\frac{28}{63-1}$	$\frac{65}{63-2}$	$\frac{27}{63-3}$	$\frac{10}{63-4}$
15. There should be extensive use of psychological and mental tests. (P)	$\frac{23}{64-1}$	$\frac{77}{64-2}$	$\frac{23}{64-3}$	$\frac{7}{64-4}$

(P) = Progressive

(T) = Traditional

(Not indicated on Board Member's Copy)

VITA

Brian Allen Lotven

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POSITION OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ON A SCALE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM AND CERTAIN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS

Major Field: Secondary Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, October 11, 1942, the son of Morris and Mildred Lotven.

Education: Graduated from Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma in 1960; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in January, 1968; received Master of Science degree in Secondary Education from Oklahoma State University in May, 1973; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1975.

Professional Experience: Classroom teacher at Skyline High School, Dallas, Texas, 1971-72; classroom teacher at Perkins/Tryon High School, Perkins, Oklahoma, 1972-73; graduate assistant at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1973-75.