

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF ELECTED AND
APPOINTED SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN SELECTED
SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN VIRGINIA AND
KENTUCKY

by

William T. Powell

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Administration

APPROVED:

M. D. Alexander, Co-Chairman

D. J. Parks, Co-Chairman

R. G. Salmon

W. L. Flowers, Jr.

F. J. Brieve

May, 1975

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses a special note of appreciation to Advisory Committee Co-Chairman, Dr. David Alexander, for his encouragement and perserverance; to Committee Co-Chairman, Dr. David Parks, whose astute direction guided this study to its completion, the writer is especially grateful. The other committee members, Dr. Fred Brieve, Dr. William Flowers, Jr., and Dr. Richard Salmon, are acknowledged for their particular contributions to this study.

Special mention should be made of the contributions of others who assisted in this study. These include Dr. Wayne Worner, Director, Division of Administrative and Education Services, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Dr. George Holmes, Executive Director, Virginia School Boards Association; Dr. Maurice Bement, Executive Director, Kentucky School Boards Association; and Mr. Sam Alexander, Kentucky Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Appreciation is also expressed to the Norfolk, Virginia School Board for sabbatical leave to pursue this study, and to Dr. Sam Ray, Jr., Norfolk Deputy Superintendent of Schools, for his cooperation and counsel.

The writer is most grateful for the assistance provided by Mrs. Vyvian Grey and Mr. Robert Blythe in the development of the final manuscript, and for typists Sherry Williams, Ruth Long, and Cheryl Weaver, a special note of thanks.

And especially for wife Patricia, son William, Jr., and daughter Paige, the writer expresses his most sincere appreciation for their patience and sacrifice during the past sixteen months.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION AND THESIS	1
THESIS	2
RELATED EVIDENCE	2
State Constitution Requirements	2
Conceptual Representativeness	5
Empirical Representativeness	9
2. FURTHER RESEARCH ON THESIS	23
HYPOTHESES	25
DEFINITIONS	29
POPULATION AND SAMPLE	31
IDENTIFICATION OF THE SAMPLE	37
INSTRUMENT	40
PREPARATION OF DATA FOR ANALYSIS AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES	40
3. RESULTS	42
HYPOTHESES AND FINDINGS	43
GENERAL DISCUSSION	56
RELATED DATA	61
4. OVERVIEW, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.	64

Chapter	Page
CONCLUSIONS	65
IMPLICATIONS	73
SELECTED REFERENCES	75
APPENDIX A	81
APPENDIX B	84
APPENDIX C	97
APPENDIX D	100
APPENDIX E	105
VITA	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Range of Wealth and Size in Each Quarter	34
2. School District Distribution by Wealth and Size (Virginia)	35
3. School District Distribution by Wealth and Size (Kentucky)	36
4. Selected Sample of Virginia School Districts	38
5. Selected Sample of Kentucky School Districts	39
6. Analysis of Representativeness for Kentucky and Virginia School Districts	41
7. Analysis of Representativeness for Virginia and Kentucky School Districts at the State Level	45
8. Analysis of Representativeness for Low Wealth Districts in Virginia and Kentucky	46
9. Analysis of Representativeness for Medium Wealth Districts in Virginia and Kentucky	48
10. Analysis of Representativeness for High Wealth Districts in Virginia and Kentucky	50
11. Analysis of Representativeness for Low Enrollment Districts in Virginia and Kentucky	51
12. Analysis of Representativeness for Medium Enrollment Districts in Virginia and Kentucky	53
13. Analysis of Representativeness for High Enrollment Districts in Virginia and Kentucky	55
14. Assessment of Representativeness as Measured by Level of Significance for Individual Variables by State	57
15. School Districts Identified by Size and Wealth (Virginia)	82
16. School Districts Identified by Size and Wealth (Kentucky)	83
17. Virginia Demographic Profile	85

Table	Page
18. Kentucky Demographic Profile	91
19. Occupation Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	106
20. Income Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	109
21. Years of Schooling Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	112
22. Race Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	115
23. Sex Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	118
24. Place of Work Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	121
25. Age Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	124
26. Native Born Profile for Virginia and Kentucky	127

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND THESIS

The study of school boards has been traditionally one of the most frequently investigated topics in pedagogical research. School board member attitude surveys have been made in every conceivable area, including those of administration and peer relationships, curriculum beliefs, expectations for the member's role as related to local financial support, opinion changes on crucial issues of education, and the self-perceived decision-making role of school board members.

Many assessments are made of board member characteristics as related to such salient concerns as the hiring and firing of superintendents, communication with school personnel, and the adopting of particular curricula.

The debate still continues over which is the "better" school board--that which is appointed or that which is elected. Educators, political scientists, and sociologists all contribute their expertise as to the "best" selection procedures. Such interpretations of which is "best" are mostly subjective; however, since there have been no definitive analyses of appointed and elected boards within the confines of the democratic concept--a concept most necessary for the entire process. Which board, the elected or the appointed, more closely represents the populace from which it was selected?

THESIS

Elected school board members in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in Virginia. This thesis will be supported regardless of size and wealth of the school jurisdiction.

RELATED EVIDENCE

Prefatory to an analysis of investigatory efforts in this area, an overview of the statutory aspects of selecting board members in Virginia and Kentucky should be noted.

State Constitution Requirements

The State of Virginia, in appointing its school board members, does so on the county level by the naming of a school trustee electoral board by the circuit court,¹ or direct appointment by the county governing body.² Town and city councils appoint their boardmen directly, unless provided for by separate charter.³ Qualifications for a board member in Virginia are that one must be a qualified voter of the district,⁴ unless decreed otherwise by city charter.⁵

¹Code of Virginia, § 22-60; § 22-61.

²Ibid., § 22-79.3; § 22-79.4; § 22-80; § 22-83.1.

³Ibid., § 22-89; § 22-89.1; § 22-89.2.

⁴Ibid., § 22-68; § 22-90.

⁵Opinions of Attorney General (Virginia), Dec. 23, 1971.

The number of school board members can vary, depending on the number of magisterial or election districts in counties,⁶ or wards or school districts in cities and towns.⁷ Cities with populations in excess of 225,000 must select a mandated number on an at large basis.⁸ Term of office also varies, depending on state or local provision.⁹ Compensation of board members is at local discretion also, with only maximum limits set forth by state law.¹⁰

Kentucky, on the other hand, elects its school board members at the regular November general election in even numbered years.¹¹ The term of office for all members is four years,¹² and there are five board members for all districts, irrespective of size.¹³

In its qualifications for board members, Kentucky is more demanding, stating that no person shall be eligible to membership:

1. unless he has attained the age of twenty-four years;
2. unless he has been a citizen of Kentucky for at least three years preceding his election and is a voter of the district for which he is elected;

⁶Code of Virginia, § 22-61; § 22-79.1; § 22-80.

⁷Ibid., § 22-89.

⁸Ibid., § 22-89.1; § 22-89.2.

⁹Code of Virginia, op. cit., § 22-64; § 22-83.1; § 22-83.2; § 22-89; § 22-89.1.

¹⁰Ibid., § 22-67.2.

¹¹Kentucky Revised Statutes, § 160-200.

¹²Ibid., § 160-200.

¹³Ibid., § 160.160.

3. unless he has completed at least the eighth grade in the common schools as shown by the records of the school in which the eighth grade was completed or by affidavit of the teacher or teachers under whom the work was completed, or unless he has the equivalent of an eighth grade education as determined by an examiner held under rules and regulations adopted by the State Board of Education¹⁴

Compensation is restricted to ten dollars per diem for each meeting attended and actual expenses incurred for county members, while non-salaried independent district members receive only expenses. There is a \$200 maximum per annum for both per diem and expenses for all members.

Two major areas of litigation have arisen concerning both states statutes, namely Virginia's appointive process and the qualifications of Kentucky's board members.

Virginia's rationale for appointing board members is "to make county school boards as far removed from politics as is possible."¹⁵ A "non political" position such as this has evoked a plethora of criticism from various circles, including educators, sociologists and political scientists who maintain there can be no separation of politics and public school policy.¹⁶ Thomas H. Eliot, the noted political scientist explained it as follows:

Yet because school districts are governmental units and the voters have ultimate responsibility, school board members and school superintendents are engaged in political activity whether they like

¹⁴Ibid., § 160-180.

¹⁵Board of Supervisors V. County School Board, 182 Va. 266, 28 S. E. 2d 698 (1944); Huffman v. Kite, 198 Va. 196, 93 S. E. 2d 328 (1958).

¹⁶Fred J. Brieve, "A Case for Elected School Board Trustees," Roanoke Times, March 19, 1972, p. 13.

it or not. The standard professional terminology for this--a semantic triumph--is community relations¹⁷

Kentucky's qualifications for membership have resulted in numerous suits.¹⁸ In *Commonwealth v. Mullins*, the court ruled that an affidavit of a board member's teacher which stated that he taught all the grades except the eighth, and a certificate of the registrar of a normal school showing registration for one term are not sufficient to show eligibility for office since neither demonstrated completion of the eighth grade or its equivalency.¹⁹

Kentucky, in comparison to the other states, demands more in general qualifications for its boardmen. No other state requires the exacting eighth grade education, twenty-four year minimum age, and only New Jersey also expects the three year residence requirement.²⁰

Conceptual Representativeness

The board of education has traditionally been identified as a crucial linkage between the community and the schools and as formally

¹⁷Thomas H. Eliot, "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics," American Political Science Review, LIII, Dec. 1959, p. 1058.

¹⁸See, for example, *Commonwealth v. Griffen*, 268, Ky. 830, 105 S. W. (2d) 1063 (1937); *Commonwealth v. Sizemore*, 243 S. W. (2d) 671 (1951); *Commonwealth v. Preece*, 257 S. W. (2d) 51 (1953); *Lear v. Commonwealth*, 317 S. W. (2d) 492 (1958); *Commonwealth v. Hester*, 406 S. W. (2d) 846 (1966); *Sayers v. Lyons*, 304 Ky. 320, 200 S. W. (2d) 749 (1947).

¹⁹*Commonwealth v. Mullins*, 307 Ky. 383, 211 S. W. (2d) 133 (1948).

²⁰Morrill H. Hall, Provisions Governing Membership on Local Boards of Education, Bulletin 1957, No. 13, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957), pp. 17-18.

representing the people. Agger, in 1960, in Springfield, Oregon,²¹ and earlier, Neal Gross in Massachusetts,²² found this linkage a viable and sometimes unexplainable one that laid bare the local power structure and its influence on public school policy. Norman Kerr, in "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation"²³ delved into the linkage role of community representation vis-a-vis the community interest bases. He found that the chief contribution of school boards was their authorization of the schools' policies, and not the espousal of local demands.

The concept of representation has been the topic of a countless number of books over the years, but several concepts should be illuminated before proceeding. The idea of formal representation of the people is more of an American tradition than a European one. Whether one follows Thomas Hobbes' theory of "artificial" persons²⁴ created for representative purposes, or Edmund Burke's interest oriented concept of "elitism,"²⁵ the fact remains that the idea of representation inclusive of the populace, and not of other factions, was set forth in this

²¹Robert E. Agger, "The Politics of Local Education: A Comparative Study in Community Decision Making," in *A Forward Look--The Preparation of School Administrators 1970*, ed. Donald E. Tope (Eugene, Oregon: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1960).

²²Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958).

²³Norman Kerr, "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation," Sociology of Education, XXXVIII (Fall, 1964), pp. 34-59.

²⁴Thomas Hobbes, English Works, ed. Sir William Molesworth (London: Longmans, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1839-1845), p. 147.

²⁵Edmund Burke, Burke's Politics, eds. Ross J. S. Hoffman and Paul Levack (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949), pp. 397-398.

country and demonstrated in the Federalist Papers²⁶ by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay.

Here again the Burkean concept of "elitism" is advocated, but to a lesser degree. Any student of history can readily tell you of Washington's and Jefferson's views of the masses and their rule by the aristocracy.

This then, leads into a more contemporary discussion of representation, namely that found on school boards in this country. Studies still bear out this theory of "elitism" as found on local boards insofar as socio-economic variables exist.

Dye and Ziegler reinforced the Burkean concept of elitism in their 1970 study which concluded that school boards do not represent the general populace.²⁷ Peter Cistone²⁸ and Fred Carver²⁹ in non-related projects alluded to elite values on the basis of social and economic characteristics, involvement in civic and organizational activities, and general background. Heinz Eulau, writing in Contemporary Political Science highlighted the difference between the elite and

²⁶Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay, The Federalist, ed. Max Beloff (Oxford: Blackwell, 1948).

²⁷Thomas Dye and Harman Ziegler, The Irony of Democracy (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1970).

²⁸Peter Cistone, "School Board Member Recruitment in Ontario" (paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, 1973), pp. 1-22.

²⁹Fred Carver, "Social Class and School Board Role Expectations," Urban Education, Vol. 3, 1968, pp. 143-154.

non-elites in this way:

It is an error, I think, to assume that the 'chosen'--whether elected or selected--are or can ever be 'like' their choosers. The very fact that of their having been elected or selected--having been 'elevated' through some mechanism of choice from one position into another--makes the 'chosen' fundamentally different from their choosers. Having been chosen, the representative has at least one attribute that differentiates him from the represented, no matter how similar, socially or psychologically, he may be in all other respects. Status differentiation, then, is a crucial property of any representational relationship.³⁰

The question evolves, then, if one is an elite, can he also be representative? Eulau presented the argument that one selected thus becomes elitist, no matter how similar in other respects, basically because of his new position. Though presented with new status, the boardman does not disaffirm identity with the populace because of his new position. He is different, yes, but still similar.

One of the nation's most distinguished school board authorities, Roald Campbell commented:

The elitist concept of the board, and one with which many of us have been comfortable, is being challenged on many fronts . . . minority groups are demanding representation on boards of education.

. . . Increasing representativeness of boards will probably come whether board members are appointed or elected . . . Even if appointing officials are committed to a representative board the achievement of such a goal is not entirely possible. There are, for instance, more ethnic groups and more regional areas in most cities than can ever be accomodated on most boards

³⁰Heinz Eulau, "Changing Views of Representation," Contemporary Political Science, ed. Ithiel de Sola Pool (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 80.

These difficulties notwithstanding, the push for representativeness will probably persist.³¹

Empirical Representativeness

Charles Reeves stated:

Virginia, where many of the elements of our democratic system originated, has, perhaps, the most undemocratic system of selecting school board members for its school divisions . . . It is a method that does not tend to free the school systems of political control.³²

Earlier, it was indicated that Virginia legal authorities viewed the appointive process as exclusively non-political. Whether political or not, this procedure should be evaluated in perspective.

White, in his definitive 1962 report of 4,072 school boards, noted that in several southern states (Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Maryland, and Tennessee) the appointive process was used except in cases where special legislation had dictated otherwise.³³ Virginia, then and now, is the only state to have completely appointive boards.³⁴ Thirty-seven other states employ the election procedure exclusively.³⁵

³¹Roald F. Campbell, "City School Boards: . What Can Be Done?" New Dimensions in School Board Leaderships, ed. Wm. E. Dickinson (Evanston, Illinois: National School Boards Association, Inc., 1969), p. 74.

³²Charles E. Reeves, School Boards: Their Status, Functions and Activities (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 83.

³³Alpheus L. White, Local School Boards: Organization and Practices (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962), pp. 10-16.

³⁴Summary and Highlights, Fifty State School Boards Association. (Evanston, Illinois: National School Boards Association, 1972, unpublished), p. 2.

³⁵Ibid.

Individual school systems of over 25,000 enrollment depicted a somewhat different view. The Educational Research Service (ERS) reported that 79.9 percent of those boards responding to its 1972 survey were elected while only 75.5 percent were elected in 1967.³⁶ Among the nation's fifty-one largest cities, Baltimore, Chicago, New York and Philadelphia were a few of the 19.6 percent with appointed boards in 1971-72.³⁷ In a similar study of 1964-65, the National School Boards Association (NSBA) reported 26.2 percent of the nation's forty-two largest cities had appointed school boards.³⁸ Overall, the figure of 14.1 percent appointed boards as quoted by White in his national survey still remains the most inclusive figure available.³⁹

As to whether the appointment of school boards or the election of school boards is the better procedure, Francis Keppel, former Assistant Secretary of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said:

For a number of years researchers have examined personal characteristics of board members (education, occupation, age, income, etc.) in an attempt to see which selection method--election or appointment--attains the most competent members. Insofar as personal characteristics indicate competence, the assertion that one method is superior to the other has not been supported by

³⁶Suzanne K. Stemnock, "Local Boards of Education: Status and Structure," Educational Research Service Circular No. 5 (Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators and NEA Research Division, 1973), p. 10.

³⁷Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Big City School Districts (Evanston, Illinois: National School Boards Association, Inc., November, 1972), pp. 5-31.

³⁸Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Big City School Districts, op. cit., p. 5.

³⁹White, op. cit., p. 8.

research. In fact, comparisons of elected and appointed board members reveal more similarities than differences.⁴⁰

Reeves offered the following arguments for appointive boards:

1. Many professional and business people . . . shrink from subjecting their names and reputations to the misrepresentations that sometimes are made in a political campaign Appointment seems to be considered more of an honor, and such people are more likely to accept the office on that basis as a civic responsibility

2. If school board members are appointed, the appointing authority can be held fully responsible to the people for the actions of the school board, for the integrity of the members appointed, and for any misuse of the schools by the appointing authority or by the school board for its members' political or selfish purposes

3. Appointment for long, overlapping terms of persons deeply interested in the welfare of the public schools, from nominees selected by representatives of civic and other organizations of the city, will secure members who are less politically inclined than would be persons competing for school board membership in a popular election.

4. It is desirable that the length of service of school board members be fairly long Fairly long service by board members is usually advantageous because it results in more consistent actions by the board and because the experience of members is valuable

5. When individual school board members are elected on particular issues, they often feel they have a mandate from the people to make those issues good in the school system The desire to make changes, by newly elected members, is likely to result in three pernicious practices or conditions. First, the school board may be led to assume certain administrative functions that should be performed by the superintendent of schools and his staff. Second, with frequent changes in school board personnel, the superintendent of schools may find it difficult to work with new board members and be forced out, resulting in too frequent changes in the chief executive school official. Third, with too frequent changes in board membership, educational policies may be kept in a state of

⁴⁰Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education (New York: Harper, 1966), p. 146.

flux, and consistent development of the school system may be retarded.⁴¹

Others including former school superintendent Archie R. Dykes, presented further corroboration:

1. Appointment of board members helps assure harmonious working relationships between the school board and the local government.

2. Board stability and continuity of service are better secured by the appointive method.

3. The elective method encourages candidates for board office to develop issues for their public appeal or to make charges against incumbent board members or professional staff in order to secure votes, while appointive board members generate less community controversy.

4. The appointive method provides opportunity for greater selectivity in choosing board members, thus assuring capable board members with proper motives.⁴²

In an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun Times urging the Illinois legislature to prevent passage of a bill which would replace Chicago's appointed school board to one elected by districts, these points were noted:

The Mayor has been determined to keep the schools out of politics and has largely succeeded in doing so. The appointments of members are made on the basis of careful selection from among lists submitted by various groups concerned as professionals or as citizens for the welfare of the city's schools.

Each board member represents the entire city, rather than a part of it, and on the whole the board's decisions have been made in the interest of the whole rather than a fragment of it.

⁴¹Reeves, op. cit., pp. 89-90.

⁴²Archie R. Dykes, School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relationships (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printing, 1965), pp. 173-176.

An elected board would be fragmented in its interests and concerns, and therefore in its decisions. Factions would be continually at war. Members would be running for re-election rather than objectively considering the problems of the school system. Many likely candidates would refuse to enter an election because of the tremendous effort and expense entailed.⁴³

All of this reasoning is succinctly drawn, and makes for a strong position for appointive boards. What of the 86 percent of those boards that are not appointed, but elected? Ward G. Reeder presented the following:

. . . school board members should be elected by popular vote at a non-partisan election; by non-partisan is meant that the politics of the candidates should not appear on the ballot or be a consideration in the election campaign. Popular election is recommended, because it permits the people to express themselves directly on school matters and gives the members whom the people select a definite feeling of responsibility to the electorate. Appointment of school board members by mayors, by councils, by judges, and by similar agencies is here frowned upon because of the danger of domination by a selfish interest, 'political' or otherwise. But these appointive methods sometimes work well, and they always work well when the appointers are intelligent and altruistic.⁴⁴

Again, Archie Dykes offered his views on the topic:

Election of board members makes the board more responsive to the public will and creates a degree of intimacy between the people and the board not possible when the board is appointed.

Public interest in the schools and educational matters is increased when the people have a direct vote in the selection of the school system's governing body.

Elected school board members have greater independence and freedom to act in the interests of the school system than do appointed board members.

An elected board is in a better position to work closely and effectively with its superintendent and professional staff than is an appointed board.⁴⁵

⁴³Editorial, Chicago Sun Times, June 12, 1967.

⁴⁴Ward G. Reeder, Fundamentals of Public School Administration, 4th Edition (New York: McMillan Company, 1958), p. 65.

⁴⁵Dykes, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

Reeves echoed these arguments, but added this dimension:

Election, more often than appointment, protects the schools from local politics. If appointed, members are sometimes selected for the purpose of using the schools for patronage or for the award of purchase contracts to supporters of local politicians. The use of schools for patronage purposes results in the selection of teachers and other employees for political reasons and not on the basis of their qualifications. . . . Furthermore, the use of the schools for political purposes results in the misuse of school funds to the disadvantage of both the schools and the taxpayers. Any sense of obligation to a municipal authority by the members of a school board may result in the use of the schools to help to maintain the political power of the existing municipal authorities.⁴⁶

Discussion of these selection procedures will undoubtedly continue, but trends are in evidence to make the boards more responsive and attentive to needs of their districts.⁴⁷ Vaughan contended there is at present more thought for appointive boards since certain community interests and geographical area representation could be initiated.⁴⁸ Most states elect on an at-large basis rather than by geographic areas, and in a 1969 survey, Garber and Reutter found that the courts have consistently upheld the state's right in the selection of its board members.⁴⁹

In this analysis of selection procedures, no discourse has been offered as to the effectiveness of local school boards. It should not go without mention, however, that several authorities feel that the present structure and function is outmoded and should be modified or

⁴⁶Reeves, op. cit., p. 88.

⁴⁷Campbell, "City School Boards: What Can Be Done?," op. cit., p. 69-72

⁴⁸Freeman H. Vaughan, "School Boards: Selection of Members," Encyclopedia of Education, Volume 8 (New York: McMillan Company and Free Press, 1971), p. 77.

⁴⁹Lee D. Garber and E. Edmund Reutter, Jr., The Yearbook of School Law (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Press, 1969).

altered drastically. Myron Liebermann and B. Everard Blanchard, for example, were of the opinion that local school boards should be controlled by professional educators and not by laymen.⁵⁰

Harold Howe, former U. S. Commissioner of Education, answered these critics with these suggestions:

. . . board members should be selected who are broadly representative of the community and who have shown initiative in civic responsibility and leadership Encourage a responsible interest in the schools by laymen who hold no official position except that of citizens.⁵¹

To remedy whatever objections are inherent in either selection procedure, to make the board more "representative" might alleviate some criticism. To determine how "representative" a board or board member is, attention should be turned to the evidence available.

As alluded to previously, many studies have been done on board member characteristics and attitudes. Those investigations of member variables such as age, sex, education, income and occupation were of concern to this research. Unfortunately, in no instance were these variables ever related to or compared to the equivalent population variables to assess the degree of demographic representativeness.

⁵⁰See B. Everard Blanchard, "Eternity of Chaos," National Association of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin 44 (254) March, 1960, pp. 40-43 and Liebermann, Myron, The Future of Public Education, University of Chicago Press.

⁵¹Harold Howe, II, "Should Educators or Boards Control Our Public Schools?" The Nations Schools 78 (6) Dec., 1966, pp. 58-60.

George S. Counts made the first intensive study of school board member characteristics in 1927,⁵² and his efforts have been duplicated on both the national and local scene on numerous occasions. Some of his findings, as well as those of his successors, should not pass without comment.

In his survey of boards throughout the nation, Counts found that 55 percent of the boardmen were in professional, technical or managerial positions. Even a lesser study by Scott Nearing in 1916 indicated that 61 percent came from similar occupational classifications.⁵³ Six years later, in a study of 169 cities with populations in the 2,500-250,000 range, Struble found 60 percent with the same occupational backgrounds cited in the Counts study.⁵⁴ A National Education Association study in the U. S. in 1946 revealed a figure of 43 percent in occupational listings comparable to those of Counts'.⁵⁵

Alexander Proudfoot, in a University of Oregon study, showed that the range of the percentage of board members coming from professional, technical and managerial positions was from 40 percent in Wood's study

⁵²George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927).

⁵³Scott Nearing, "Who's Who in Our School Boards" School and Society 5 (January 20, 1917), p. 5.

⁵⁴George S. Struble, "A Study of School Board Personnel," American School Board Journal, 65 (October, 1922), pp. 48-49, 137-138.

⁵⁵National Education Association, Status and Practices of Boards of Education, Research Bulletin Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1946), p. 53.

in West Virginia to 69 percent in Brown's 1951 study that covered the entire United States.⁵⁶ In a study conducted by Clarence Hines from 1891 to 1944 of the Eugene, Oregon School Board, it was reported that the board never represented the working class or the farm groups, but it always represented the business and professional community.⁵⁷

Albert, in a 1958 survey of 396 boards and Goldhammer in 1955, both concluded that business and professional interests were most frequently represented.⁵⁸ A more recent study by the Educational Research Service in 1972 showed that this same occupational grouping accounted for over 70 percent of 1,313 boardmen for districts enrolling 25,000 or more pupils.⁵⁹

Board composition may reflect these occupational classifications which represent special interests, and which can and will influence board policy. Smith wrote:

Anyone who lives observantly in a modern democracy can enumerate a dozen instances in which particular groups argue their special cases in terms of the larger community.⁶⁰

⁵⁶Alexander Proudfoot, A Study of the Socio-Economic Status of Influential School Board Members in Alberta as Related to Their Attitudes Toward Certain Common Problems Confronting School Boards, (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1962), p. 51.

⁵⁷Clarence Hines, "A Study of School Board Administrative Relationships: The Development of the Eugene, Oregon Superintendency 1891-1944," American School Board Journal, 122 (February, 1951), pp. 19-21.

⁵⁸See Frank R. Albert, Jr., Selected Characteristics of School Board Members Toward Certain Criticism of Public Education, (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1959), and Goldhammer, Keith, "Community Power Structure and School Board Membership," American School Board Journal 130 (March, 1955).

⁵⁹Stemnock, op. cit., p. 10.

⁶⁰Howard R. Smith, Democracy and the Public Interest (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1960), p. 25.

Campbell summarized in this way:

Citizens who perform legislative functions must take positions on issues; the positions chosen will inevitably reflect personal values, and these in turn may be shared by minority or majority segments of the community. This is the American way--it is likewise the American experience that some public representatives are pawns and not able to exercise an independent judgment.⁶¹

The age variable has also come under close scrutiny over the years, beginning with Counts' reported 48.3 as the median age in his earlier study.⁶² Subsequent research showed a range of 42.5 years in Tiedt's⁶³ study to 53.4 years in Woods' West Virginia study.⁶⁴ Perkins, in his study in New York in 1967 characterized his boardmen as "in their mid to late forties."⁶⁵

The median income of board members on a national level showed an increase of almost \$8,000 over the thirty-one year period from 1927 to 1958. More recent figures showed a figure of over \$14,000 in Cistone's Ontario study.⁶⁶

⁶¹Roald F. Campbell, "Process of Policy Making Within Structures of Educational Government," Government of Public Education for Adequate Policy Making, eds. Wm. P. McLure and Van Miller (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960), pp. 59-76.

⁶²Counts, op. cit., p. 36.

⁶³Sidney W. Tiedt, "Oregon School Board Members in the Willamette Valley," Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Vol. 6 (Eugene, Oregon: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1962), p. 7.

⁶⁴Roy C. Woods, "The West Virginia School Board Member," American School Board Journal, 128 (April, 1954), pp. 31-33.

⁶⁵James A. Perkins, et al., "School Boards and School Board Membership: Recommendations and Report of a Survey," New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership (Albany, New York: 1967), p. 29.

⁶⁶Cistone, op. cit., p. 11.

Education of board members has always been of paramount interest, with the education criterion varying among the surveys. For example, Counts reported that 50 percent of all board members had attended college, whereas White in his survey of 24,041 boardmen reported that 48.3 percent were college graduates.⁶⁷ Undoubtedly, this figure would be even higher if those who had attended college had been included. Albert⁶⁸ reported that a figure of 72 percent of his national sample had attended college, while Brown,⁶⁹ in his study seven years previously, indicated 67 percent nationwide had attended some college. In his analysis of twenty-seven school districts in New York State, Perkins found that 53 percent of the boardmen had at least a bachelors degree.⁷⁰ Teal, in a Pennsylvania study in 1956, reported that 50 percent of his sample had attended college.⁷¹

The small number of female board members has remained relatively static over the years. From 15 percent in Counts' historic study in 1927, an increase of only 4 percent was noted over a forty-five year period.⁷² Other significant figures include 10 percent in the 1946

⁶⁷White, op. cit., p. 18.

⁶⁸Albert, op. cit., p. 73.

⁶⁹R. H. Brown, "Composition of School Boards," American School Board Journal 129 (August, 1954), pp. 23-24.

⁷⁰Perkins, op. cit., p. 30.

⁷¹Hal C. Teal, Attitudes of Selected School Board Members Concerning Problems Facing Public Education (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956), quoted in Goldhammer, Keith, The School Board (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 93.

⁷²Stemnock, op. cit., p. 10.

NEA⁷³ research; 18 percent in Albert's⁷⁴ 1958 inquiry and 24 percent in the NSBA survey of big cities in 1971.⁷⁵ The lowest degree of female participation recorded in any survey of this type was the 6 percent cited in Proudfoot's analysis of Alberta, Canada in 1962.⁷⁶

Cunningham reported interviewing male board members about their feelings with respect to women serving on school boards. Vehement opposition was expressed by some interviewees who suggested that no right-thinking male would support women for board membership.⁷⁷ Stapley's study also indicated that women were no less effective than men in the performance of school board functions.⁷⁸

Minority group representation on school boards has become increasingly meaningful since the mandated integration of the public schools in 1954. Empirical evidence in the area of minority participation is quite limited, but in a NSBA Survey in 1968, 16 percent of

⁷³NEA, op. cit., p. 53.

⁷⁴Albert, op. cit., p. 107

⁷⁵Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Big City School Districts, op. cit., p. 2.

⁷⁶Proudfoot, op. cit., p. 56.

⁷⁷Luvern L. Cunningham, A Community Develops Educational Policy: A Case Study (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1958) p. 189 quoted in Campbell, Roald F. et. al., The Organization and Control of American Schools 2nd edition (Columbus Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970), p. 183.

⁷⁸Maurice E. Stapley, Effective School Board Membership (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago), 1952.

all big city board members were Negroes.⁷⁹ The ERS Survey of those districts of 25,000 or more pupils revealed a figure of 11 percent Negro boardmen,⁸⁰ and the latest National School Board Association investigation showed 25 percent of fifty-one of the nation's largest city school boards had minority representation.⁸¹

Theodore Lowi, who studied the ethnicity and social class of New York City mayoralty appointees during the 1900's, suggested that these appointments demonstrate recognition of the political importance of minority groups. These minorities, by virtue of their appointment, received acknowledgement of the legitimacy of their claims for political representation.⁸²

In summation, a consensus of data taken over the past forty-five years indicated that the typical school board member is:

1. white
2. over forty-five
3. male
4. college trained

⁷⁹Survey of Public Education in the Member Cities of the Council of Big City Boards of Education (Evanston, Illinois: National School Board Association, November, 1968), p. 4.

⁸⁰Stemnock, op. cit., p. 10.

⁸¹Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Big City School Districts (Evanston, Illinois: National School Board Association, November, 1972), p. 1.

⁸²Theodore J. Lowi, At the Pleasure of the Mayor (New York: The Free Press, 1964).

5. above the average in income
6. in a professional, technical or managerial position.

The two major areas of change were in the increase of minority representation on boards and the inflated income medians. Surprisingly, even with the advent of the women's liberation movement, no sizeable alteration was noticed in the number of female board members.

Whether the board member assumes an elitist position by virtue of election or appointment, or is only selected because of his elite status in the community, remains an open-ended question. Evidence has been offered to substantiate either contention.

Arguments have been presented to demonstrate the feasibility of both the election or the appointment of board members. Most authorities concur that even though more boards are elected, the better, or more qualified members are found on appointed boards.

Chapter 2

FURTHER RESEARCH ON THESIS

Chapter One has created a scenario for future endeavor in this study. Previous evidence relating to school board membership indicated a void of comparative data applicable for measuring representativeness, which was indicated as the continuum essential for democratic ideology. In no study has an attempt been made to document a representative index for the assessment of the degree in which the board mirrored the populace it served. Such a documentation was a goal of this investigation.

Philosophers, political scientists, politicians and educators are in obvious disagreement over the meaning of representation. As indicated earlier, Burke, Hobbes and the authors of the Federalist all had their ideas on the subject. "The dictionary tells us that 'representative' in the sense of 'representativeness' means 'typical of a class'"⁸³ Friedrich indicated that representation means, as the word's etymological origins indicate, re-presentation, a making present again.⁸⁴ Pitkin further categorized the sense as was applicable for this investigation, as descriptive representation, the making present of something absent by resemblance or reflection, as in a mirror.⁸⁵

⁸³Hanna F. Pitkin, The Concept of Representation (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967), p. 79.

⁸⁴Carl J. Friedrich, Constitutional Government and Democracy (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1950), p. 267.

⁸⁵Pitkin, op. cit., p. 11.

John Adams, who possessed keen insight in representative theory much to the discomfort of mother England stated, "A representative legislature should be an exact portrait, in miniature, of the people at large, as it should think, feel, reason and act like them."⁸⁶ This miniature, or condensation of the whole, analogy was also voiced by George Harris in his monograph, The True Theory of Representation in a State, published in 1857.

Others tended to equate representation with sampling. Marie Swabey said:

. . . The principle of sampling in democratic theory is that a smaller group, selected impartially or at random from a larger group, tends to have the character of the larger group. Accordingly a part, if properly chosen, may be taken as truly representative of the whole and substituted for it . . . Throughout modern "representative" democracy this principle of the valid substitution of the part for the whole is central.⁸⁷

Consider now, the degree of the representativeness of these representatives. Stuart Rice did a pioneer study in 1928 entitled "The Representativeness of Elected Representatives," in which he attempted to correlate the characteristics of state legislators with those of their constituents, hoping to prove that these measures would show "the extent to which they represent their constituency."⁸⁸

⁸⁶John Adams, "Letter to John Penn," Works (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1852-1865), IV, p. 205.

⁸⁷Marie C. Swabey, Theory of the Democratic State (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937), p. 25.

⁸⁸Stuart Rice, Quantitative Methods in Politics (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1928), p. 189.

His interpretation of what is representative, then is most applicable here. To represent means to be representative in the sense of having representative, or like characteristics of the constituency. De Grazia stated it in modified fashion:

. . . voters often demand that their representative possess some large measure of identity of characteristics with the group qualities, so that representation may be regarded as a consensus of characteristics. . . .⁸⁹

Pitkin assumed that people's characteristics are a guide to the actions they will take, and the constituency is concerned with characteristics of their representatives for just this reason. Again the term "descriptive representation" highlighted the concept that a person stands for others by being sufficiently like them.⁹⁰

HYPOTHESES

Within this conceptual frame fits the main ingredient for investigation. That is: Are boards of education in Kentucky and Virginia representative of the population which they serve?

Operationally stated, the hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1. Elected school board members in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

⁸⁹Alfred De Grazia, Public and Republic (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1951), p. 5, 8 quoted in Pitkin, op. cit., p. 78.

⁹⁰A. Phillips Griffiths and Richard Wollheim, "How Can One Person Represent Another?", Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Vol. XXXIV (1960), p. 188.

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypothesis 2. Elected school board members in low wealth districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in low wealth districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypothesis 3. Elected school board members in medium low and medium high wealth districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in medium low and medium high wealth districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypothesis 4. Elected school board members in high wealth districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in high wealth districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypothesis 5. Elected school board members in low enrollment districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in low enrollment districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypothesis 6. Elected school board members in medium low and medium high enrollment districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in medium low and medium high enrollment districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypothesis 7. Elected school board members in high enrollment districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in high enrollment districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

A basic design of the study, then, was to generate conceptual and methodological formats for the future.

DEFINITIONS

Boards of Education--A proportional, stratified random sample of Kentucky and Virginia legal governing bodies selected on the basis of wealth and size of district. All members of the selected boards who responded to the questionnaire are included in this study.

School District--That Kentucky and Virginia school district selected by a proportional, stratified random sample on the basis of size and wealth.

Wealth of District--The equalized assessed valuation of property divided by the number of pupils in average daily attendance for selected Virginia and Kentucky school districts in 1972-73. For analytical purposes, the wealth of the district was described as low, medium and high (see Tables 4 and 5, pp. 38-39).

District Enrollment--The number of pupils enrolled in each school district or jurisdiction in Kentucky and Virginia in 1972-73. For analytical purposes, the size of the district was described as low, medium and high (see Tables 4 and 5, pp. 38-39).

The following characteristics or variables described the boards of education, the school districts (county or city) and the Kentucky and Virginia general populations (see Appendix E).

Occupation: White Collar Workers--The Bureau of the Census definition was used: Professional, technical and kindred workers; managers and administrators, except farm; sales workers; and clerical and kindred workers found in Virginia and Kentucky in 1970 (Tables 46, 122; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Occupation: Blue Collar Workers--The Bureau of the Census reported that these are craftsmen and kindred workers; operatives except transport; transport equipment operatives; and laborers, except farm (Tables 46, 122; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Occupation: Service Workers--According to census taxonomy, this included private household workers, policemen, firemen, waiters, barbers, hairdressers, practical nurses and bartenders (Tables 46, 122; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Occupation: Farm Workers--Again the census reported that this included farmers and farm managers, farm laborers and farm foremen (Tables 46, 122; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Level of Family Income--The income for a family residing in Kentucky or Virginia in 1970 (Tables 68, 124; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

School Years Completed--The number of school years completed by a Kentucky or Virginia resident twenty-five years and over in the

1970 census (Tables 46, 120; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Race: Percent White--The percent of those residents of Virginia and Kentucky cities and counties classified as other than Negro and other races (Tables 16, 35; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Sex: Percent Male--Virginia and Kentucky percentages of those residents classified as male (Tables 21, 35; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Place of Work: Percent Worked in County of Residence--Those Virginia and Kentucky workers employed in the same county of their residence (Tables 50, 119; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Age--The age of those residents of Virginia or Kentucky in 1970 (Tables 20, 35; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Native Born: Percent Born in State of Residence--The percentage of those residents of Virginia and Kentucky born in the state of their residence in 1970 (Table 43; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

Non Public School Enrollment--The percentage of those Virginia and Kentucky students enrolled in some school other than public (Tables 45, 120; 1970 Bureau of the Census).

These variables for classifying boards, districts and states according to their demographic characteristics were chosen because: (1) they provide an index for measurement and (2) they are recorded in 1970 Census reports.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

As alluded to in previous discussion, Virginia is the only state using only the appointive method in selecting school board members. Kentucky has a completely elective process by which board members are

selected. With this in mind, it was determined that these states would be the most appropriate due to their propinquity and availability of related information.

Kentucky is a state of 185 school districts; Virginia is one of 135 school districts. Five members comprise each local board in Kentucky,⁹¹ and in Virginia the number usually varies from three to nine. National School Boards Association statistics cited a total of 1,702 board members for both states for the school year 1971-72. These board members were representative of a combined total population of 7,867,805 for both states.

Individual county and city enrollment figures for school year 1972-73 were recorded for Kentucky and Virginia. The former information came from Kentucky School Enrollment, Kentucky Department of Education, Fiscal Year 1972-73, while the Virginia figures originated from the Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1972-73.

The other criterion used in determining the sample was the assessed valuation per pupil for school year 1972-73 which was found in Virginia Education Association Research Service Report R-232, published in February, 1974 and for Kentucky in Supplement, Profiles of Kentucky Public Schools, Kentucky Department of Education, Fiscal Year 1972-73.

⁹¹There is one exception to this. The Georgetown Independent Board merged with the Scott County Board, making for a total of eight members. It will be reduced to a five member board after 1977.

A combination of these two variables, district enrollment and assessed valuation per pupil, indicated:

- (1) size of the individual school district
- (2) the wealth of the individual school district.

To assure a stratified sample, the total number of districts for both states was distributed into four classifications for both size and wealth using the first, second and third quartiles as dividing points.

Table 1 indicated the ranges obtained for wealth and enrollment groupings. Tables 15 and 16, Appendix A, contain the total Virginia and Kentucky school district distribution by both size and wealth.

A proportional sample was taken from each cell, with the total number being contingent on the number of districts found in each cell. For example, in cell A-1 (see Table 2), there were eight districts according to the range defined. It was determined that the proportional value of these eight districts of the total population was 5.97 percent ($8 \div 134$). Of the sixteen cells, an optimum of two samples per cell would realize a total sample of thirty-two, therefore, cell A-1 resulted in a proportional sample of two (5.97×32), keeping in mind that a minimum of 20 percent of the total population would yield a sample of twenty-seven districts. By tabulation, however, a total sample of thirty-one was realized, or approximately 23 percent of the population.

The same procedures were utilized in determining the Kentucky sample, the only difference being that a total sample of thirty-two was recorded.

Table 1. Range of Wealth and Size in Each Quarter

A. Virginia				
Quarter	A	B	C	D
Assessed Valuation Per Pupil (Wealth)	\$ 5,890- 25,821	\$26,301- 31,361	\$31,462- 41,418	\$ 41,621- 110,217

Quarter	1	2	3	4
Enrollment (Size)	387- 1,997	2,000- 3,951	4,051- 8,231	8,881- 144,110
B. Kentucky				
Quarter	A	B	C	D
Assessed Valuation Per Pupil (Wealth)	\$ 3,522- 21,603	\$21,630- 32,293	\$32,482 38,454	\$38,614- 61,924

Quarter	1	2	3	4
Enrollment (Size)	454- 2,099	2,101- 3,043	3,101- 4,511	4,609- 36,468

Table 2. School District Distribution by Wealth and Size (Virginia)

WEALTH SIZE	A \$ 5,890- 25,821	B \$26,301- 31,361	C \$31,462- 41,418	D \$ 41,621- 110,217	Totals
1 (387-1197)	8	5	6	14	33
2 (2000-3951)	4	11	10	9	34
3 (4051-8231)	12	7	10	4	33
4 (8881-144,110)	10	11	7	6	34
TOTALS	34	34	33	33	134 ^a

^aEnrollment figures from James City were included with Williamsburg City in the Annual Report, 1972-73.

Table 3. School District Distribution by Wealth and Size (Kentucky)

WEALTH SIZE	A \$ 3,522- 21,603	B \$21,630- 32,293	C \$32,482- 38,454	D \$38,614- 61,924	Totals
1 (454-2099)	6	8	3	9	26
2 (2101-3043)	5	7	11	3	26
3 (3101-4511)	8	6	7	6	27
4 (4609-36,468)	7	5	6	8	26
TOTALS	26	26	27	26	105

One delimitation was made prior to computing the Kentucky selections. Fifteen counties were omitted due to the presence of more than one independent school district within the county. In Jefferson County, for example, there were two independent districts other than the county system. This, of course, would have resulted in a disproportionate number of boards for Kentucky if the county was included in the randomization process. Also, Bureau of the Census statistics were available on a county basis in Kentucky, and not for legal subdivisions within that jurisdiction. A listing of those deleted counties and the school districts within each is found in Appendix C.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE SAMPLE

A stratified, proportional and randomized sample of the individual cells was drawn from the data found in Appendix A and is found in Tables 4 and 5. Tables 2 and 3 depict the total number of school districts within each classification; the individual districts were subsequently numbered and selected from a random numbers table. Each of the individual classifications (low, medium, and high) was categorized by a profile containing those demographic variables previously defined. Data also included on this profile was those equivalent variables for the state and the school district (see Appendix B, Tables 17 and 18).

The variables for analysis were:

1. occupation
2. level of family income
3. years of school completed
4. race
5. sex

Table 4. Selected Sample of Virginia School Districts

WEALTH SIZE	A (\$5,890-25,821) LOW WEALTH	B (\$26,301-31,361) MEDIUM LOW WEALTH	C (\$31,462-41,418) MEDIUM HIGH WEALTH	D (\$41,621-110,217) HIGH WEALTH
1 (387-1997) LOW ENROLLMENT	1. Bland County 2. Buena Vista City	1. Clifton Forge City	1. New Kent County	1. Rappahannock Co. 2. Prince Edward Co. 3. Highland Co.
2 (2000-3951) MEDIUM LOW ENROLLMENT	1. Alleghany Co.	1. Nelson Co. 2. Radford City 3. Brunswick Co.	1. Gloucester Co. 2. Louisa Co.	1. Fluvanna Co. 2. Warren Co.
3 (4051-8231) MEDIUM HIGH ENROLLMENT	1. Amherst Co. 2. Halifax Co. 3. Scott Co.	1. Dickenson Co. 2. Mecklenburg Co.	1. Giles Co. 2. Staunton City	1. Culpepper Co.
4 (8881-144,110) HIGH ENROLLMENT	1. Portsmouth City 2. Washington Co.	1. Petersburg City 2. Augusta Co. 3. Prince William Co.	1. Chesterfield Co. 2. Newport News City	1. Richmond City

Table 5. Selected Sample of Kentucky School Districts

WEALTH SIZE	A (\$5,522-21,603) LOW WEALTH	B (\$21,630-32,293) MEDIUM LOW WEALTH	C (\$32,482-38,454) MEDIUM HIGH WEALTH	D (\$38,614-61,924) HIGH WEALTH
1 (454-2099) LOW ENROLLMENT	1. Menifee 2. Elliott	1. Edmonson 2. Bracken-Augusta	1. Ballard	1. Hancock 2. Lyon 3. McLean
2 (2101-3043) MEDIUM LOW ENROLLMENT	1. Martin 2. Magoffin	1. Larue 2. Hart	1. Henry-Eminence 2. Fleming 3. Washington	1. Grant- Williamstown
3 (3101-4511) MEDIUM HIGH ENROLLMENT	1. Leslie 2. Jessamine	1. Marion 2. Taylor- Campbellsville	1. Scott 2. Breckenridge- Cloverport	1. Union 2. Woodford
4 (4609-36,468) HIGH ENROLLMENT	1. Letcher-Jenkins 2. Knox-Barbourville	1. Christian 2. Laurel-East Bernstaat	1. Graves-Mayfield 2. Warren-Bowling Green	1. Calloway-Murray 2. Fayette

6. place of work
7. age
8. native born

INSTRUMENT

The development of an instrument was completed after a review of appropriate resource material⁹² and in consultation with the advisory committee. The questionnaire (Appendix D) was mailed directly to each individual board member in the selected Virginia and Kentucky school districts. A self-addressed, stamped envelope and a personal letter (Appendix D) was also included. A follow-up letter (Appendix D) to individual school district superintendents was sent to apprise them of the study and to enlist their cooperation in having the questionnaire returned.

PREPARATION OF DATA FOR ANALYSIS AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

After the returned data were recorded on the individual profile sheets, the compiled information was analyzed through the Galfo Statistics Package⁹³ which contains chi square.

A summary table of chi square values at the .05 level of significance indicated the extent of representativeness for each state as illustrated in Sample Table 6.

⁹²C. Sellitiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations, rev. ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), Appendix C.

⁹³Armand J. Galfo, Galfo Statistics Package (Williamsburg, Va., College of William and Mary, 1971), Adapted by J. Robert Dawson, Jr., Old Dominion University, 1973.

Table 6. Analysis of Representativeness for Kentucky and Virginia School Districts
(Sample Table)

STATE	KENTUCKY			VIRGINIA		
VARIABLES	Chi-Square	S ^a	NS ^b	Chi-Square	S	NS
Occupation						
Income						
Education						
Race						
Sex						
Place of Work						
Age						
Native Born						
Non Public School Enrollment						

^aSignificant

^bNon-Significant

Chapter 3

RESULTS

The questionnaires were terminated on January 5, 1975, seven weeks after the original posting. In the tabulation of the thirty-one school districts samples in Virginia, thirty responded with 141 individual questionnaires for a return rate of 75 percent. Kentucky, on the other hand, had forty-one of forty-three school districts responding with 124 returns, or 56.9 percent. Two hundred sixty-five of four hundred six board members answered their questionnaires, for a total of 65.3 percent in returns.

In recording the responses, certain other data such as member occupational trends, number of boards with women, number of boards with non-white members, and levels of the formal schooling of the boardmen were also included. This additional information was especially useful in the light of the arguments surrounding the issue: appointed vis-a-vis elected board members.

Data for hypotheses one through seven are presented in Tables 7-13. One variable, non public school enrollemnt, was not included since the total number of board member children was not requested in the questionnaire. The recorded data concerning non public school enrollment are footnoted with each table.

In tabulating the data, it was observed that some items were omitted from individual returns. This accounts for the disparity among the numbers (N) of the different variables. For example, only the education and sex categories were completed by all respondents in both Virginia and Kentucky.

As an added check on the relationship between the two sets of data, school board results vis-a-vis the demographic statistics, the coefficient of contingency (C) has been added to each set of variables. The import of this additional exercise was that the results were reinforced by demonstrating the degree of significance in computing chi square (χ^2).

Individual tables for each variable, including the percentage of distribution and chi square are included in Appendix E. To synthesize some of the data contained in Tables 7-13, Table 14 was used to pair all variables by state, wealth, and size according to their similarity or dissimilarity.

HYPOTHESES AND FINDINGS

Hypothesis 1. Elected school board members in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

As indicated in Table 7, there were significant differences between the populations and samples for all variables with the exception of the native born category. Virginia, with a X^2 value of 1.32, and Kentucky with a corresponding value of 2.80, demonstrated representativeness between the school board members and their school district populations. The largest disparity was reflected in the income variable, with X^2 scores of 360.11 and 352.32 for Virginia and Kentucky respectively.

Hypothesis 2. Elected school board members in low wealth districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in low wealth districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Table 8 for low wealth districts in Virginia demonstrated significant differences for all variables except in native born with a low 0.10 X^2 value. Income again showed the widest margin of disparity between the school board members and the district population with a 152.60 value. Kentucky exhibited no significant differences in three categories: occupation (2.77), race (0.004), and native born (0.80).

Table 7. Analysis of Representativeness for Virginia and Kentucky School Districts at the State Level

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	STATE COMPOSITE TOTALS (HYPOTHESIS ONE)							
STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY			
VARIABLES	N	X ² ^a	C ^b	S/NS ^c	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	137	189.52	0.021	S	117	41.91	0.013	S
Income	136	360.11	0.036	S	120	352.32	0.045	S
Education (School Years Completed)	141	296.33	0.023	S	124	118.77	0.019	S
Race	140	15.79	0.004	S	124	8.61	0.004	S
Sex	141	89.46	0.008	S	124	97.90	0.012	S
Place of Work	135	27.18	0.008	S	120	6.24	0.005	S
Age	136	120.74	0.012	S	120	99.76	0.014	S
Native Born	133	1.32	d	NS	115	2.80	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

a. chi square

b. coefficient of contingency

c. significant/not significant at .05 level

d. coefficients of contingency are not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.

e. Virginia state shows 6.8 percent of its children to be in non public schools; 9.2 percent of Virginia's school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky state has 10.0 percent children in non public schools; 3.2 percent of Kentucky's school board members have children in non public schools.

Table 8. Analysis of Representativeness for
Low Wealth Districts in Virginia and Kentucky

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	LOW WEALTH COMPOSITE (HYPOTHESIS TWO)							
STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY			
VARIABLES	N	X ² ^a	C ^b	S/NS ^c	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	35	41.06	0.022	S	20	2.77	0.010	NS
Income	35	152.60	0.048	S	22	101.37	0.062	S
Education (School Years Completed)	36	111.60	0.030	S	23	29.58	0.026	S
Race	36	6.35	0.005	S	23	0.004	d	NS
Sex	36	22.05	0.009	S	23	11.70	0.011	S
Place of Work	36	4.17	0.007	S	21	7.90	0.018	S
Age	35	25.99	0.012	S	23	15.80	0.015	S
Native Born	34	0.10	d	NS	22	0.80	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

- a. chi square
- b. coefficient of contingency
- c. significant/not significant at .05 level
- d. coefficients of contingency is not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.
- e. Virginia's low wealth districts show 3.6 percent of their children in non public schools; 5.8 percent of Virginia's low wealth school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky's low wealth districts have 1.2 percent children in non public schools; 0.0 percent of Kentucky's low wealth school board members have children in non public schools.

As in Virginia, the most disproportionate score (101.37) was found within the income variables.

Hypothesis 3. Elected school board members in medium wealth districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in medium wealth districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Virginia in Table 9 denoted no significant differences in the race (2.34), and in the native born (2.37) variables. The education (or school years completed) category replaced income as the most disproportionate measure with a X^2 score of 160.65. Kentucky evidenced significant differences for all variables except native born (3.39). Income (290.30) implied the most significant difference.

Hypothesis 4. Elected school board members in high wealth districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in high wealth districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

Table 9. Analysis of Representativeness for
Medium Wealth Districts in Virginia and Kentucky

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	MEDIUM WEALTH COMPOSITE (HYPOTHESIS THREE)							
	STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY		
VARIABLES	N	X ² ^a	C ^b	S/NS ^c	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	70	49.02	0.016	S	66	18.05	0.013	S
Income	68	148.49	0.032	S	68	290.30	0.059	S
Education (School Years Completed)	72	160.65	0.025	S	70	99.98	0.024	S
Race	71	2.34	d	NS	69	5.84	0.004	S
Sex	72	42.66	0.009	S	69	52.23	0.013	S
Place of Work	67	19.52	0.009	S	68	3.98	0.006	S
Age	69	82.59	0.014	S	66	64.83	0.017	S
Native Born	67	2.37	d	NS	64	3.39	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

- a. chi square
- b. coefficient of contingency
- c. significant/not significant at .05 level
- d. coefficients of contingency are not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.
- e. Virginia's medium wealth districts show 5.5 percent of their children in non public schools; 6.3 percent of Virginia's medium wealth school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky's medium wealth districts have 4.4 percent children in non public schools; 2.5 percent of Kentucky's medium wealth school board members have children in non public schools.

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Table 10 demonstrated the same findings as Tables 7 and 8 for Virginia: that there were significant differences for all variables except native born (0.09). Occupation proved to be the greatest dissimilarity between the population and the sample with a X^2 value of 213.65. Kentucky had no significant differences in the race (1.20), place of work (0.02), and native born (2.56) categories, while occupation (79.57) measured the most significant difference.

Hypothesis 5. Elected school board members in low enrollment districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in low enrollment districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age

Table 10. Analysis of Representativeness for High Wealth Districts in Virginia and Kentucky

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	HIGH WEALTH COMPOSITE (HYPOTHESIS FOUR)							
STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY			
VARIABLES	N	^a X ²	^b C	^c S/NS	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	32	213.65	0.041	S	31	79.57	0.028	S
Income	33	88.79	0.034	S	30	71.41	0.033	S
Education (School Years Completed)	33	49.79	0.018	S	32	28.57	0.015	S
Race	33	8.53	0.005	S	32	1.20	d	NS
Sex	33	21.25	0.008	S	32	31.12	0.011	S
Place of Work	32	5.31	0.007	S	31	0.02	d	NS
Age	32	28.01	0.011	S	31	25.25	0.011	S
Native Born	32	0.09	d	NS	29	2.56	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

- a. chi square
- b. coefficient of contingency
- c. significant/not significant at .05 level
- d. coefficients of contingency are not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.
- e. Virginia's high wealth districts show 6.9 percent of their children in non public schools; 9.8 percent of Virginia's high wealth school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky's high wealth districts have 6.3 percent children in non public schools; 0.2 percent of Kentucky's school board members have children in non public schools.

Table 11. Analysis of Representativeness for
Low Enrollment Districts in Virginia and Kentucky

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	LOW ENROLLMENT COMPOSITE (HYPOTHESIS FIVE)							
	STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY		
VARIABLES	N	X ² ^a	C ^b	S/NS	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	24	23.16	0.037	S	26	10.53	0.025	S
Income	25	126.40	0.106	S	26	153.14	0.101	S
Education (School Years Completed)	25	53.03	0.050	S	27	31.02	0.025	S
Race	24	1.84	d	NS	27	0.05	d	NS
Sex	25	18.09	0.020	S	27	17.41	0.018	S
Place of Work	24	2.19	d	NS	26	7.34	0.020	S
Age	24	26.51	0.028	S	26	20.70	0.023	S
Native Born	24	12.87	0.017	S	24	0.00	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

- a. chi square
- b. coefficient of contingency
- c. significant/not significant at .05 level
- d. coefficients of contingency are not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.
- e. Virginia's low enrollment districts show 10.9 percent of their children to be in non public schools; 10.8 percent of Virginia's low enrollment school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky's low enrollment districts have 2.9 percent children in non public schools; 0.0 percent of Kentucky's low enrollment school board members have children in non public schools.

- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

The data in Table 11 revealed that Virginia has significant differences in all categories except race (1.84) and place of work (2.19). Income proved to be the category with the most dissimilarity with a score of 126.40. Kentucky, like Virginia, showed no significant difference in race (0.05) but displayed a perfect 0.00 X^2 value in the native born grouping. A high of 153.14 for the income variable represented the greatest disparity between the sample and the population.

Hypothesis 6. Elected school board members in medium enrollment districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in medium enrollment districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

As in Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10, Table 12 denoted that the Virginia native born category (3.77) had the only non significant difference among the variables selected. Income (344.01) demonstrated the widest

Table 12. Analysis of Representativeness for
Medium Enrollment Districts in Virginia and Kentucky

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	MEDIUM ENROLLMENT COMPOSITE (HYPOTHESIS SIX)							
STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY			
VARIABLES	N	^a X ²	^b C	^c S/NS	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	71	65.98	0.025	S	54	11.24	0.013	S
Income	72	344.01	0.069	S	55	207.10	0.062	S
Education (School Years Completed)	74	239.51	0.042	S	58	84.25	0.029	S
Race	74	6.23	0.005	S	58	3.28	d	NS
Sex	74	41.62	0.012	S	58	42.44	0.014	S
Place of Work	72	27.20	0.016	S	55	8.22	0.011	S
Age	73	57.27	0.017	S	56	42.13	0.017	S
Native Born	71	3.77	d	NS	55	0.24	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

- a. chi square
- b. coefficient of contingency
- c. significant/not significant at .05 level
- d. coefficients of contingency are not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.
- e. Virginia's medium enrollment districts show 3.0 percent of their children in non public schools; 4.3 percent of Virginia's medium enrollment school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky's medium enrollment districts have 5.9 percent children in non public schools; 2.9 percent of Kentucky's medium enrollment school board members have children in non public schools.

variance of the significantly different categories. As in Table 8, Kentucky exhibited significant differences except in the race (3.28) and native born (0.24) groupings. A 207.10 X^2 income score was the greatest contrast among the scores recorded for the Kentucky sample in Table 11.

Hypothesis 7. Elected school board members in high enrollment districts in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in high enrollment districts in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Table 13 for Virginia repeated the previous data recorded in Table 11, in that there were significant differences for all variables except race (3.45) and place of work (2.39). Income (114.09) indicated the most sizeable contradictions between the school board members and the school districts. Kentucky showed non significant differences in the race (1.75), place of work (1.85), and native born (0.22) categories. A X^2 value of 106.02 was recorded for income, the most dissimilar of those significantly different variables.

Table 13. Analysis of Representativeness for High Enrollment Districts in Virginia and Kentucky

CLASSIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS	HIGH ENROLLMENT COMPOSITE (HYPOTHESIS SEVEN)							
STATE	VIRGINIA				KENTUCKY			
VARIABLES	N	X ² ^a	C ^b	S/NS ^c	N	X ²	C	S/NS
Occupation	42	109.25	0.019	S	37	19.64	0.012	S
Income	39	114.09	0.024	S	39	106.02	0.032	S
Education (School Years Completed)	42	101.18	0.016	S	39	41.86	0.015	S
Race	42	3.45	d	NS	39	1.75	d	NS
Sex	42	27.83	0.006	S	39	34.09	0.009	S
Place of Work	42	2.39	d	NS	39	1.85	d	NS
Age	39	51.90	0.010	S	38	42.52	0.012	S
Native Born	39	9.98	0.004	S	36	0.22	d	NS
Non Public School Enrollment	e							

- a. chi square
- b. coefficient of contingency
- c. significant/not significant at .05 level
- d. coefficients of contingency are not included on non significant chi square values as it was only included to demonstrate the degree of significance between like X² values.
- e. Virginia's high enrollment districts show 6.0 percent of their children to be in non public schools; 8.6 percent of Virginia's high enrollment school board members have children in non public schools. Kentucky's high enrollment districts have 3.9 percent children in non public schools; 1.4 percent of Kentucky's high enrollment school board members have children in non public schools.

Table 14 was included to provide a synthesis of the data contained in the preceding tables. It furnishes a schematic overview of data from both states, their school district classifications by wealth and enrollment, the selected variables, and the level of significance or representativeness of the school boards.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Tables 7-14 demonstrated that at the .05 level of significance, only one variable, native born, showed representativeness, or non significant differences, between the board members and their school districts on the state level. Other variables depicted representativeness, but on a more restricted basis according to either wealth or enrollment. Excluding the state totals, there were 48 individual measures of representativeness for each state (eight variables x six categories). Of these totals, Virginia showed no significant differences in nine categories while Kentucky exhibited representativeness in fourteen categories. Only variables race, place of work, occupation, and native born indicated any similarity between the states in that there were non significant differences (see Table 14, p. 57).

Excluding the native born variable in which there was accord between the elected and the appointed selection procedures, there were seven other occasions in which Kentucky demonstrated representativeness, while Virginia indicated significant differences in the same categories. In only two situations were Virginia's school boards more representative than those in Kentucky, and that was in the race and place of work categories.

Table 14. Assessment of Representativeness as Measured by Level of Significance for Individual Variables by State

VARIABLE	STATE	CLASSIFICATION	S/S ^a	S/NS ^b	NS/S ^c	NS/NS ^d
Occupation	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low		*/*		
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: High	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High	*/*			
Income	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: High	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High	*/*			
Education (School Years Completed)	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: High	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High	*/*			

- a. S/S = Significant/Significant at .05 level
- b. S/NS = Significant/Not Significant at .05 level
- c. NS/S = Not Significant/Significant at .05 level
- d. NS/NS = Not Significant/Not Significant at .05 level

Table 14. (continued)

VARIABLE	STATE	CLASSIFICATION	S/S ^a	S/NS ^b	NS/S ^c	NS/NS ^d
Race	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low		*/*		
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium			*/*	
	VA/KY	Wealth: High		*/*		
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low				*/*
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium		*/*		
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High				*/*
Sex	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: High	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High	*/*			
Place of Work	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: High		*/*		
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low			*/*	
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High				*/*

a. S/S = Significant/Significant at .05 level

b. S/NS = Significant/Not Significant at .05 level

c. NS/S = Not Significant/Significant at .05 level

d. NS/NS = Not Significant/Not Significant at .05 level

Table 14. (continued)

VARIABLE	STATE	CLASSIFICATION	S/S ^a	S/NS ^b	NS/S ^c	NS/NS ^d
Age	VA/KY	STATE	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Wealth: High	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium	*/*			
	VA/KY	Enrollment: High	*/*			
Native Born	VA/KY	STATE				*/*
	VA/KY	Wealth: Low				*/*
	VA/KY	Wealth: Medium				*/*
	VA/KY	Wealth: High				*/*
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Low		*/*		
	VA/KY	Enrollment: Medium				*/*
VA/KY	Enrollment: High		*/*			

- a. S/S = Significant/Significant at .05 level
- b. S/NS = Significant/Not Significant at .05 level
- c. NS/S = Not Significant/Significant at .05 level
- d. NS/NS = Not Significant/Not Significant at .05 level

Incorporating state figures to all the classifications, a total of 112 tests were run for both states (eight variables x seven classifications). Out of a possible 112, seventy-eight tests indicated there were significant differences between the school board and the school district for both states.

Of the eight variables tested for significance, the native born category, as previously mentioned, demonstrated in seven classifications the least amount of differences between the samples school board members and their populations. The other variables, in order of their representativeness with the number of non significant differences included, were:

2. race (6)
3. place of work (3)
4. occupation (1)
5. income (0)
6. years of school completed (0)
7. age (0)
8. sex (0)

There were no representative trend evidenced in the wealth or enrollment classifications for either state. Of Kentucky's fourteen instances of non significant differences, seven were by wealth classifications and seven by enrollment classifications. Virginia, on the other hand, had four wealth and five enrollment classifications for a total of nine non significant differences.

One noticeable trend did present itself in the compilation of the individual X^2 values. In a comparison of school board members with

their districts, the most prevalent difference appeared in the income category. On no less than eleven of fourteen occasions did income register the greatest X^2 value, or most significant difference between the sample and the population. Occupation, sex, and school years completed accounted for the other three diversities.

RELATED DATA

The questionnaires revealed interesting data not reported anywhere in the study since the information alone was not required in the statistical analysis. In reporting these results, elected boards represent Kentucky and appointed boards are those of Virginia. A recording of the sex and race questionnaire showed these data:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Elected Boards</u>	<u>Appointed Boards</u>
Women represented on boards	19.5	36.7
Non-whites represented on boards	2.4	30.0

Even though the elected boards show the smaller percentages of women and non-whites represented, Kentucky exhibited on five separate occasions no significant differences in the race of board members and the population. Only once did Virginia show this representativeness according to race. Both states, it may be recalled, had significant differences in all seven classifications of the sex variable.

Years of school completed also demonstrated discernible differences, and a total of all the data revealed these figures:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Elected Boards</u>	<u>Appointed Boards</u>
Not high school graduates	11.3	5.0
High school graduates or equivalent	37.9	18.4
Attended college, but did not graduate	20.2	18.4
College graduates	30.6	58.2

The data supported the argument previously cited that appointed board members are better educated than their elected counterparts.

Another interesting sidelight of the study was the distribution of occupations among the members. Within the broader headings of: white collar, blue collar, farm and service workers, the most frequently listed occupations were:

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	<u>Combined State Totals</u>
Business	16.0
Farming	13.0
Professional	12.6
Skilled Trades	5.7
Manufacturing	4.7
Household	4.2

Business included categories such as auto dealers, bankers, builders, insurance and real estate agents, and service station managers. Farming is self explanatory. Household included those homemakers who serve on the school board. Doctors, registered nurses, dentists, lawyers, teachers, engineers, and ministers composed the professional group.

Manufacturing referred to factory management and labor while skilled trades referred to plumbers, electricians, machinists, carpenters, and barbers.

There were also some other occupations reported that were noteworthy, including: a crop duster, a rancher, a forest ranger, a funeral director, a coal miner, a seedsman, an aluminum reducer, a newspaperman, and a yardmaster.

Chapter 4

OVERVIEW, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was designed to determine the extent to which school boards in Kentucky and Virginia represented the population of the school districts according to selected demographic characteristics. Board members were compared to their representative populations in regard to: occupation, level of family income, years of school completed, race, sex, place of work, age, and native born. Another variable, non public school enrollment, was originally projected for analysis, but is not reported as results of the information requested in the questionnaire were inconclusive.

Analysis of the variables sought to support or to discount the thesis that elected school boards in Kentucky were more demographically representative of their populations than were appointed school boards in Virginia. This thesis was repeated in seven hypotheses based on the wealth and enrollment classification of the sampled districts. Classifications included low, medium, and high wealth districts and low, medium, and high enrollment districts. Hypothesis One was designed to incorporate a synthesis of all classifications and is as follows: Elected school board members in Kentucky are more demographically representative than appointed school board members in Virginia as indicated by the following variables:

- a. occupation
- b. level of family income
- c. school years completed
- d. race
- e. sex
- f. place of work
- g. age
- h. native born
- i. non public school enrollment

Hypotheses Two through Seven were identical to Hypothesis One except for the delimitation by either wealth or enrollment. Hypothesis One included the state totals for both Virginia and Kentucky.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data obtained from the school board members and a chi square statistical analysis, several conclusions were drawn from this study. The major conclusion was that on composite state levels, Kentucky and Virginia school boards are not representative of the people according to the following variables:

1. occupation
2. income
3. years of school completed
4. race
5. sex
6. place of work
7. age

Kentucky and Virginia school boards on a composite state level are representative of the populace in regard to one variable, native born.

Selected classifications according to either wealth or enrollment depicted no significant differences in the school board members and their populations. These were:

Virginia

1. Race in medium wealth, low and high enrollment classifications
2. Place of work in low and high enrollment classifications
3. Native born on a state basis, and in low, medium and high wealth classifications and in medium enrollment classifications

Kentucky

1. Occupation in a low wealth classification
2. Race in low and high wealth, and low, medium, and high enrollment classifications
3. Place of work in high wealth and high enrollment classifications
4. Native born on a state basis, and in all subsequent classifications

In analyzing the individual demographic profile tables in Appendix E, it was obvious that the following categories were proportionately represented on the composite state level:⁹⁴

⁹⁴Proportionate representation refers to the range within a plus or minus ten percent of the population. Over representation and under representation is assumed for all categories where the school board membership exceeded a plus or minus ten percent of the population.

Virginia

1. service workers
2. \$10,000-14,999 income level
3. high school graduates
4. ages 30-44
5. ages 60+
6. native born
7. born out of state

Kentucky

1. white collar workers
2. service workers
3. \$10,000-14,999 incomes
4. 1-3 years of high school
5. white race
6. non white race
7. ages 60+
8. native born
9. born out of state

The following groups were over-represented on the composite state level:

Virginia

1. white collar workers
2. farmers
3. \$15,000+ incomes
4. college educated
5. white race
6. male sex

7. work in city or county of residence
8. ages 45-59

Kentucky

1. farmers
2. \$15,000+ incomes
3. high school graduates
4. college educated
5. male sex
6. work in city or county of residence
7. ages 30-44
8. ages 45-59

Among the segments under represented on the composite state level were:

Virginia

1. blue collar workers
2. \$0-4999 incomes
3. \$5000-9999 incomes
4. grades 5-8 education
5. 1-3 years of high school
6. non white race
7. female sex
8. work outside city or county of residence
9. ages 15-29

Kentucky

1. blue collar workers
2. \$0-4999 incomes
3. \$5000-9999 incomes

4. grades 5-8 education
5. female sex
6. work outside city or county of residence
7. ages 15-29

In the various classifications according to wealth and enrollment,⁹⁵ the following categories were proportionately represented.

Virginia

1. white collar workers (HW)
2. service workers (all except LE)
3. farmers (MW)
4. \$10,000-14,999 incomes (all except LE)
5. high school graduates (LW, HW, ME)
6. white race (MW)
7. non white race (MW)
8. ages 30-44 (all except LW, HW)
9. ages 60+ (all except HW)
10. native born (all except LE, HE)

Kentucky

1. white collar workers (HW)
2. service workers (all except HW, HE)
3. farmers (LW, MW, ME)
4. \$10,000-14,999 incomes (all)
5. 1-3 years of high school (all except HW)

⁹⁵Low Wealth (LW); Medium Wealth (MW); High Wealth (HW); Low Enrollment (LE); Medium Enrollment (ME); High Enrollment (HE).

6. high school graduates (HW)
7. white race (all)
8. non white race (all)
9. work in city or county of residence (HW, HE)
10. ages 30-44 (LW, HE)
11. ages 60+ (all except HW, LE)
12. native born (all except HW)

The following groups were over represented on the boards of the respective states:

Virginia

1. white collar workers (all except HW)
2. farmers (all except MW)
3. \$10,000-14,999 incomes (LE)
4. \$15,000+ incomes (all)
5. high school graduates (LE)
6. college educated (all)
7. white race (all except MW)
8. male sex (all)
9. work in city or county of residence (all)
10. ages 30-44 (LW)
11. ages 45-59 (all)
12. ages 60+ (HW)
13. born in state (HE)

Kentucky

1. white collar workers (all except HW)
2. farmers (HW, LE, HE)
3. \$15,000+ incomes (all)

4. high school graduates (LW, MW, LE, ME)
5. college educated (all)
6. male sex (all)
7. work in city or county of residence (all except HW, HE)
8. ages 30-44 (MW, HW, LE, ME)
9. ages 45-59 (all)
10. born in state (HW)

The following groups were under represented on the boards of the respective states:

Virginia

1. blue collar workers (all)
2. service workers (LE)
3. \$0-9999 incomes (all)
4. grades 5-8 educated (all)
5. 1-3 years of high school (all)
6. high school graduates (MW, HE)
7. non white race (all except MW)
8. female sex (all)
9. work outside city or county of residence (all)
10. ages 15-29 (all)
11. ages 30-44 (HW)
12. born outside state (HE)

Kentucky

1. blue collar workers (all)
2. service workers (HW, HE)
3. \$0-9999 incomes (all)
4. grades 5-8 educated (all)

5. 1-3 years of high school (HW)
6. female sex (all)
7. work outside city or county of residence (all except HW, HE)
8. ages 15-29 (all)
9. ages 60+ (HW, LE)
10. born outside state (HW)

The preceding data indicated that the typical school board member of Virginia and Kentucky is probably a white collar worker, has a family income in excess of \$15,000, is white, male, college educated, between the ages of forty-five and fifty-nine, works in the city or county of residence, and, as previously indicated, was born in his respective state.

It is the opinion of this researcher that, on the basis of the results obtained herein, representativeness or the reflection of certain demographic characteristics in either an elected or appointed school board, is not a viable standard in arguing either for or against a particular procedure in the selection of school boardmen. In either case, the school boards here represented are a group of "elites" that bear little or no resemblance to the groups they serve.

A most obvious conclusion of this study was that an elected school board is no more representative than an appointed one, and the argument that people tend to elect their own kind is fallacious. In fact, on page four it was reported that a greater percentage of appointed boards had non white and female representation than did the elected boards. This fact would tend to indicate that the appointing authority was perhaps more responsive to local demographic considerations

than was the electorate.

Selection of the sample in both states according to specified wealth and enrollment classifications involved predominately rural totals from both Virginia and Kentucky. This precluded those urbanized areas with large concentrations of non whites. Also, it should be remembered that several of Kentucky's urban areas were omitted because of the existence of several independent districts within the county (see Appendix C). This possible explanation for the poorer showing for non whites is not plausible for female representation, however. The rural predominance of the sample could also account for the disproportionate number of farmers represented on the boards of both states.

IMPLICATIONS

At no time has the researcher sought to establish that either an elected or an appointed board was more effective than the other. This in itself could be a topic for a future endeavor, utilizing the same data provided in this study. Perhaps research in this area could provide a definitive basis for evaluation, utilizing the extent of representativeness vis-a-vis board effectiveness.

Another possible source of investigation might be a comparison of the electorate or the registered voters of Kentucky, to the elected board members. In Virginia, an analysis of the appointing authority and their respective school board appointees might provide further insight into the concept of representativeness.

Representativeness might also be determined on the basis of the voting records of the board members with respect to attitudinal surveys

of the populace concerning certain school issues. If there was correlation between what the public wanted and how the boardmen responded, an index of representativeness would be developed on the basis of the collected data. This undertaking would be similar to the Rice Study mentioned on page 24, wherein representativeness of state legislators was measured on the basis of their voting records.

The family income range of the boardmen sampled indicated a wide disparity in all cases between the populace and the board members. This income variable might well have depicted no representativeness due to the demands on the time of a board member. One earning a lesser income, or not in a job position that permitted released time for meetings, would probably not be a candidate for either election or appointment. The "elitist" status alluded to previously never brought into perspective this time factor, and its significance for eligibility to office.

The evidence presented in this paper also tends to refute much of the ideology expressed by Swabey, Pitkin, and DeGrazia cited in previous discussion. They were of the opinion that the representatives are identified with their constituency because of like characteristics. This was not the case with the school board members.

Finally, the documentation produced in this study supports that evidence brought out by Dye, Ziegler, Cistone, and Carver, in that boards do not represent the general populace.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Adams, John. "Letter to John Penn." Works, Vol. IV. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1852-1865.
- Agger, Robert E. "The Politics of Local Education: A Comparative Study in Community Decision Making." in A Forward Look--The Preparation of School Administrators 1970. Donald E. Tope (Ed.). Eugene, Oregon: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1960.
- Agger, Robert E., et al. The Rulers and the Ruled: Political Power and Impotence in American Communities. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Albert, Frank R., Jr. "Selected Characteristics of School Board Members Toward Certain Criticism of Public Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1959.
- Ary, Donald; Lucy C. Jacobs and Asghar Razavieh. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1972.
- Blanchard, B. Everard. "Eternity of Chaos." National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 44 (254). March, 1970.
- Brieve, Fred J. "A Case for Elected School Board Trustees." Roanoke Times, March 19, 1972.
- Brown, R. H. "Composition of School Boards." American School Board Journal, 129. August, 1954.
- Burke, Edmund. Burke's Politics. Ross J. S. Hoffman and Paul Levack, (Eds.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949.
- Campbell, Roald F. "City School Board: What Can Be Done?" New Dimensions in School Board Leaderships. William E. Dickinson, (Ed.). Evanston, Illinois: National School Boards Association, Inc., 1969.
- Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee. Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1965.
- Campbell, Roald F. "Process of Policy Making Within Structures of Educational Government." in Government of Public Education for Adequate Policy Making. William P. McLure and Van Miller, (Eds.). Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1960.
- Carver, Fred. "Social Class and School Board Role Expectations." Urban Education, Vol. 3.

- Charters, W. W., Jr. A Bibliography of Empirical Studies of School Boards 1900-1951. A Re-Issue. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, August, 1968.
- Charters, W. W., Jr. A Bibliography of Empirical Studies of School Boards, 1952-1968. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, September, 1968.
- Charters, W. W., Jr. "Social Class Analysis and the Control of Public Education." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. XXIII. Fall, 1953.
- Chicago Sun Times. Editorial. June 12, 1967.
- Cistone, Peter. "School Board Member Recruitment in Ontario." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, 1973.
- Counts, George S. The Social Composition of Boards of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Cronin, J. The Control of Urban Schools. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "A Community Develops Educational Policy: A Case Study." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1958.
- De Grazia, Alfred. Public and Republic. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1951. Quoted in Pitkin, Hanna F. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.
- Dye, Thomas and Harman Ziegler. The Irony of Democracy. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1970.
- Dykes, Archie R. School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relationships. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printing, 1965.
- Eliot, Thomas H. "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics." American Political Science Review, Vol. LIII. December, 1959.
- Eulau, Heinz. "Changing Views of Representation." Contemporary Political Science. Ithiel de Sola Pool (Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Friedrick, Carl J. Constitutional Government and Democracy. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1950.
- Galfo, Armand J. Galfo Statistics Package. Williamsburg, Virginia: College of William and Mary, 1971. Adapted by J. Robert Dawson, Jr. Rev. Old Dominion University, 1973.

- Garber, Lee D. and E. Edmund Reutter, Jr. The Yearbook of School Law. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Press, 1969.
- Gittell, M. Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy In New York City. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1967.
- Goldhammer, Keith. "Community Power Structure and School Board Membership." American School Board Journal, 130. March, 1955.
- Goldhammer, Keith. The School Board. Library of Education Series. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.
- Grieder, Calvin, Truman M. Pierce and K. Forbis Jordan. Public School Administration. 3rd. ed. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1969.
- Griffiths, A. Phillips, and Richard Woolheim. "How Can One Person Represent Another?" Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Vol. XXXIV, 1960.
- Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Hall, Morrill H. Provisions Governing Membership on Local Boards of Education. Bulletin 1957, No. 13, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957.
- Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison and John Jay. The Federalist. Max Beloff (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell, 1948.
- Hines, Clarence. "A Study of School Board Administrative Relationships: The Development of the Eugene, Oregon Superintendency, 1891-1944." American School Board Journal, 122. February, 1951.
- Hobbes, Thomas. English Works. Sir William Moleworth (Ed.). London: Longmans, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1839-1845.
- Hottleman, Girard D. "Moneyed Men Given the Poor." Massachusetts Teacher, Vol. 52, No. 4. January, 1973.
- Howe, Harold, II. "Should Educators or Boards Control Our Public Schools?" The Nations Schools, 78 (6). December, 1966.
- Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Hurwitz, Mark W. "What Works Best: An Elected or An Appointed School Board?" American School Board Journal, 159. July, 1972.

- Johns, Roe L. and Ralph B. Kimbrough. The Relationship of Socio-Economic Factors, Educational Leadership Patterns and Elements of Community Power Structure to Local School Fiscal Policy: Final Report. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Keppel, Francis. The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York: Harper, 1966.
- Kerr, Norman. "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation." Sociology of Education, Vol. XXXVIII. Fall, 1964.
- Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision Making. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Local Boards of Education." National Education Association Research Bulletin, 42 (2). May, 1964.
- Lieberman, Myron. The Future of Public Education. University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Lowi, Theodore J. At the Pleasure of the Mayor. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Mann, Dale. The Politics of Administrative Representation. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.
- "Methods of School Board Selection." The National School Boards Association Information Service Bulletin, Vol. 5, No. 5. July, 1967.
- Mills, C. W. The Power Elite. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Mullins, Carolyn. "All About the Nation's Big League Boardmen and How They Run the Public Schools: An Inside Look at Education's 400." American School Board Journal, Vol. 189, No. 15. September, 1972.
- National Education Association. Status and Practices of Boards of Education. Research Bulletin Vol. XXIV, No. 2. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1946.
- Nearing, Scott. "Who's Who in Our School Boards." School and Society, 5. January 20, 1917.
- Perkins, James A., et al. "School Boards and School Board Membership: Recommendations and Report of a Survey." New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership. Albany, New York, 1967.
- Pitkin, Hanna F. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

- Prewitt, Kenneth. The Recruitment of Political Leaders: A Study of Citizen-Politicians. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
- Proudfoot, Alexander. "A Study of the Socio-Economic Status of Influential School Board Members in Alberta as Related to Their Attitudes Toward Certain Common Problems Confronting School Boards." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1962.
- Reeder, Ward G. Fundamentals of Public School Administration. 4th Ed. New York: McMillan Company, 1958.
- Reeves, Charles E. School Boards: Their Status, Functions and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.
- Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Richmond, Virginia: Virginia 1972-73 State Board of Education, December, 1973.
- Rice, Stuart. Quantitative Methods in Politics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1928.
- Rossmiller, Richard A. "The Public Image of the School Board Role." U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, February 17, 1966.
- Sellitiz, C., et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- School Laws of Kentucky, Annotated. Kentucky Department of Education. Banks and Baldwin Law Publishing Company, 1970.
- Smith, Howard R. Democracy and the Public Interest. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1960.
- Stapeley, Maurice E. Effective School Board Membership. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1952.
- Stemnock, Suzanne K. "Local Boards of Education: Status and Structure." Educational Research Service Circular No. 5. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators and NEA Research Division.
- Struble, George S. "A Study of School Board Personnel." American School Board Journal, 65. October, 1922.
- Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Big City School Districts. Evanston, Illinois: National School Board Association, 1972.
- Swabey, Marie C. Theory of the Democratic State. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

- Teal, Hal C. "Attitudes of Selected School Board Members Concerning Problems Facing Public Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956.
- Tiedt, Sidney W. "Oregon School Board Members in the Willamette Valley." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Vol. 6. Eugene, Oregon: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1962.
- U. S. Department of Commerce. Social and Economics Statistics Administration. Bureau of the Census. 1970 Census of Population, Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population, Part 19. Kentucky: February, 1973.
- U. S. Department of Commerce. Social and Economics Statistics Administration. Bureau of the Census. 1970 Census of Population, Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population, Part 48. Virginia: February, 1973.
- Vaughan, Freeman H. "School Boards: Selection of Members." Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 8. New York: McMillan Company and Free Press, 1971.
- Vincent, William S. and Charles M. Bernardo. "School Board Member Characteristics and Fiscal Responsibility." Institution of Administrative Research Bulletin, Vol. 7, No. 2. New York: Columbia University, February, 1967.
- Virginia's Educational Disparities. Virginia Education Association Research Service, R-232. Richmond, Virginia: February, 1974.
- Virginia School Laws. Charlottesville, Virginia: The Mitchie Company, 1972.
- Whalen, R. E., Jr. "Effectiveness of Elected and Appointed School Board Members." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1953.
- White, Alpheus L. Local School Boards: Organization and Practices. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Wiles, David and Houston Conley. "School Boards: Their Policy-Making Relevance." Teachers College Record, Vol. 75. Columbia University: February, 1974.
- Woods, Roy C. "The West Virginia School Board Member." American School Board Journal, 128. April, 1954.

APPENDIX A

Table 15. School Districts Identified By Size and Wealth (Virginia)

WEALTH SIZE	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
	QUARTER 1	Bland (1116 ^a -24362 ^b) Buena Vista (1572-24,529) Cape Charles (387-18,855) Charles City (1924-22,046) Fries (541-5890) Greene (1426-23,809) Norton (1274-19,568) Poquoson (1634-24,281)	Clifton Forge (1166-29,091) Craig (819-28,380) Cumberland (1740-30,072) Galax (1654-29,235) South Boston (1696-26,978)	Amelia (1880-33,957) Bath (1249-39,306) Lexington (1132-39,919) New Kent (1542-40,689) Powhatan (1768-40,830) Richmond Co. (1597-36,284)
QUARTER 2	Allegheny (3302-25,727) Floyd (2202-23,470) Franklin City (2195-19,450) Grayson (2739-21,069)	Bristol (3285-28,698) Brunswick (3544-30,007) Charlotte (2999-27,772) Greenville (3640-28,450) King George (2262-30,553) Lunenburg (2766-28,510) Nelson (2844-30,486) Northampton (3114-27,405) Nottoway (3243-26,632) Patrick (3615-27,706) Radford (2228-30,226)	Appomattox (2465-33,716) Buckingham (2772-40,195) Caroline (3802-33,643) Covington (2282-31,850) Gloucester (3559-41,418) Louisa (3937-35,654) Madison (2259-40,407) Page (3951-31,604) Sussex (2930-31,462) Westmoreland (2638-41,132)	Fluvanna (2175-52,085) Fredericksburg (2875-45,840) Goochland (2631-47,797) Harrisonburg (2593-45,080) Lancaster (2000-53,225) Orange (3837-50,889) Suffolk (2019-44,165) Warren (3935-41,909) Winchester (3772-51,802)
QUARTER 3	Amherst (5458-25,821) Carroll (5372-20,545) Colonial Heights (4065-25,459) Dinwiddie (5327-19,201) Franklin Co. (6996-24,560) Halifax (7514-23,773) Lee (5168-18,782) Prince George (5514-18,553) Pulaski (7587-20,006) Scott (5505-21,696) Smyth (7315-20,096) Wythe (5196-24,648)	Accomack (6348-31,211) Bedford (8231-30,673) Botetourt (4772-31,359) Dickenson (4559-26,551) Hopewell (5618-29,855) Hackleburg (6727-26,361) Spotsylvania (5190-31,361)	Frederick (7041-32,180) Giles (4051-37,659) Isle of Wight (4587-37,481) Martinsville (4468-38,129) Rockbridge (4058-33,302) Russell (6759-32,736) Shenandoah (5362-37,637) Southampton (4125-33,673) Staunton (4576-35,103) Waynesboro (4356-33,819)	Charlottesville (7189-51,089) Culpeper (4844-43,076) Fauquier (7236-56,014) Williamsburg (5162-47,600)
QUARTER 4	Buchanan (9744-25,337) Campbell (11,711-23,348) Hampton (34,623-21,927) Henry (13,544-21,140) Nansemond (9652-24,915) Pittsylvania (15,222-24,454) Portsmouth (25,494-22,110) Tazewell (11,027-17,350) Washington (10,820-21,976) Wise (9809-16,195)	Augusta (11,034-30,119) Chesapeake (26,566-27,432) Danville (10,183-27,712) Montgomery (8881-28,467) Petersburg (9705-30,400) Prince William (37,596-28,676) Roanoke Co. (25,130-29,077) Rockingham (11,014-31,059) Stafford (7151-28,461) Virginia Beach (51,329-28,675) York (9068-28,110)	Chesterfield (24,745-35,027) Hanover (10,369-34,127) Henrico (34,644-38,299) Lynchburg (11,105-36,118) Newport News (32,198-33,702) Norfolk (51,037-38,089) Roanoke City (18,719-35,844)	Albemarle (9198-47,531) Alexandria (17,022-84,454) Arlington (23,440-110,217) Fairfax City (144,110-45,607) Loudoun (11,686-57,856) Richmond City (45,646-48,582)

^aFirst figure represented is enrollment. ^bSecond figure is assessed valuation (in dollars) per pupil.

Table 16. School Districts Identified By Size and Wealth (Kentucky)

WEALTH		SIZE			
		Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
QUARTER 1	Clinton (1940 ^a -20,604 ^b)	Bracken-Augusta (1590-31,323)	Ballard (1795-37,492)	Carlisle (1110-39,496)	
	Elliott (1457-13,806)	Crittenden (1859-29,224)	Metcalfe (1839-33,771)	Garrard (2099-44,251)	
	Lee (1876-18,933)	Cumberland (1525-21,630)	Carroll (2071-38,454)	Hancock (1558-51,454)	
	Menifee (1092-18,755)	Edmonson (2033-22,308)		Hickman (1357-51,740)	
	Owsley (1173-11,911)	Gallatin (1059-31,633)		Lyon (989-54,748)	
	Wolfe (1619-10,548)	Livingston (1697-32,293)		McLean (2072-38,614)	
		Robertson (454-30,461)		Nicholas (1393-39,343)	
		Timble (1309-32,216)		Owen (1679-41,609)	
				Spencer (1321-46,342)	
	QUARTER 2	Butler (2380-21,419)	Allen-Scottsville (2809-31,493)	Adair (2976-33,798)	Anderson (2304-44,282)
Jackson (2497-13,160)		Hart (2768-29,751)	Bath (2134-37,999)	Grant-Williamstown (2445-40,164)	
Magoffin (3043-13,118)		Larue (2648-30,731)	Caldwell (2637-35,741)	Rowan (2780-42,913)	
Martin (3022-15,044)		Monroe (2824-24,682)	Fleming (2466-35,581)		
Morgan (2587-16,933)		Pendleton (2576-25,428)	Fulton-Fulton (2168-35,019)		
		Powell (2261-22,352)	Green (2102-36,846)		
		Russell (2728-27,145)	Henry-Eminence (2279-35,735)		
			Lawrence (2711-34,693)		
			Todd (2397-33,474)		
			Trigg (2101-34,192)		
QUARTER 3	Breathitt-Jackson (4160-11,136)	Grayson (3837-27,791)	Breckinridge-Cloverport (3357-32,692)	Bourbon-Paris (4339-42,630)	
	Estill (3169-18,239)	Lewis (3307-22,185)	Casey (3148-33,218)	Harrison (3180-41,012)	
	Jessamine (3968-3522)	Marion (4197-24,781)	Lincoln (4045-32,482)	Mason-Maysville (3743-43,226)	
	Knott (4359-12,801)	Meade (3511-25,157)	Montgomery-Mt. Sterling (3848-33,363)	Oldham (3383-49,654)	
	Leslie (3722-9899)	Ohio (4511-29,423)	Scott (3973-35,579)	Union (3265-50,424)	
	McCreary (3602-10,941)	Taylor-Campbellsville (4133-29,675)	Simpson (3239-36,171)	Woodford (3548-61,924)	
	Rockcastle (3353-14,951)		Webster-Providence (3101-33,655)		
	Wayne-Monticello (3548-17,444)				
QUARTER 4	Carter (5174-21,603)	Bullitt (8419-28,747)	Boyle-Danville (5009-36,315)	Boone-Walton-Verona (8930-39,147)	
	Clay (5739-9104)	Christian (11,109-26,730)	Graves-Mayfield (6605-34,329)	Calloway-Murray (4609-40,743)	
	Floyd (9740-16,785)	Johnson-Paintsville (4624-22,296)	Henderson-Henderson (8567-34,934)	Clark (5738-40,030)	
	Knox-Barbourville (6285-11,560)	Laurel-East Bernstadt (7888-22,615)	Marshall (4972-36,580)	Daviess-Owensboro (16,231-43,151)	
	Letcher-Jenkins (6824-14,817)	Logan-Russellville (5219-29,925)	McCracken-Paducah (12,346-34,913)	Fayette (36,468-49,242)	
	Perry Hazard (8045-14,003)		Warren-Bowling Green (12,279-35,520)	Franklin-Frankfort (7207-47,302)	
	Pike-Pikeville (17,013-21,470)			Nelson-Bardstow (5814-47,577)	
				Shelby-Shelbyville (4795-42,215)	

^aFirst Figure represented is enrollment.

^bSecond figure is assessed valuation (in dollars) per pupil.

APPENDIX B

Table 17. Virginia Demographic Profile

AREA VARIABLES	Virginia State	Allegheny County	Amherst County	Augusta County	Bland County	Brunswick County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	839,597	1,327	2,994	3,560	262	1,522
b. Blue Collar	621,245	2,320	4,519	8,728	1,028	3,039
c. Service Worker	202,241	413	1,623	2,013	216	637
d. Farm Worker	46,167	73	413	1,039	232	584
Total	1,714,250	4,137	9,401	17,320	1,772	5,782
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	258,155	861	1,314	2,693	538	1,588
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	392,679	1,540	2,209	4,535	569	1,447
c. \$10,000-14,999	278,152	666	1,511	2,852	190	582
d. \$15,000 & over	230,270	236	616	1,245	49	195
Total	1,162,256	3,323	5,650	11,315	1,366	3,812
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	600,982	1,985	4,100	7,513	1,361	3,103
b. High School						
1-3 years	488,982	1,496	2,747	5,568	1,018	2,054
4 years	616,942	1,932	2,644	6,071	298	798
c. College						
1-4 years	427,322	800	1,409	3,566	194	830
Total ^a	2,446,082	6,825	13,854	28,845	3,189	9,225
4. Race						
a. White	3,761,514	12,079	20,330	42,208	5,283	6,713
b. Non-white	886,980	382	5,742	2,012	140	9,459
Total	4,648,494	12,461	26,072	44,220	5,423	16,172
5. Sex						
a. Male	2,222,121	6,288	12,512	21,926	2,848	7,987
b. Female	2,351,373	6,173	13,560	22,294	2,575	8,185
Total	4,648,494	12,461	26,072	44,220	5,423	16,172
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	988,302	1,812	3,816	7,540	851	3,293
b. Other	867,284	2,216	5,463	9,277	865	1,821
Total	1,885,586	4,028	9,279	16,817	1,705	5,614
7. Age						
a. 15-29	1,213,233	2,918	6,268	10,106	1,228	3,951
b. 30-44	810,164	2,191	4,734	9,241	960	2,632
c. 45-59	741,008	534	4,005	7,453	746	2,222
d. 60 & over	538,054	1,590	3,558	5,984	925	2,288
Total ^b	3,225,161	12,461	26,072	44,220	5,423	16,172
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	2,908,504	9,819	22,821	37,173	6,486	14,228
b. Other	1,648,417	2,638	3,131	6,848	937	1,933
Total	4,574,921	12,457	25,952	44,021	5,423	16,161
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	19,796 ^c 48,581 ^d	15/ 35	57/ 78	105/ 144	0/ 29	32/ 37
b. Elementary (1-8)	47,032/ 776,013	0/2,181	148/3,991	101/ 2,285	0/ 716	290/2,919
c. High School (9-12)	15,835/ 310,132	0/ 801	14/1,284	33/ 2,878	6/ 369	140/1,274
Total	77,663/1,114,726	15/3,017	219/5,353	239/10,307	6/1,094	462/4,230

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 17. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Buena Vista City	Chesterfield County	Clifton Forge City	Culpeper County	Dickenson County	Fluvanna County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	957	16,748	1,042	2,694	1,031	833
b. Blue Collar	1,372	11,922	801	2,758	2,118	1,378
c. Service Worker	314	2,512	276	971	282	352
d. Farm Worker	0	244	07	584	0	140
Total	2,643	31,496	2,126	6,907	3,431	2,704
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	373	2,097	363	1,352	2,060	672
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	751	6,022	626	1,873	1,518	625
c. \$10,000-14,999	400	6,602	378	920	477	328
d. \$15,000 & over	140	4,926	123	461	85	121
Total	1,664	19,647	1,490	4,596	4,116	1,886
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary 5-8 years	1,208	8,060	690	3,358	3,954	1,564
b. High School 1-3 years	613	9,473	600	9,876	1,093	812
4 years	703	10,386	1,220	2,212	1,063	806
c. College 1-4 years	444	9,409	543	1,524	588	427
Total ^a	3,421	38,920	3,268	10,061	8,230	4,048
4. Race						
a. White	6,202	5,017	4,616	13,818	15,956	4,880
b. Non-white	223	8,843	885	4,400	121	2,741
Total	6,425	76,855	5,501	18,218	16,077	7,621
5. Sex						
a. Male	2,941	37,852	2,518	8,935	7,982	3,817
b. Female	3,484	39,003	2,983	9,283	8,095	3,804
Total	6,425	76,855	5,501	18,218	16,077	7,621
6. Place of Work						
a. Wnrk in county of Residence	1,721	9,059	1,386	4,924	2,381	1,188
b. Other	897	22,373	606	3,737	917	1,479
Total	2,618	31,432	1,992	6,661	3,298	2,667
7. Age						
a. 15-29	1,717	20,308	1,172	3,237	3,647	1,560
b. 30-44	1,151	16,085	909	3,045	2,667	1,232
c. 45-59	1,018	11,060	922	2,903	2,361	1,205
d. 60 & over	800	5,320	1,158	2,290	2,058	1,266
Total ^b	6,425	76,855	5,501	18,218	16,077	7,621
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	5,644	52,717	4,542	14,547	14,545	6,226
b. Other	770	23,252	946	3,544	1,513	1,355
Total	6,414	75,969	5,488	18,091	16,058	7,581
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	33/ 33 ^d	108/ 1,523	22/ 27	58/ 106	0/ 107	8/ 30
b. Elementary (1-8)	25/ 960	792/ 14,375	9/ 733	39/ 3,209	12/ 2,906	0/ 1,335
c. High School (9-12)	0/ 367	251/ 5,174	0/ 338	17/ 988	0/ 1,254	10/ 518
Total	58/ 1,390	1,061/ 20,972	22/ 1,098	105/ 4,294	12/ 4,267	16/ 1,873

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 17. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Giles County	Cloucester County	Halifax County	Highland County	Louisa County	Mecklenburg County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	1,574	2,106	2,623	254	1,341	3,598
b. Blue Collar	3,490	2,371	5,047	325	2,958	5,154
c. Service Worker	670	712	980	52	479	1,077
d. Farm Worker	147	86	1,319	240	292	1,289
Total	5,881	5,275	9,969	871	5,070	11,118
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	1,273	1,052	3,133	306	1,306	2,901
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	2,164	1,373	2,755	241	1,376	2,821
c. \$10,000-14,999	903	923	1,320	116	314	1,181
d. \$15,000 & over	252	443	353	26	199	576
Total	4,594	3,793	7,561	689	3,395	7,479
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary 5-8 years	2,981	2,518	5,961	595	2,986	5,244
b. High School 1-3 years	1,890	1,703	3,503	315	1,362	3,406
4 years	2,538	2,001	2,829	385	1,730	3,052
c. College 1-4 years	1,211	1,162	1,164	222	594	2,097
Total ^a	9,550	8,066	15,952	1,623	7,822	16,030
4. Race						
a. White	16,344	10,918	17,951	2,315	8,549	17,005
b. Non-white	397	3,141	12,125	14	5,415	12,421
Total	16,741	14,059	30,076	2,329	14,004	29,426
5. Sex						
a. Male	8,260	6,922	14,822	1,251	7,033	14,286
b. Female	8,481	7,137	15,254	1,278	6,971	15,140
Total	16,741	14,059	30,076	2,529	14,004	29,426
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	3,961	2,666	6,759	692	2,706	9,472
b. Other	1,661	2,363	3,039	135	2,172	1,640
Total	5,624	5,229	9,798	827	4,878	11,112
7. Age						
a. 15-29	3,233	3,015	6,826	444	3,016	6,471
b. 30-44	2,891	2,431	4,863	413	2,248	4,288
c. 45-59	3,171	2,457	5,040	481	2,299	5,178
d. 60 & over	2,364	2,270	4,280	602	1,317	4,451
Total ^b	16,741	14,059	30,076	2,529	14,004	29,426
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	13,389	11,927	27,174	2,081	12,013	25,374
b. Other	3,318	2,071	2,889	448	1,946	4,168
Total	16,707	13,998	30,063	2,529	13,961	29,542
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	^c 17/ 100 ^d	33/ 46	40/ 39	-----	0/ 19	48/ 68
b. Elementary (1-8)	10/2,531	72/2,418	162/5,383	0/ 444	4/2,636	122/5,324
c. High School (9-12)	7/1,083	47/ 863	31/2,331	0/ 209	24/ 808	111/2,226
Total	29/3,714	152/3,327	213/7,753	0/ 644	28/3,463	481/7,618

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 17. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Nelson County	New Kent County	Newport News City	Petersburg City	Portsmouth City	Prince Edward County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	892	672	22,872	4,924	16,724	2,030
b. Blue Collar	2,121	883	15,684	5,476	16,256	2,221
c. Service Worker	468	335	6,558	3,014	5,983	779
d. Farm Worker	246	127	139	05	77	411
Total	3,929	1,977	45,253	13,419	39,040	5,443
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	1,281	449	6,949	2,445	7,021	1,114
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	1,067	499	11,304	3,430	10,891	1,143
c. \$10,000-14,999	452	293	8,963	1,919	6,593	598
d. \$15,000 & over	159	149	6,444	1,139	3,801	328
Total	2,959	1,390	33,660	8,953	28,306	3,183
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	2,557	868	13,324	5,663	15,150	2,127
b. High School						
1-3 years	1,761	669	15,556	3,882	16,515	1,531
4 years	688	528	18,778	3,981	13,716	997
c. College						
1-4 years	570	251	14,715	3,515	8,328	1,473
Total ^a	6,649	2,700	66,351	19,467	57,861	7,032
4. Race						
a. White	8,347	2,923	97,896	16,048	65,997	9,097
b. Non-white	3,355	2,377	40,281	20,055	44,966	5,282
Total	11,702	5,300	138,177	36,103	110,963	14,379
5. Sex						
a. Male	5,854	2,703	71,532	16,843	52,922	6,402
b. Female	5,848	2,597	66,645	19,260	58,041	7,977
Total	11,702	5,300	138,177	36,103	110,963	14,379
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	1,579	608	41,140	8,112	25,552	3,890
b. Other	2,268	1,277	17,413	5,572	15,601	1,383
Total	3,847	1,885	58,553	13,684	41,153	5,273
7. Age						
a. 15-29	1,447	1,207	42,096	8,314	27,265	4,811
b. 30-44	1,830	930	24,071	5,725	17,722	1,835
c. 45-59	1,984	841	20,081	6,353	19,688	2,267
d. 60 & over	2,194	660	11,355	5,195	13,363	2,190
Total ^b	11,702	5,300	138,177	36,103	110,963	14,379
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	10,700	4,517	66,979	26,890	68,077	11,457
b. Other	984	751	68,381	8,830	41,634	2,860
Total	11,684	5,268	135,360	35,720	109,711	14,317
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	0/ 12 ^d	-----	1,282/ 1,672	143/ 285	710/ 1,574	55/ 62
b. Elementary (1-8)	0/2,019	57/ 943	1,010/23,240	197/5,601	707/20,167	620/2,163
c. High School (9-12)	0/ 785	10/ 102	115/ 9,562	62/2,063	246/ 2,357	214/ 624
Total	0/2,816	67/1,245	2,627/24,474	402/2,949	1,663/28,898	889/2,849

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 17. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Prince William County	Radford City	Rappahannock County	Richmond City	Scott County	Staunton City
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	18,438	1,961	412	52,576	1,961	4,730
b. Blue Collar	10,820	1,556	867	33,101	4,109	3,609
c. Service Worker	3,959	834	271	18,370	681	1,999
d. Farm Worker	316	05	317	248	600	26
Total	33,533	4,356	1,867	104,295	7,351	10,364
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	2,811	450	569	14,760	2,843	1,129
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	7,863	967	434	21,517	2,565	2,304
c. \$10,000-14,999	8,894	676	220	14,249	1,006	1,580
d. \$15,000 & over	6,414	391	99	10,680	298	951
Total	25,982	2,484	1,322	61,206	6,712	5,964
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	7,227	1,287	1,086	35,264	5,770	3,501
b. High School						
1-3 years	8,292	873	436	34,793	2,233	2,816
4 years	12,202	1,352	424	29,292	2,561	3,756
c. College						
1-4 years	12,588	1,457	220	30,904	890	3,179
Total ^a	48,884	5,323	2,929	140,401	13,957	14,452
4. Race						
a. White	104,418	11,044	4,331	143,857	24,158	21,917
b. Non-white	6,664	552	868	105,764	218	2,587
Total	111,102	11,596	5,199	249,621	24,376	24,504
5. Sex						
a. Male	57,017	4,274	2,600	116,558	11,883	10,220
b. Female	54,085	7,322	2,599	133,063	12,493	13,514
Total	111,102	11,596	5,199	249,621	24,376	23,734
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	18,124	2,565	892	27,486	2,655	4,966
b. Other	23,665	1,832	876	24,670	4,531	5,432
Total	41,839	4,296	1,773	102,156	7,186	10,398
7. Age						
a. 15-29	29,740	4,572	1,112	63,332	5,636	5,236
b. 30-44	24,584	1,661	852	39,509	4,175	4,288
c. 45-59	9,115	1,668	877	43,097	4,106	4,116
d. 60 & over	4,210	1,295	892	40,433	3,847	4,382
Total ^b	111,102	11,596	5,199	249,621	24,376	24,504
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	43,713	9,042	4,513	182,988	21,602	18,829
b. Other	65,290	2,486	662	63,492	2,740	5,608
Total	109,003	11,528	5,175	246,480	24,342	24,237
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	1,289/1,911 ^d	7/ 92	5/ 5	360/2,890	13/ 82	89/ 154
b. Elementary (1-8)	724/23,795	0/1,278	9/1,027	2,354/38,434	7/3,760	66/2,372
c. High School (9-12)	121/ 6,629	0/ 612	0/ 328	1,146/15,488	8/1,435	61/1,520
Total	2,134/32,335	7/1,980	14/1,360	3,860/56,812	28/5,277	216/5,254

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 17. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Warren County	Washington County				
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	2,104	5,024				
b. Blue Collar	3,107	6,517				
c. Service Worker	661	1,528				
d. Farm Worker	160	1,038				
Total	6,032	14,127				
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	994	3,898				
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	1,865	4,506				
c. \$10,000-14,999	1,016	1,667				
d. \$15,000 & over	406	779				
Total	4,281	10,850				
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	2,767	8,406				
b. High School						
1-3 years	1,904	4,790				
4 years	2,527	3,968				
c. College						
1-4 years	1,020	3,145				
Total ^a	8,953	22,774				
4. Race						
a. White	14,342	40,027				
b. Non-white	959	808				
Total	15,301	40,835				
5. Sex						
a. Male	7,440	19,949				
b. Female	7,861	20,886				
Total	15,301	40,835				
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	4,169	7,632				
b. Other	1,774	6,117				
Total	5,923	13,749				
7. Age						
a. 15-29	1,294	4,686				
b. 30-44	2,607	7,468				
c. 45-59	2,968	6,547				
d. 60 & over	2,821	5,960				
Total ^b	15,301	40,835				
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	12,217	13,260				
b. Other	2,998	7,521				
Total	15,235	40,783				
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	19 ^c 57 ^d	22/ 485				
b. Elementary (1-8)	772, 435	676, 181				
c. High School (9-12)	24/ 858	27/2, 766				
Total	50/3, 350	50/9, 432				

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 18. Kentucky Demographic Profile

AREA VARIABLES	Kentucky State	Ballard County	Bracken County	Breckenridge County	Calloway County	Christian County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	417,376	732	550	1,212	4,486	5,607
b. Blue Collar	448,621	1,280	1,049	2,018	3,653	5,304
c. Service Worker	111,892	282	175	518	1,402	2,368
d. Farm Worker	68,959	392	654	1,095	558	1,441
Total	1,088,758	2,686	2,428	4,843	10,009	14,720
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	268,181	817	825	1,459	2,534	4,774
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	288,997	807	728	1,564	2,725	4,638
c. \$10,000-14,999	172,466	464	278	592	1,330	2,007
d. \$15,000 & over	95,578	248	91	219	658	959
Total	825,222	2,336	1,922	3,834	7,247	12,378
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	608,008	1,760	2,018	4,035	4,961	8,324
b. High School						
1-3 years	284,899	987	717	1,103	2,242	4,060
4 years	412,640	1,579	1,037	1,712	3,015	6,687
c. College						
1-4 years	196,694	457	242	471	3,199	3,824
Total ^a	1,713,298	5,186	4,255	8,254	14,198	25,507
4. Race						
a. White	2,981,766	7,856	7,158	14,103	26,805	43,578
b. Non-white	236,940	420	69	686	887	12,646
Total	3,218,706	8,276	7,227	14,789	27,692	56,224
5. Sex						
a. Male	1,579,056	4,045	3,535	7,368	13,710	30,970
b. Female	1,639,650	4,231	3,692	7,421	13,982	25,254
Total	3,218,706	8,276	7,227	14,789	27,692	56,224
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	810,922	1,570	1,556	2,987	7,441	21,312
b. Other	295,404	2,715	775	1,729	2,376	2,315
Total	1,106,326	4,305	2,331	4,766	9,817	23,627
7. Age						
a. 15-29	788,235	1,573	1,397	3,114	9,436	18,960
b. 30-44	527,133	1,285	1,112	2,248	3,639	8,342
c. 45-59	504,697	1,682	1,261	2,604	4,019	6,912
d. 60 & over	476,907	1,947	1,501	2,809	4,761	6,996
Total ^b	3,218,706	8,276	7,227	14,789	27,692	56,224
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	2,590,648	5,960	6,475	13,589	20,180	35,891
b. Other	610,632	2,278	746	1,188	7,363	19,576
Total	3,201,280	8,238	7,221	14,777	27,543	55,467
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	8,415/ 18,441 ^d	6/ 12	0/ 4	-----	34/ 83	99/ 322
b. Elementary (1-8)	48,758/ 532,061	6/ 1,166	20/ 1,033	204/ 2,560	37/ 3,211	80/ 8,684
c. High School (9-12)	19,287/ 214,701	5/ 481	19/ 485	83/ 1,071	0/ 1,281	80/ 3,533
Total	76,460/ 763,203	17/ 1,659	39/ 1,522	287/ 3,631	71/ 4,575	259/ 12,537

^aTotal for individual area is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual area is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 18. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Edmonson County	Elliott County	Fayette County	Fleming County	Grant County	Graves County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	500	390	40,776	981	1,245	3,408
b. Blue Collar	1,517	633	18,681	1,570	1,471	5,716
c. Service Worker	261	333	9,909	347	441	1,338
d. Farm Worker	223	155	1,799	1,087	430	811
Total	2,501	1,311	71,165	3,983	3,587	11,273
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	1,185	853	8,303	1,441	835	3,368
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	822	372	14,407	1,061	1,276	3,439
c. \$10,000-14,999	264	142	11,659	369	465	1,690
d. \$15,000 & over	81	69	8,762	188	186	542
Total	2,412	1,436	43,131	3,059	2,762	9,039
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	8,324	1,726	17,403	3,208	2,335	7,137
b. High School						
1-3 years	4,060	206	14,036	785	1,059	3,758
4 years	6,687	320	25,863	1,334	1,442	4,865
c. College						
1-4 years	1,824	264	27,732	504	485	2,020
Total ^a	25,507	3,095	89,217	6,583	5,756	18,967
4. Race						
a. White	8,514	5,921	152,216	11,083	9,927	29,435
b. Non-white	237	12	22,107	283	72	1,504
Total	8,751	5,933	174,323	11,366	9,999	30,939
5. Sex						
a. Male	4,399	2,995	84,312	5,628	4,916	14,861
b. Female	4,352	2,938	90,011	5,738	5,083	16,098
Total	8,751	5,933	174,323	11,366	9,999	30,939
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	1,324	593	60,869	3,149	2,068	7,523
b. Other	1,096	704	9,164	5,210	1,422	3,167
Total	2,420	1,297	70,033	8,379	3,470	10,690
7. Age						
a. 15-29	2,146	1,365	52,026	2,426	2,133	6,198
b. 30-44	1,380	914	30,659	1,823	1,556	4,685
c. 45-59	1,337	893	25,046	1,852	1,642	5,730
d. 60 & over	1,447	933	19,476	2,211	1,872	6,726
Total ^b	8,751	5,933	174,323	11,366	9,999	30,939
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	8,183	5,469	125,251	10,476	8,692	25,460
b. Other	568	464	47,205	879	1,292	5,364
Total	8,751	5,933	172,456	11,355	9,984	30,824
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	— c	0/ 10	870/ 1,538	0/ 20	0/ 68	61/ 142
b. Elementary (1-8)	41/ 1,390	10/ 956	1,058/ 23,874	21/ 1,601	0/ 1,472	89/ 4,486
c. High School (9-12)	15/ 595	7/ 348	527/ 10,003	0/ 603	8/ 555	22/ 1,838
Total	56/ 1,985	17/ 1,314	2,455/ 37,413	21/ 2,224	8/ 2,095	172/ 6,466

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 18. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Hancock County	Hart County	Henry County	Jessamine County	Knox County	Larue County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	651	1,148	1,184	2,754	1,906	1,012
b. Blue Collar	1,225	1,746	1,536	2,516	2,621	1,474
c. Service Worker	215	559	392	978	802	414
d. Farm Worker	172	1,226	977	778	320	695
Total	2,263	4,679	4,089	7,026	5,649	3,595
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	457	1,926	1,064	1,371	3,930	1,199
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	675	1,343	1,101	1,741	1,387	1,058
c. \$10,000-14,999	497	360	559	923	487	416
d. \$15,000 & over	200	192	311	473	255	241
Total	1,829	3,821	3,035	4,512	6,059	2,912
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	1,491	3,816	2,565	2,838	5,774	2,718
b. High School						
1-3 years	573	1,076	969	1,461	1,444	797
4 years	1,092	1,308	1,752	1,822	1,591	1,190
c. College						
1-4 years	366	533	587	1,748	1,137	583
Total ^a	3,747	8,005	6,492	8,594	12,441	6,052
4. Race						
a. White	6,936	12,601	10,122	16,265	23,287	10,167
b. Non-white	144	1,379	788	1,185	402	505
Total	7,080	13,980	10,910	17,430	23,689	10,672
5. Sex						
a. Male	3,579	6,881	5,391	8,530	11,365	5,287
b. Female	3,501	7,099	5,519	8,900	12,324	5,385
Total	7,080	13,980	10,910	17,430	23,689	10,672
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	1,682	3,371	2,323	3,316	3,055	1,705
b. Other	551	1,255	1,811	3,499	2,393	1,820
Total	2,233	4,626	4,134	6,815	5,450	3,525
7. Age						
a. 15-29	1,653	2,940	2,311	3,310	5,541	2,331
b. 30-44	1,155	2,147	1,748	2,767	3,350	1,828
c. 45-59	1,013	2,507	1,927	2,430	3,742	1,731
d. 60 & over	1,070	2,499	2,158	2,098	3,968	1,917
Total ^b	7,080	13,980	10,910	17,430	23,689	10,672
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	5,489	12,982	10,062	13,365	20,457	9,803
b. Other	1,558	989	800	3,863	3,184	846
Total	7,047	13,971	10,862	17,228	23,641	10,649
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	^c 28/ ^d 42	0/ 6	0/ 10	16/ 95	14/ 66	0/ 20
b. Elementary (1-8)	119/1,156	5/2,396	6/1,560	58/2,690	88/4,290	48/1,805
c. High School (9-12)	8/ 486	15/ 825	13/ 539	22/1,139	6/1,488	0/ 828
Total	155/1,684	20/3,227	19/2,109	96/3,924	104/5,844	48/2,653

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 18. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Laurel County	Leslie County	Letcher County	Lyon County	McLean County	McGoffin County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	2,559	650	1,456	477	771	619
b. Blue Collar	3,320	1,075	2,907	902	1,570	714
c. Service Worker	717	301	718	214	264	216
d. Farm Worker	621	14	14	146	472	61
Total	7,217	2,040	5,095	1,739	3,077	1,610
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	3,645	1,810	3,356	545	1,043	1,555
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	2,182	658	1,786	455	955	614
c. \$10,000-14,999	854	163	616	274	443	230
d. \$15,000 & over	359	62	197	91	150	113
Total	7,040	2,713	5,955	1,365	2,591	2,512
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	6,969	2,632	5,801	1,440	2,319	2,718
b. High School						
1-3 years	1,720	589	1,724	501	860	564
4 years	2,288	428	1,310	247	1,354	1,001
c. College						
1-4 years	1,613	424	836	311	360	286
Total ^a	14,566	5,313	12,154	3,720	5,343	5,087
4. Race						
a. White	27,113	11,619	22,693	5,146	8,993	10,437
b. Non-white	272	4	472	416	79	6
Total	27,386	11,623	23,165	5,562	9,062	10,443
5. Sex						
a. Male	13,407	5,765	11,314	3,265	4,396	5,171
b. Female	13,979	5,858	11,851	2,297	4,666	5,272
Total	27,386	11,623	23,165	5,562	9,062	10,443
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	5,306	1,542	3,295	827	1,574	1,157
b. Other	1,632	565	1,633	878	1,408	439
Total	6,938	2,107	4,928	1,705	2,982	1,596
7. Age						
a. 15-29	4,256	2,702	5,056	1,293	1,884	2,323
b. 30-44	4,366	1,905	3,599	1,075	1,418	1,644
c. 45-59	4,192	1,517	3,845	1,043	1,562	1,378
d. 60 & over	4,671	1,293	3,531	1,081	1,816	1,493
Total ^b	27,386	11,623	23,165	5,562	9,062	10,443
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	24,428	10,810	19,681	4,710	7,879	9,582
b. Other	2,919	789	3,441	847	1,145	856
Total	27,347	11,619	23,122	5,557	9,024	10,438
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	^c 10/ ^d 16	0/ 11	0/ 22	0/ 11	0/ 6	0/ 7
b. Elementary (1-8)	74/4,515	5/2,580	27/4,246	5/ 567	24/1,361	7/2,076
c. High School (9-12)	14/1,652	22/ 892	10/1,627	0/ 412	12/ 582	14/ 824
Total	98/6,183	27/3,483	33/5,925	5/ 997	36/1,956	21/2,277

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 18. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Marion County	Martin County	Henrietta County	Scott County	Taylor County	Union County
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	1,412	363	212	2,562	1,854	1,442
b. Blue Collar	2,168	1,107	528	2,472	3,316	1,985
c. Service Worker	632	282	90	775	607	775
d. Farm Worker	967	12	106	1,091	873	591
Total	5,179	1,973	986	6,901	6,650	4,813
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	1,442	1,331	500	1,384	1,745	1,047
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	1,536	560	423	1,668	1,894	1,257
c. \$10,000-14,999	527	127	84	1,026	834	864
d. \$15,000 & over	256	87	7	521	331	367
Total	3,761	2,105	1,014	4,599	4,804	3,535
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary 5-8 years	1,627	2,117	1,194	2,991	4,231	2,301
b. High School 1-3 years	1,182	466	221	1,543	1,368	1,511
4 years	1,722	319	227	2,512	1,688	2,322
c. College 1-4 years	771	290	90	1,433	1,253	1,012
Total ^a	8,010	4,389	2,075	9,261	9,549	7,682
4. Race						
a. White	15,242	9,369	4,027	16,269	16,058	13,027
b. Non-white	1,472	8	23	1,679	1,080	2,855
Total	16,714	9,377	4,050	17,948	17,138	15,882
5. Sex						
a. Male	8,176	4,708	2,083	8,667	8,296	8,627
b. Female	8,538	4,669	1,967	9,281	8,842	7,255
Total	16,714	9,377	4,050	17,948	17,138	15,882
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	3,451	1,148	417	3,589	3,194	3,814
b. Other	1,685	814	562	3,260	3,202	860
Total	5,136	1,962	979	6,849	6,497	4,674
7. Age						
a. 15-29	3,921	2,197	947	4,998	4,119	4,827
b. 30-44	2,389	1,411	610	2,895	3,071	2,190
c. 45-59	2,357	1,307	569	2,577	2,638	2,278
d. 60 & over	2,326	1,181	645	2,613	2,683	2,395
Total ^b	16,714	9,377	4,050	17,948	17,138	15,882
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	15,669	7,879	3,517	15,138	14,611	12,355
b. Other	1,045	1,492	533	2,743	2,515	3,498
Total	16,714	9,371	4,050	17,881	17,126	15,853
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	8/ 15 ^d	4/ 34	5/ 13	39/ 51	8/ 46	17/ 60
b. Elementary (1-8)	868/2,229	0/1,283	12/ 735	82/2,812	32/2,561	497/2,460
c. High School (9-12)	182/1,367	0/ 261	12/ 278	18/1,049	0/1,044	20/ 924
Total	1,063/4,681	4/2,778	30/1,026	139/3,912	40/3,651	534/3,474

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

Table 18. (continued)

AREA VARIABLES	Warren County	Washington County	Woodford County			
1. Occupation						
a. White Collar	9,754	966	2,112			
b. Blue Collar	8,189	1,231	1,938			
c. Service Worker	3,050	357	828			
d. Farm Worker	1,348	1,116	856			
Total	22,338	3,730	5,734			
2. Income						
a. \$ 0- 4,999	4,486	1,138	852			
b. \$ 5,000- 9,999	4,909	1,052	1,348			
c. \$10,000-14,999	3,068	367	1,024			
d. \$15,000 & over	1,648	161	522			
Total	14,111	2,709	3,751			
3. Years of School						
a. Elementary						
5-8 years	8,824	2,376	2,361			
b. High School						
1-3 years	3,918	773	1,339			
4 years	6,629	1,296	2,041			
c. College						
1-4 years	6,208	661	1,521			
Total ^a	28,146	5,225	7,769			
4. Race						
a. White	52,477	9,595	12,869			
b. Non-white	4,955	1,133	1,565			
Total	57,432	10,728	14,434			
5. Sex						
a. Male	28,020	5,244	6,924			
b. Female	29,412	5,484	7,510			
Total	57,432	10,728	14,434			
6. Place of Work						
a. Work in county of Residence	18,145	2,071	3,578			
b. Other	3,692	1,679	2,019			
Total	21,837	3,750	5,597			
7. Age						
a. 15-29	18,693	2,359	3,489			
b. 30-44	8,918	1,561	2,509			
c. 45-59	8,052	1,767	2,161			
d. 60 & over	7,448	1,768	1,964			
Total ^b	57,432	10,728	14,434			
8. Native Born						
a. Born in State of Residence	45,218	9,921	12,026			
b. Other	12,018	746	2,327			
Total	57,236	10,719	14,353			
9. Non-Public School Enrollment						
a. Kindergarten	89/ 236	13/ 28	102/ 167			
b. Elementary (1-8)	239/ 8,293	411/ 1,216	79/ 2,320			
c. High School (9-12)	44/ 3,111	40/ 809	42/ 1,018			
Total	372/ 11,640	466/ 2,754	233/ 3,505			

^aTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents 25 years of age and over.

^bTotal for individual areas is expressed as the sum total of all residents of less than 1 year of age to 60 years and over.

^cFirst figure represents number of non-public students in each category.

^dSecond figure represents total number of students enrolled in public and non-public categories.

APPENDIX C

Kentucky Counties and Independent School Districts
Deleted From The Study

County	Independent Districts
1. Barren	a. Cavern b. Glasgow
2. Bell	a. Middlesboro b. Pineville
3. Boyd	a. Ashland b. Catlettsburg c. Fairview
4. Campbell	a. Bellevue b. Dayton c. Ft. Thomas d. Newport e. Silver Grove f. Southgate
5. Greenup	a. Raceland b. Russell
6. Hardin	a. Elizabethtown b. West Point
7. Harlan	a. Harlan b. Lynch
8. Hopkins	a. Dawson Springs b. Earlington
9. Jefferson	a. Anchorage b. Louisville
10. Kenton	a. Beechwood b. Covington c. Erlanger d. Ludlow

Kentucky Counties and Independent School Districts
Deleted From The Study (continued)

County	Independent Districts
11. Madison	a. Berea b. Richmond
12. Mercer	a. Burgin b. Harrodsburg
13. Muhlenberg	a. Central City b. Greenville
14. Pulaski	a. Science Hill b. Somerset
15. Whitley	a. Corbin b. Williamsburg

APPENDIX D

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

November 22, 1974

Your school board has been selected as part of a two state survey of school board member characteristics. Over 60 boards in Kentucky and Virginia were chosen at random to participate in the study.

The study is designed to compare selected characteristics of your particular school board with those selected characteristics of the community it serves. To assure anonymity, neither individual school board members, school boards nor school districts will be identified in the final report of the study.

I sincerely enlist your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Wayne M. Worner
Division Director

WMW/lsp

Enclosure

SURVEY OF LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS:

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER CHARACTERISTICS

Purpose: This study is intended to measure selected characteristics for individual school boards. Both the National School Boards Association and the Southern Region of School Boards are aware of this study.

Instructions: Completion will take approximately 2 minutes. Please fill in all requested information and return AS SOON AS POSSIBLE in the stamped envelope provided.

General Information:

School District _____ State _____

Total Number of Board Members _____

Personal Information:

Your Sex _____ Your Race _____ Your State of Birth _____

Your Occupation _____

Do you work in same county or city of residence? _____

Do you have any children in non-public schools? _____

If yes, what grade level(s)? _____

The following items are to be answered by circling the most appropriate selection:

Family Income:

Age:

- A. \$ 0- 4,999
- B. \$ 5,000- 9,999
- C. \$10,000-14,999
- D. \$15,000 or more

- A. 15-19
- B. 20-24
- C. 25-29
- D. 30-44
- E. 45-59
- F. 60 and over

Education: (Circle highest grade completed)

Grade: 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 or equivalent

College: 1 2 3 4 5 +

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

December 5, 1974

Just recently a questionnaire was mailed to members of your school board. This is part of a two state survey of randomly selected school boards and their member characteristics.

Both Mr. Sam Alexander, Kentucky Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Dr. Maurice Bement, Executive Secretary of the Kentucky School Boards Association, endorse this project.

Please emphasize to your board members the importance of returning these questionnaires as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Wayne M. Worner
Division Director

WMW/pb



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

December 10, 1974

Just recently a questionnaire was mailed to members of your school board. This is part of a two state survey of randomly selected school boards and their member characteristics.

Dr. George Holmes, Executive Secretary of the Virginia School Boards Association endorses this project, and was instrumental in its scope and design.

Please emphasize to your board members the importance of returning these questionnaires as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Wayne M. Worner
Division Director

WMW/pb

APPENDIX E

Table 19. Occupation Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N	% White Collar	% Blue Collar	% Service	% Farm
A. Virginia (State)					
School Board Composite	137	61.3	10.9	8.8	19.0
School District Composite	416,529	43.5	39.8	14.1	2.5
$X^2 = 189.5186$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .021					
B. Kentucky (State)					
School Board Composite	117	50.4	21.4	5.1	23.1
School District Composite	234,979	40.8	37.3	12.9	9.0
$X^2 = 41.9100$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .013					
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	36	64.0	8.0	6.0	19.0
School District Composite	88,440	36.0	46.6	13.1	4.3
$X^2 = 41.0570$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .022					
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	20	45.0	30.0	15.0	10.0
School District Composite	25,690	33.3	47.3	13.7	5.7
$X^2 = 2.7662$, 3 d. f.; N S; C = .010					
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	70	67.1	11.4	10.0	11.4
School District Composite	200,330	44.4	40.4	12.9	2.3
$X^2 = 49.0225$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .016					

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 19. (continued)

	N	% White Collar	% Blue Collar	% Service	% Farm
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	66	53.0	22.7	4.5	19.7
School District Composite	106,812	33.2	41.2	12.0	13.7
$\chi^2 = 18.0543$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .013					
A. Virginia (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	32	43.8	12.5	9.4	34.4
School District Composite	128,119	47.5	34.1	16.7	1.6
$\chi^2 = 213.6472$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .041					
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	31	48.3	12.9	0.0	38.7
School District Composite	102,477	50.7	30.7	13.7	4.9
$\chi^2 = 79.5692$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .028					
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	24	62.5	12.5	0.0	25.0
School District Composite	16,699	33.5	44.9	13.4	8.2
$\chi^2 = 23.1604$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .037					
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	26	42.3	23.1	7.7	26.9
School District Composite	16,991	25.2	51.5	9.6	13.7
$\chi^2 = 10.5310$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .025					

chi square (χ^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 19. (continued)

	N	% White Collar	% Blue Collar	% Service	% Farm
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	71	59.2	9.9	9.9	21.1
School District Composite	101,707	32.6	49.0	12.5	5.9
$X^2 = 65.9786$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .025					
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	54	44.4	24.1	5.6	26.0
School District Composite	70,432	30.9	40.3	12.0	16.8
$X^2 = 11.2410$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .013					
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	42	64.3	11.9	7.1	16.7
School District Composite	298,483	47.9	36.4	14.7	1.0
$X^2 = 109.2531$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .019					
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	37	64.9	16.2	2.7	16.2
School District Composite	147,556	47.4	34.1	13.8	4.7
$X^2 = 19.6440$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .012					

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 20. Income Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N	% \$0 - 4999	% \$5000 - 9999	% \$10,000 - 14,999	% \$15,000 +
A. Virginia (State)					
School Board Composite	136	0.7	2.2	26.5	70.6
School District Composite	283,828	24.9	36.3	24.0	14.8
$X^2 = 360.1050, 3 \text{ d. f.}; S; C = .036$					
B. Kentucky (State)					
School Board Composite	120	5.0	11.7	20.8	62.5
School District Composite	174,292	35.7	34.7	18.9	10.6
$X^2 = 352.3191, 3 \text{ d. f.}; S; C = .045$					
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	36	0.0	0.0	30.6	66.7
School District Composite	65,432	30.6	39.4	20.4	9.6
$X^2 = 152.5998, 3 \text{ d. f.}; S; C = .048$					
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	20	20.0	15.0	20.0	55.0
School District Composite	26,306	56.0	28.7	10.5	4.8
$X^2 = 101.3703, 3 \text{ d. f.}; S; C = .062$					
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	68	1.5	4.4	23.5	70.6
School District Composite	141,233	21.8	35.1	26.3	16.8
$X^2 = 148.4869, 3 \text{ d. f.}; S; C = .032$					

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 20. (continued)

	N	% \$0 - 4999	% \$5000 - 9999	% \$10,000 - 14,999	% \$15,000 +
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	68	1.5	13.2	23.5	61.8
School District Composite	81,772	39.0	36.5	16.7	7.8
$X^2 = 290.2976$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .059					
A. Virginia (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	33	0.0	0.0	27.3	72.8
School District Composite	77,163	25.6	36.0	22.7	15.7
$X^2 = 88.7938$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .034					
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	30	3.3	6.7	16.7	73.3
School District Composite	66,211	23.6	34.9	25.0	16.5
$X^2 = 71.4149$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .033					
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	25	0.0	0.0	32.0	68.0
School District Composite	11,104	33.6	38.4	19.8	8.2
$X^2 = 126.4025$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .106					
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	26	3.8	19.2	11.5	65.4
School District Composite	14,905	41.8	35.5	16.4	6.3
$X^2 = 153.1434$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .101					

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 20. (continued)

	N	% \$0 - 4999	% \$5000 - 9999	% \$10,000 - 14,999	% \$15,000 +
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	72	1.4	4.2	29.2	65.3
School District Composite	72,605	33.3	39.3	19.5	7.9
$X^2 = 344.0115$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .069					
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	55	7.3	9.1	25.5	58.2
School District Composite	54,424	39.7	36.2	16.3	7.8
$X^2 = 207.0961$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .062					
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	39	0.0	0.0	17.9	82.1
School District Composite	200,119	21.3	35.1	25.9	17.7
$X^2 = 114.0883$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .024					
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	39	2.6	10.3	20.5	66.7
School District Composite	104,960	32.8	33.8	20.7	12.7
$X^2 = 106.0239$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .032					

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 21. Years of Schooling Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N ^a	% Elem. (5-8 yrs.)	% High School (1-3 yrs.)	% High School (4 yrs.)	% College (1-4 yrs.)
A. Virginia (State)					
School Board Composite	141	1.4	3.5	18.4	76.6
School District Composite	548,757	29.6	24.7	26.0	19.8
$X^2 = 296.3267$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .023					
B. Kentucky (State)					
School Board Composite	124	2.4	8.9	37.9	50.8
School District Composite	342,336	38.1	16.8	26.1	19.0
$X^2 = 118.7671$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .019					
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	36	0.0	5.6	22.2	72.2
School District Composite	121,881	36.1	27.0	23.5	13.4
$X^2 = 111.6004$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .030					
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	23	8.7	17.4	34.8	39.1
School District Composite	43,371	57.2	15.4	15.7	11.7
$X^2 = 29.5809$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .026					
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	72	2.8	2.8	12.5	81.9
School District Composite	265,915	26.9	22.9	29.0	21.2
$X^2 = 160.6470$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .025					

^aSchool District Composite totals do not reflect those individuals of less than twenty-five years of age, nor those individuals with less than five years of schooling.

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S); not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 21. (continued)

	N ^a	% Elem. (5-8 yrs.)	% High School (1-3 yrs.)	% High School (4 yrs.)	% College (1-4 yrs.)
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	69	1.4	7.2	40.6	52.2
School District Composite	168,969	42.0	17.0	26.2	14.8
X ² = 99.9802, 3 d. f.; S; C = .024					
A. Virginia (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	33	0.0	3.0	27.3	69.7
School District Composite	160,961	29.1	25.9	22.8	22.3
X ² = 49.7880, 3 d. f.; S; C = .018					
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	32	0.0	6.3	28.1	65.6
School District Composite	129,996	26.8	17.0	29.3	26.9
X ² = 28.5728, 3 d. f.; S; C = .015					
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	25	0.0	0.0	36.0	64.0
School District Composite	21,099	37.6	24.6	21.6	16.2
X ² = 53.0349, 3 d. f.; S; C = .050					
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	27	0.0	11.1	51.9	37.0
School District Composite	47,752	42.9	17.0	27.7	12.4
X ² = 31.0187, 3 d. f.; S; C = .025					

^aSchool District Composite totals do not reflect those individuals of less than twenty-five years of age, nor those individuals with less than five years of schooling.

chi square (X²); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S); not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 21. (continued)

	N ^a	% Elem. (5-8 yrs.)	% High School (1-3 yrs.)	% High School (4 yrs.)	% College (1-4 yrs.)
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	74	2.7	6.8	14.9	75.7
School District Composite	136,611	39.3	23.1	23.8	13.9
$\chi^2 = 239.5069$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .042					
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	58	5.2	8.6	37.9	48.3
School District Composite	97,472	46.0	17.0	24.1	12.9
$\chi^2 = 84.2493$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .029					
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	42	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7
School District Composite	391,047	25.7	25.3	27.0	22.0
$\chi^2 = 101.1802$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .016					
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	39	0.0	7.7	28.2	64.1
School District Composite	197,112	33.1	16.7	26.7	23.6
$\chi^2 = 41.8595$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .015					

^aSchool District Composite totals do not reflect those individuals of less than twenty-five years of age, nor those individuals with less than five years of schooling.

chi square (χ^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S); not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 22. Race Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N	% White	% Non White
A. Virginia (State)			
School Board Composite	140	89.3	10.7
School District Composite	1,177,020	74.2	25.8
$X^2 = 15.7899$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .004			
B. Kentucky (State)			
School Board Composite	124	99.2	0.8
School District Composite	690,224	91.4	8.6
$X^2 = 8.6128$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .004			
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	36	94.4	5.6
School District Composite	256,631	74.8	25.2
$X^2 = 6.3505$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .005			
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	23	100.0	0.0
School District Composite	105,710	98.0	2.0
$X^2 = 0.0037$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = 0.000			
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	71	87.3	12.7
School District Composite	571,539	79.3	20.7
$X^2 = 2.3419$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .002			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 22. (continued)

	N	% White	% Non White
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	69	100.0	0.0
School District Composite	320,480	90.9	9.1
$X^2 = 5.8370$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .004			
A. Virginia (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	33	87.9	12.1
School District Composite	312,868	61.6	38.4
$X^2 = 8.5325$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .005			
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	32	96.9	3.1
School District Composite	264,034	89.3	10.7
$X^2 = 1.1960$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .002			
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	24	91.7	8.3
School District Composite	44,756	78.1	21.9
$X^2 = 1.8421$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .006			
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	27	100.0	0.0
School District Composite	55,941	97.5	2.5
$X^2 = 0.0467$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .0009			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 22. (continued)

	N	% White	% Non White
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	74	90.5	9.5
School District Composite	288,406	77.8	22.2
$X^2 = 6.2322$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .005			
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	58	100.0	0.0
School District Composite	213,433	93.1	6.9
$X^2 = 3.2831$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .004			
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	42	85.7	14.3
School District Composite	807,876	71.6	28.4
$X^2 = 3.4472$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .002			
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	39	97.4	2.6
School District Composite	420,850	89.7	10.3
$X^2 = 1.7486$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .002			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);
not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 23. Sex Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N	% Male	% Female
A. Virginia (State)			
School Board Composite	141	88.7	11.3
School District Composite	1,141,037	48.5	51.5
$X^2 = 89.4615$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .008			
B. Kentucky (State)			
School Board Composite	124	94.4	5.6
School District Composite	690,224	49.5	50.5
$X^2 = 97.8990$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .012			
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	36	88.9	11.1
School District Composite	256,631	48.4	51.6
$X^2 = 22.0530$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .009			
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	23	87.0	13.0
School District Composite	105,710	49.1	50.9
$X^2 = 11.6975$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .011			
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	72	88.9	11.1
School District Composite	571,539	49.7	50.3
$X^2 = 42.6630$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .009			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);
not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 23. (continued)

	N	% Male	% Female
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	69	94.2	5.8
School District Composite	320,480	50.0	50.0
$X^2 = 52.2260$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .013			
A. Virginia (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	33	87.9	12.1
School District Composite	312,868	46.3	53.7
$X^2 = 21.2490$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .008			
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	32	100.0	0.0
School District Composite	264,034	49.1	50.9
$X^2 = 31.1206$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .011			
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	25	92.0	8.0
School District Composite	44,756	47.5	52.5
$X^2 = 18.0881$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .020			
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	27	92.6	7.4
School District Composite	55,941	50.6	49.4
$X^2 = 17.4093$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .018			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 23. (continued)

	N	% Male	% Female
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	74	86.5	13.5
School District Composite	288,406	48.3	51.7
$\chi^2 = 41.6169$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .012			
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	58	93.1	6.9
School District Composite	213,433	49.5	50.5
$\chi^2 = 42.4403$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .014			
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	42	90.5	9.5
School District Composite	807,876	48.6	51.4
$\chi^2 = 27.8347$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .006			
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	39	97.4	2.6
School District Composite	420,850	49.4	50.6
$\chi^2 = 34.0882$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .009			

chi square (χ^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 24. Place of Work Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N	% Work In City/County of Residence	% Work Outside City/County of Residence
A. Virginia (State)			
School Board Composite	135	83.0	17.0
School District Composite	435,332	60.7	39.3
$X^2 = 27.1810$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .008			
B. Kentucky (State)			
School Board Composite	120	84.2	15.8
School District Composite	245,455	73.7	26.3
$X^2 = 6.2364$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .005			
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	36	75.0	25.0
School District Composite	89,516	56.7	43.3
$X^2 = 4.1746$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .007			
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	21	90.5	9.5
School District Composite	25,134	57.8	42.2
$X^2 = 7.9039$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .018			
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	67	82.1	17.9
School District Composite	220,536	54.5	45.5
$X^2 = 19.5164$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .009			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 24. (continued)

	N	% Work In City/County of Residence	% Work Outside City/County of Residence
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	68	82.4	17.6
School District Composite	119,810	70.6	29.4
$X^2 = 3.9801$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .006			
A. Virginia (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	32	93.8	6.3
School District Composite	125,280	74.4	25.6
$X^2 = 5.3083$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .007			
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	31	83.9	16.1
School District Composite	100,511	81.4	18.6
$X^2 = 0.0145$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .0003			
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	24	80.8	19.2
School District Composite	16,071	62.4	37.6
$X^2 = 2.1937$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .012			
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	26	79.2	20.8
School District Composite	18,252	52.3	47.7
$X^2 = 7.3413$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .020			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 24. (continued)

	N	% Work In City/County of Residence	% Work Outside City/County of Residence
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	72	90.3	9.7
School District Composite	99,838	59.4	40.6
$\chi^2 = 27.2005$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .016			
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	55	80.0	20.0
School District Composite	73,883	60.2	39.8
$\chi^2 = 8.2237$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .011			
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	42	73.8	26.2
School District Composite	319,423	61.0	39.0
$\chi^2 = 2.3895$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .003			
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	39	92.3	7.7
School District Composite	153,320	82.8	17.2
$\chi^2 = 1.8532$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .003			

chi square (χ^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);
not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 25. Age Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N ^a	% 15-29	% 30-44	% 45-59	% 60 +
A. Virginia (State)					
School Board Composite	136	0.0	21.3	55.9	22.8
School District Composite	803,522	35.4	24.8	22.1	17.7
$X^2 = 120.7369$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .012					
B. Kentucky (State)					
School Board Composite	120	1.7	36.7	48.3	13.3
School District Composite	500,204	37.1	22.0	20.6	20.2
$X^2 = 99.7593$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .014					
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	36	0.0	36.1	50.0	11.1
School District Composite	176,817	32.3	24.5	23.8	19.4
$X^2 = 25.9917$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .012					
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)					
School Board Composite	23	0.0	26.1	47.8	26.1
School District Composite	72,464	35.1	22.4	21.6	20.9
$X^2 = 15.7978$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .015					
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	69	0.0	18.8	60.9	20.3
School District Composite	393,798	37.7	27.1	20.8	14.3
$X^2 = 82.5941$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .014					

^aSchool District Composite totals do not reflect those individuals of less than twenty-five years of age, nor those individuals with less than five years of schooling.

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S); not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 25. (continued)

	N ^a	% 15-29	% 30-44	% 45-59	% 60 +
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)					
School Board Composite	66	0.0	34.8	53.0	12.1
School District Composite	233,391	35.7	21.3	20.9	22.1
X ² = 64.8320, 3 d. f.; S; C = .017					
A. Virginia (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	32	0.0	9.4	50.0	40.6
School District Composite	232,907	33.7	21.3	23.1	22.0
X ² = 28.0133, 3 d. f.; S; C = .011					
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)					
School Board Composite	31	6.5	48.4	38.7	6.5
School District Composite	194,349	39.6	22.7	19.9	17.7
X ² = 25.2515, 3 d. f.; S; C = .011					
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	24	0.0	16.7	62.5	20.8
School District Composite	33,392	35.2	21.1	22.0	21.6
X ² = 26.5143, 3 d. f.; S; C = .028					
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	26	3.8	46.2	42.3	7.7
School District Composite	40,807	30.0	21.9	22.4	25.6
X ² = 20.7010, 3 d. f.; S; C = .023					

^aSchool District Composite totals do not reflect those individuals of less than twenty-five years of age, nor those individuals with less than five years of schooling.

chi square (X²); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S); not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 25. (continued)

	N ^a	% 15-29	% 30-44	% 45-59	% 60 +
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	73	0.0	28.8	54.8	16.4
School District Composite	204,684	32.5	23.5	23.0	21.0
$X^2 = 57.2732$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .017					
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	56	1.8	41.1	44.6	12.5
School District Composite	150,777	34.1	22.3	21.5	22.1
$X^2 = 42.1261$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .017					
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	39	0.0	25.6	66.7	7.7
School District Composite	565,446	36.4	25.5	21.8	16.2
$X^2 = 51.8955$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .010					
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)					
School Board Composite	38	0.0	23.7	57.9	18.4
School District Composite	308,620	39.6	21.9	19.9	18.6
$X^2 = 42.5212$, 3 d. f.; S; C = .012					

^aSchool District Composite totals do not reflect those individuals of less than twenty-five years of age, nor those individuals with less than five years of schooling.

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S); not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 26. Native Born Profile for Virginia and Kentucky

	N	% Born In State	% Born Out of State
A. Virginia (State)			
School Board Composite	133	75.2	24.8
School District Composite	1,129,058	70.3	29.7
$X^2 = 1.3170$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .001			
B. Kentucky (State)			
School Board Composite	115	87.0	13.0
School District Composite	686,345	80.3	19.7
$X^2 = 2.7969$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .002			
A. Virginia (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	34	79.4	20.6
School District Composite	255,145	75.6	24.5
$X^2 = 0.1012$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .0005			
B. Kentucky (Low Wealth)			
School Board Composite	22	73.3	22.7
School District Composite	105,402	86.1	13.9
$X^2 = 0.7973$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .003			
A. Virginia (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	67	74.6	25.4
School District Composite	564,505	64.9	35.1
$X^2 = 2.3704$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .002			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);
not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 26. (continued)

	N	% Born In State	% Born Out of State
B. Kentucky (Medium Wealth)			
School Board Composite	64	92.2	7.8
School District Composite	319,126	82.7	17.3
$X^2 = 3.3900$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .003			
A. Virginia (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	32	71.9	28.1
School District Composite	309,408	75.6	24.4
$X^2 = 0.0846$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .0004			
B. Kentucky (High Wealth)			
School Board Composite	29	89.7	10.3
School District Composite	261,817	75.1	24.9
$X^2 = 2.5583$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .003			
A. Virginia (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	24	54.2	45.8
School District Composite	44,614	83.5	16.5
$X^2 = 12.8726$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .017			
B. Kentucky (Low Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	24	87.5	12.5
School District Composite	55,816	85.4	14.6
$X^2 = 0.0000$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .0000			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);
not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

Table 26. (continued)

	N	% Born In State	% Born Out of State
A. Virginia (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	71	76.1	23.9
School District Composite	287,397	85.0	15.0
$X^2 = 3.7740$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .004			
B. Kentucky (Medium Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	55	90.9	9.1
School District Composite	212,893	87.9	12.1
$X^2 = 0.2376$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .001			
A. Virginia (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	39	89.7	10.3
School District Composite	797,047	64.2	35.8
$X^2 = 9.9796$, 1 d. f.; S; C = .004			
B. Kentucky (High Enrollment)			
School Board Composite	36	80.6	19.4
School District Composite	417,636	75.8	24.2
$X^2 = 0.2225$, 1 d. f.; N S; C = .0007			

chi square (X^2); degrees of freedom (d. f.); significant at .05 probability level (S);

not significant at .05 probability level (N S); coefficient of contingency (C)

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 3**

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 3**

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 3 of 3**

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF ELECTED AND
APPOINTED SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN SELECTED
SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN VIRGINIA AND
KENTUCKY

by

William T. Powell

(ABSTRACT)

This study was undertaken to determine whether elected school boards are more representative of the populace than are appointed school boards. Since there have been debates for many years on whether elected school boards are more representative than appointed school boards, this study sought to reinforce the position that elected boards are more representative.

For purposes of this paper, representativeness was defined as the replication in the school board of certain local demographic features, including occupation, level of family income, years of formal schooling, race, sex, place of work, age, and native born.

The states selected for investigation were Kentucky, where all school boards are elected, and Virginia, where they are all appointed. Individual school districts within each state were classified according to both wealth and enrollment. The 1970 Bureau of the Census data were recorded for each district specifically for the demographic characteristics to be measured in this study.

Composites of the individual districts according to both wealth and size were compiled in such a way as to preclude the identification

of any one school district or school board. The school board data were compiled from information included in questionnaires submitted to randomly selected school boards in both states.

The composite data of classifications by state, by low, medium, and high wealth districts, and by low, medium, and high enrollment districts were computerized and reported in a chi square statistical analysis.

The chi square analysis demonstrated that, on the state level, both Virginia and Kentucky school board members were significantly different from their populations in all categories except in the native born category which did show a similarity between board members and their populations residing in the state of their birth. There were no discernable trends evidenced on the lesser composite levels according to either wealth or enrollment of the school districts, indicating that neither wealth nor enrollment of the school district made any difference in the composition of the school boards.

Another comparison of school board membership and school district demography was included to denote the degree of representativeness as measured by a plus or minus ten percent difference between the two. These results indicated that on the state level, Kentucky had proportional representation in the race and native born categories. Virginia displayed proportional representation in only one category, native born.

As a result of this study, typical school board members in both Virginia and Kentucky were found to be white collar workers, earning \$15,000 or more in family income, college trained, white, male, working in the city or county of residence, between the ages of forty-five and fifty-nine, and born in their respective states.