

NATIONAL SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDE OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TOWARD
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION - COMMUNITY CONTROL

by

James Albin Meyer

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Educational Administration

APPROVED:

Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood
Chairman

Dr. Jim C. Fortune

Dr. Wayne M. Worner

Dr. Houston Conley

Dr. A. Bernard Hatch

June, 1982

Blacksburg, Virginia

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my wife, Connie, for her encouragement, love, and support to complete this endeavor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses his appreciation to those whose assistance, cooperation and time made this dissertation possible.

Dr. Kenneth Underwood, Chairman of the writer's dissertation, is due sincerest gratitude for his counseling, encouragement, and special interest in the writer's professional career. Also, further recognition is due Dr. Underwood for acquiring support of the study from The American School Board Journal.

Appreciation is also extended to other members of the writer's dissertation committee: Dr. Jim Fortune for his suggestions and willingness to take extra time in the conceptualization and resolution of problems; Dr. Wayne Worner for his cooperation in critiquing and editing this study; Dr. Houston Conley and Dr. Bernard Hatch for their assistance and encouragement throughout the study, including personal expenses incurred for traveling long distances.

Special recognition is due Dr. Steve Parson for providing bibliographical materials to aid the writer in pursuit of this study.

Acknowledgement is also due to my parents who provided me the educational preparation which was so helpful in completing this study.

The writer wishes to express personal gratitude to his wife, Connie, and daughter, Kathleen, for only through their encouragement, love, and understanding was this study possible.

Many others were helpful in many ways, and to all I am thankful and appreciative.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Need	2
Statement of the Problem	6
Definitions	8
Significance of Problem	10
Limitations of Study	10
Outline of the Study	11
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Historical Perspective - Community Participation	13
Historical Perspective - Community Control	20
An Appraisal of Community Control	24
Legal Aspects	26
Levels of Participation	28
Types of Activities	31
Advisory Committee Functions and Activities	34
Traditional Parent Groups	41
Related Research	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	<u>Page</u>
School Boards	55
Profile of School Board Member	59
School Board Districts	61
Rationale for Citizen Participation	61
The Value of Citizen Participation	62
Conclusions	64
Recommendations	65
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	68
Sample	70
Instrumentation	72
Collection of Data	76
Method of Analysis	77
Summary	77
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	78
Description of The Population and Sample	78
Demographic and Personal Data Relative to Respondents	80
Research Question 1	94
Research Question 2	96
Research Question 3	97
Research Question 4	99

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	<u>Page</u>
Research Question 5	104
Research Question 6	109
Research Question 7	113
Research Question 8	120
Research Question 9	130
Research Question 10	138
Conclusions	147
Summary	169
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	170
Summary	170
Conclusions	189
Recommendations	191
Researcher's Commentary	194
BIBLIOGRAPHY	196
APPENDICES	201
Appendix A: Cover Letter and Questionnaire	201
Appendix B: Tabulations for Research Question 1	209
APPENDIX C: Chi-Square Tabulation for Research Question 5	218
APPENDIX D: Chi-Square Tabulation for Research Question 6	239
APPENDIX E: Chi-Square Tabulation for Research Question 7	260

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX F: Chi-Square Tabulation for Research Question 8	280
APPENDIX G: Chi-Square Tabulation for Research Question 9	318
APPENDIX H: Chi-Square Tabulation for Research Question 10	343
APPENDIX I: Superintendent/Board Responsibility . . .	375
APPENDIX J: Respondent's Concerns	377
APPENDIX K: Comparison of Sex of Respondents by Sex of Serving Board Members	379
VITA	381
ABSTRACT	

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Regions of the United States	71
2	Population and Sample by Region	73
3	Distribution of Returned Surveys by Regions	79
4	Classification of School Districts by Respondents	81
5	Distribution of Returned Surveys by Enrollment with National Indicators	82
6	Sex of Respondents	84
7	Method of Selection of Respondents	85
8	Age of Respondents	86
9	Educational Level of Respondents	88
10	Family Income of Respondents	89
11	Occupation Categories of Respondents	91
12	Years Served by Respondents	92
13	Race of Respondents	93
14	Percentage of Respondent's Reporting Degree of Community Involvement in Educational Issues	95
15	Percentage of Respondent's Belief in Involvement of Community Advisory Groups	98
16	Percentage of Respondent's Belief in Status of Involvement by Community Advisory Groups	100
17	Percentage of Respondents Willing to Delegate Decision-Making	106

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
18	Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Involvement and the Delegation of Responsibility to the Community	107
19	Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group Involvement by Status of Involvement	111
20	Analysis of Community Advisory Group Involvement by Demographic Variables	114
21	Analysis of Community Advisory Group Involvement by Personal Variables	121
22	Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making by Demographic Variables	131
23	Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making by Personal Variables	139
24A	Percentage of Respondent's Reporting Degree of Community Group Involvement in Educational Issues	149
24B	Percentage of Respondent's Reporting Degree of Community Group Involvement in Educational Issues	150
25	Percentage of Respondent's Belief in Involvement by Community Advisory Groups	151
26	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Status of Community Advisory Group Involvement	153
27	Percentage of Respondents Willing to Delegate Decision-Making to Community, Administrative-Instructional Staff, and Board	155
28	Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Involvement and Delegation of Responsibility to the Community	157

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
29	Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Groups Involvement	158
30	Congruency of Action by Respondents - A National Profile	160
31	Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Involvement in Selected Areas by Demo- graphic and Personal Variables	184
32	Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Decision-Making Responsibility in Selected Areas by Demographic Variables	186
33	Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Decision-Making Responsibility in Selected Areas by Personal Variables	188
34	Congruency of Respondent's Responses	192

Chapter 1

Introduction

One of the specific areas of school board leadership is to encourage cooperative relationships between the school system and the community. To accomplish this relationship Tuttle recommends enlisting the aid of community groups and committees in reviewing how well certain courses in the school program are meeting the wishes and desires of the people in the community, and what extension or curtailment of the curriculum may be indicated. He further notes that people are apathetic toward schools usually "because they do not know the facts regarding school conditions, needs, and potentialities. The surest way for citizens to get such facts is to help collect them, organize them, study them, and recommend appropriate action to their boards of education."¹ Tuttle states that:

The National School Boards Association believes that in the making of policies, wisdom would indicate that individuals and groups who will be affected by a given policy should be consulted by the board of education during the formulation period and should be fully informed concerning the policy finally adopted.²

¹Edward M. Tuttle, School Board Leadership in America (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958), p. 116.

²Tuttle, pp. 278-279.

Are school board members willing to look to the community for recommendations? The underlying question is: Do school board members believe in community participation?

Statement of Need

A more active period of community participation began to emerge in the late 1940's and early 1950's when stimulated by the postwar increase in birth rate and the call for educational support to returning veterans.³ Community participation was also stimulated by the 1954 Supreme Court decision (Brown v. Board of Education) which found measurable dysfunctions in segregated school systems. This decision increased the demand for access to quality education. Due to the launching of Sputnik in 1957, federal programs which included community participation were implemented as a means of improving education and attending to national industrial needs. Some of these federal programs have been cited by Havighurst.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 required participation of the poor in making policies and decisions about the actual use of federal money under these laws. The American Indian Education Act of 1972 required participation of Indian parents in the planning and supervision of any project or program supported under this act.⁴

³Mario D. Fantini, "Community Participation: Alternative Patterns and Their Consequences on Educational Achievement," (Robert L. Sinclair and others), A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1981), p. 13.

⁴Robert J. Havighurst, "Local Community Participation in Educational Policy Making and School Administration," Community Participation in Education, ed. Carl A. Grant (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), p. 23.

Davies also stated that the Model Cities Act of 1966 and the urban renewal programs of the 1960's were important factors in implementing community participation.⁵

At the state level Alaska and Florida in 1974 and Maryland in 1976 authorized community participation in the form of district advisory councils to the Board. Eight states have mandated citizen involvement in planning or evaluation of school programs. These states were: New Jersey, 1975; California, 1976; Texas, 1975; West Virginia, 1974; South Dakota, 1976; Virginia, 1976; North Carolina, 1977; and South Carolina, 1977. These same states defined the parameters for this involvement: New Jersey - district and school goal-setting; California - classroom program and program evaluation and alternative means for completion of course of study for high school graduation; Texas - goal-setting for the district; West Virginia - development of comprehensive plans for county schools; South Dakota - planning and program development; Virginia - six-year education plan for each county; North Carolina - providing of funds for development of local advisory councils; South Carolina - school finance reform measures with provisions for local school advisory mechanisms.⁶

⁵Don Davies and others, Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979), p. 3.

⁶Davies, pp. 36-38.

More recently, however, a few states (namely California, Florida, South Carolina, and Hawaii) have taken the lead in mandating local, more representative grassroots community advisory councils.⁷ The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) of 1973 mandated each school district and/or building level citizen advisory council to assist in the preparation of an annual report. The mandate required such committees to be broadly representative of parents, citizens, educators, and students at the secondary level. The duties of advisory committees were to be prescribed by school boards without usurping any legal powers or duties of school boards. California Assembly Bill 65 (1977) required a School Improvement Program (SIP) for which funding was available only if the program was developed by a School Site Council with equal representatives of parents and teachers. School councils were responsible for designing the SIP's and overseeing their implementation.⁸ The South Carolina Education Finance Act of June 10, 1977, states in Section 6(3)b:

⁷ Kathleen Huguenin, Ross Zerchykov, Don Davies, Narrowing the Gap Between Interest and Practice: A Report to Policy-Makers on Community Organizations and School Decisionmaking (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979), p. 38.

⁸ Jackie Berman, Roberta Hughey, and Joy Sovde, "School Council Legislation Executive Summary," Citizen Action in Education, 7:7, November, 1980.

Each school board of trustees shall establish an advisory council at each school in the district composed of at least two parents, elected by the parents of the children enrolled in the school; at least two teachers, elected by the faculty; at least two students in schools with grades 9 and above elected by the students; other representatives of the community and persons selected by the principal; provided, however, that the elected members of the committee shall comprise at least a two-third majority of the membership of the committee. These councils shall be constituted in each school no later than January 1, 1978. Each council shall assist in the preparation of the annual school report required in this section and shall provide such assistance as the principal may request as well as carrying out any other duties prescribed by the local school board. The local school board shall make provisions to allow any council to file a separate report to the local school board if the council deems it necessary. However, no council shall have any of the powers and duties reserved by law or regulation to the local school board.⁹

According to Wray Register, Vice-Chairman of the Florida Education Council, Hawaii has now joined California, Florida, and South Carolina in establishing advisory committees by state law, and there seems to be an increase in interest nationally in such committees. He also points out that there are an estimated million and a half people nationally serving on such advisory councils and committees.¹⁰

Looking at the position of school board members, Tuttle emphasized that school board members have "a social responsibility toward

⁹The South Carolina Education Finance Act of 1977, reprinted by South Carolina Department of Education with permission of the Citizens' Coalition on South Carolina School Financing.

¹⁰Wray Register, Proceedings of the First Statewide Conference on Citizen Participation in Education, Sponsored by Florida Education Council, Florida School Board Association, Florida Department of Education, March 21-22, 1980, p. 1.

all the people who look to the school as the center of growth and development for young and old alike."¹¹ And as Krebs stated, "the boards of education have the major responsibility for school policies. Only boards of education can enact school policies. However, advisory councils play a major role in the development of policies."¹²

Many studies have been developed on community participation but very few studies have focused on local school board members attitudes toward community participation. The purpose, then, of this study is to discover whether local school board members believe in community participation and to what degree they believe community participation is appropriate within selected areas of curriculum, finance, personnel and student affairs of the educational program.

Statement of Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate the attitude of local school board members toward community participation within the areas of curriculum, finance, personnel, and student affairs and the relationship of this attitude to selected demographic and personal data.

¹¹Tuttle, p. 278.

¹²Alfred H. Krebs, Organizing and Working with Departmental Advisory Councils in the Public Schools (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 24.

Research Questions

The research questions to be addressed were:

1. For each community group involved in educational issues, what percentage of school board members responded that the degree of involvement was heavy, moderate, or none?
2. For each area, what percentage of school board members believed that representatives of one and more community advisory groups should be involved in decision making?
3. What were the actual areas of involvement by community advisory groups?
4. For each area, what percentage of school board members were willing to delegate the primary responsibility for decision making to each of the following groups: community at large, community advisory groups, teachers, no one?
5. In what areas did school board members want community involvement but express unwillingness to assign responsibility for decision making?
6. In what areas did school board members believe that the community should be involved but were not presently involved?
7. Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected demographic characteristics?
8. Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected personal characteristics?

9. Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision making across selected demographic characteristics?

10. Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision making across selected personal characteristics?

Definitions

The range of types of community participation included: PTA's, parent associations, parent advisory units, parent volunteers, home room mothers, community councils, home tutors, paraprofessionals, community boards, and home education.¹³

Community Participation

The term community participation identifies any form of citizen involvement, from district residents' control over program planning and administrative decision-making, to the establishment of lay advisory groups, to parental choice among program offerings, to increased participation in parent/teacher councils, to the organization of home tutors and in-house school volunteers."¹⁴

Community - The community is a generic term to represent the contiguous population of a school district.

¹³Mario D. Fantini, "Community Participation: Alternative Patterns and their Consequences on Educational Achievement." A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking, ed. Robert L. Sinclair and others (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1981), p. 13.

¹⁴Ibid.

Community Advisement - Advisement entails the opportunity for community members to give advice on the decisionmaking areas.¹⁵

Community Control - Control entails decisionmaking opportunities that will determine school policy on the selected areas.¹⁶

Attitude - "An attitude is a characteristic and usually long-lasting way of thinking, feeling, and behaving toward an object, idea, person, or group of persons."¹⁷

Terminology associated with community participation in the literature addresses advisement and control. These two terms identify functionally the nature of community participation. Commonly school board members address these two participatory functions using different terminology. The term used by school board members to denote advisement is involvement; and the term used to denote control is delegated responsibility for decisionmaking. In the literature and early discussion of the problem, the former terms will be used. However, in the reporting of the survey results, a change to the latter terms will be made.

¹⁵Harriet Talmage and Allan C. Ornstein, "School Superintendents' Attitudes toward Community Participation," Educational Research Quarterly, 1:37-45, Summer, 1976.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷William F. Glueck, Personnel: A Diagnostic Approach (Dallas, Texas: Business Publications, Inc., 1978), p. 36.

Significance of the Problem

This study will provide recent information about local school board members' opinion toward community participation. Knowing how school board members perceive community participation could be an aid to school board members, administrators, and educators in order to improve school community relations. As the 13th Annual Gallup Poll of public opinion shows, the most pressing problems facing public schools, besides lack of discipline and use of drugs, deal with curriculum, finance, personnel, and student affairs.¹⁸ Community participation can be a means to resolving these problems. "There has never been any doubt that citizen participation is a vital ingredient in American public education."¹⁹ Yet, the relationship of school boards to school councils as a form of community participation is not well researched or documented.²⁰

Limitations of Study

The limitations of the study were:

1. The population of this study was composed of school board members who subscribed to The American School Board Journal.

¹⁸George H. Gallup, "The 13th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools", Phi Delta Kappan, 62:31-47, September, 1981.

¹⁹Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell, "The Structure of Citizen Participation: Public Decisions for Public Schools", Public Testimony on Public Schools (California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 183.

²⁰Don Davies and others, Sharing the Power? A Report on the Status of School Councils in the 1970's (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1977), p. 53.

2. A follow-up to non-response was not possible since the National School Boards Association guaranteed absolute anonymity.

3. The responses to the questionnaire were assumed to be the true attitude of the members.

4. It was not possible to assess the degree of community advisory group involvement in educational issues because the sponsors of the survey required a simple yes-no answer.

5. This study did not focus on decentralization, community education, or the structure of community advisory councils.

6. The question assessing delegation of responsibility did not address the role of district central office because of the preference of the survey sponsor.

Outline of the Study

This study on board members' attitude toward community participation is divided into five chapters. The first chapter includes the following sections: Introduction, statement of need, statement of the problem, research objectives, significance of the problem, definitions and limitations of the study. The second chapter presents a review of the literature. The third chapter describes the procedures used in devising the data gathering instrument, the administration of the questionnaire, the selection of the sample, and methods used to collect, organize, and analyze the data. The fourth chapter describes the data and the findings of the survey. The fifth chapter includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature relevant to community participation and community control. This chapter is divided into a series of sections, namely, the historical perspective of community participation and community control, legal aspects, levels of participation, types of activities, council functions and activities, traditional parent groups, review of research studies, school boards, rationale for citizen participation, value of citizen participation, conclusions and recommendations.

Historical Perspective - Community Participation

To gain a perspective about the family's right to participate in decisions about schooling, one must look back to the colonial period in America. The Acts of the English Parliament required every individual to live within the discipline of some family or surrogate family for proper religious and vocational training. An educational triangle developed between the household, church and school. The household carried the largest share of the responsibility for the training and education as specified by the state and the church.¹

¹Ralph W. Tyler, "Parental Involvement in Curriculum Decision-making: A Review and Critique", A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking, ed. Robert L. Sinclair and others (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1981), p. 1.

With the founding of the United States, school boards and committees replaced Parliament and the church as sources of decisions about schooling.

At the local level, the accepted traditions reinforced by the views of the majority of the community furnished the chief basis for decisions about schooling. A consensus among this local majority could and often did override decisions by school personnel but only in the last century has there been a clear movement toward involving minorities and individual families in curriculum decisionmaking.²

Citizen involvement in the processes of education has been deeply rooted in American history. Cook points out that

American schools of colonial days were extensions of the strong influences of the home. Early settlers built schools, hired teachers, determined how and what was to be taught. Town meetings were held in the school buildings. Early efforts toward citizen involvement in education included societies for the promotion of agriculture, beginning around 1785 in Philadelphia. Josiah Holbrook's concept of the lyceum, established in 1826, was another, the purpose of which was twofold: 1) to promote mutual improvement of the members through study and association; 2) to stimulate and support the movement for the establishment of tax-supported common schools.³

²Tyler, p. 2

³Nancy C. Cook, "The State of the Art of Community Education in South Carolina: The Historical Basis and Current Status," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1977), cited by Nancy C. Cook, Citizen Participation Issues, Research Report 79-103 (Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979), p. 10, 11.

. . . James Conant suggested that the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association examine the concept of citizen participation by devising a citizen led, citizen-serving group to develop possible solutions to problems that were to confront a future educational system.⁴

Davies and Olsen report that the concept of a school council originated in Berkeley, California, in 1919, as the first coordinating council established to address youth problems in the area.⁵

With the depression in the early thirties the Works Progress Administration (W.P.A.) emerged from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. One of the provisions of the W.P.A. was the establishment of advisory councils.

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's citizen involvement with the rural schools had generated enough support for local schools to construct and house community canneries, frozen food lockers, creosote vats, sawmills, farm shops for maintaining farm equipment, plant nurseries and green-houses, seed treating facilities, potatoe curing houses, and other seed operations for community use.⁶

In 1946 the Battle Creek (Michigan) Public Schools Educational Advisory Council was formed as a means of keeping the community informed on the educational program as well as serving as an effective body of lay

⁴Nancy C. Cook, Citizen Participation Issues, Research Report 79-103 (Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979). p. 11.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Cook, p. 12.

citizens who cooperate with the faculty and administration in the development of educational policy and programs.⁷

Lay participation has been a matter of policy as well as practice in our public schools since their founding. Lay boards of education have acted as school trustees in local systems nationwide. Schools, in turn, have become extensions of the family as teachers and administrative officials find themselves assuming parental tasks with accordant responsibility.

That educational personnel are called upon to serve in in loco parentis indicates a functional tie between institution and home. This tie has a complex nature insofar as the concept of in loco parentis affirms a parallel element within the educational process at the same time that it transfers parental authority to the schools. . . .

The "double-bind" of lay participation in education again reflects the basic democratic principles from which it originated. . . . The abdication of citizens' involvement in the governance and business of public schools is as true to democratic theory as is the assertion of their right to direct control.⁸

Two theories of participatory democracy emerged: a classical theory with its emphasis on the individual participant and an elitist

⁷Strang, Ruth, "Community Schools and the People Working Together," The Community School: The 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 161-162

⁸Mario D. Fantini, "Community Participation: Alternative Patterns and their Consequences on Educational Achievement," A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking, ed. Robert L. Sinclair and others (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1981), p. 9.

theory with its alternative faith in a cadre of specialized representatives. The tension between these two theories outlined the philosophic framework for discussion of political participation in American Society.

In the education sector, it marks the opposing poles of our available models of community participation in their present and historic forms.⁹

. . . In loco parentis statutes preserve the ultimate authority of parents as participants in establishing school policy and in reviewing the procedure by which services are delivered to their children. It is, therefore, important to emphasize that the parent, like the citizen, still maintains the right to participate actively and effectively in all public matters, a right (not merely a privilege) based in the articulation of fundamental tenets and in the establishment of a public school system as the agent of society's civic mission.¹⁰

Cahn and Passett affirm that:

What citizen participation does mean is participation in every dimension of our culture, our political system, our decision-making processes. It means full enfranchisement with respect to the totality of society's activities. It does not mean the illusion of involvement, the opportunity to speak without being heard, the receipt of token benefits or the enjoyment of stop-gap, once-every-summer palliative measures.

. . . In that view, seven dimensions of participation are distinguishable. . . Each dimension can be seen as a distinct right, akin to those inalienable rights which stem from a commitment to the democratic credo. They include

- the right of effective speech
- the right to be wrong
- the right to be different
- the right to influence decision-making

⁹Fantini, p. 11

¹⁰Ibid.

- the right to contribute
- the right to consume with dignity
- the right to a continuing share in this society's burdens and benefits.¹¹

Rowell also speaks about the rights of the parents as follows:

The rights of parents go beyond legal safeguards and simple acts of friendly participation in the schools their children attend. Parents have the fundamental human rights to know, to understand, and to share in decisions that affect the education of their children. These rights are:

- to be informed about teachers and principals
- to be informed about the curriculum
- to be informed about policies
- to influence administrative decisions
- to influence school policy.¹²

In the early 1950's citizen participation was a matter of major interest. Herbert Hamlin, writing in 1952, stated that "the movement for citizen participation is the most promising educational movement of the day. It must not be allowed to fail."¹³

Davies points out that "by 1954 an estimated 10,000 citizen advisory councils were directly involved with the public schools at the building or district level, aiming to improve school community relations."¹⁴

¹¹Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett, Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), p. 39-40.

¹²J. Cy Rowell, "The Five Rights of Parents," Phi Delta Kappan, 62: 441-443, February, 1981.

¹³Herbert M. Hamlin, Citizens' Committees in the Public Schools (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1952), p. i.

¹⁴Don Davies and others, Sharing the Power? A Report on the Status of School Councils in the 1970's (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1977), p. 18.

Citizen participation as a controversial issue in public education emerged from the turmoil of the 1960's. The failure of desegregation in urban areas and the collapse of the "War on Poverty" both raised widespread doubts about the capacity of the schools to respond to the needs of urban communities and their citizens. These doubts were joined by strong feelings that the schools were not performing adequately, were inflexible, and were too often unresponsive in their programs. Under these circumstances, citizen participation was no longer taken for granted.¹⁵

Citizen participation has been shaped largely by two substantially independent developments of the post-World War II period: the "community relations" movement in school administration and the "maximum feasible participation" of federal legislation concerning services to the poor. Each of these two broad social developments called for significant changes in the relationships between citizens and the schools. The "community relations" movement was based on the professional view that the citizen was to be utilized to support the professional's expertise and make the schools fit his image. The "maximum feasible participation"

¹⁵Donald B. Reed and Douglas E. Mitchell, "The Structure of Citizen Participation: Public Decisions for Public Schools", Public Testimony on Public Schools, ed. Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell (California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 183.

development was based on the presumption of the citizen's legitimate voice in the operation of the schools.¹⁶

Reed and Mitchell point out that there were several reasons for this dramatic upsurge of professional interest in community participation: first, there were too few dollars to meet the expanding and urgent needs of education due to the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the Korean conflict; second, there was a movement to secure equality of educational opportunity for minorities, leading to the Supreme Court's desegregation decision in 1954; third, the revolution in administrative theory accounted for the widespread interest of professional educators in citizen participation. This revolution in administrative theory became known as the "human relations" approach to administration, based on the realization that if people were involved in making the decisions affecting their lives, they would tend to support them. This belief accounted for a tremendous growth in the number of citizens' committees created at every level in public education over the past three decades.¹⁷

By the mid-1960's observers began to reassess the basis of the participation movement. Sumption and Engstrom asserted that "the traditional public relations program of the school consisting, as it

¹⁶Reed and Mitchell, p. 184

¹⁷Ibid.

does, of 'telling and selling' the community on education, is outmoded."¹⁸

Reed and Mitchell point out that one major problem seemed to be that the human relations movement sought citizen participation in order to get cooperation and support, becoming more a public relations campaign than a process of public participation. Also noteworthy is the fact that federal interest in citizen participation was not aimed at education, but was, in fact, more related to the problem of minorities, urban centers, and the poor than to schools directly.¹⁹

Historical Perspective - Community Control

In 1975 Guthrie, Thomason, and Craig affirmed that there had been an erosion of lay control due to the fact that "one school board member now represents roughly 2,470 people."²⁰ Therefore, the individual citizen is less able than before to personally interact with the board member. "This imbalance between boards and those they represent has contributed to serious erosion of the layman's role in matters of school policy, an increase in the power of professional educators, and greater uniformity among schools."²¹ Also the effort to separate

¹⁸Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School-Community Relations: A New Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 2.

¹⁹Reed and Mitchell, p. 185.

²⁰James W. Guthrie, Diana K. Thomason, and Patricia A. Craig, "The Erosion of Lay Control," Public Testimony on Public Schools, ed. Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell, (California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 92.

²¹Guthrie, Thomason, Craig, p. 94.

schools from the political process has tended to exclude laymen from policy decisions about schools. "Today 85 percent of the school boards in the United States enjoy taxing power."²² This fiscal independence is defended by professional educators in order to keep education politically untarnished. With the reduction in elected officials and the growth in the size of school systems due to district consolidation and population increases, there arose the professional school administrator. With centralized control of city school systems came a reduction in the number of lay participants in educational decisionmaking, creating a professional school bureaucracy and expanding the role of the superintendent.

Centralization of educational decisions has also come about through the increasingly litigious nature of American society. Since the late 1950's, individuals have turned increasingly to the courts, rather than to the legislative process, to settle questions of social policy. The courts, then, have become more frequent participants in educational policy making. "Such increased litigation of educational issues portends a diminished role for local decisionmaking as well as state legislatures."²³

By the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century, the historical forces and events described to this point - consolidation of school districts, attempts at depoliticization, growth of professional administration, burgeoning bureaucratization, increasing litigation, and

²²Guthrie, Thomason, Craig, p. 96.

²³Guthrie, Thomason, Craig, p. 101.

unionization of teachers - had combined to dilute dramatically public control over the schools. This loss of power benefited professional educators who had gradually come to dominate the policy-making process for schools."²⁴

It has usually been the case throughout history that such a dramatic shift of power triggers countermovements; education is no exception. Efforts to restore citizen control have taken a number of forms: decentralization, accountability, community control. Specific ways include: third-party negotiations with parents, citizens and students in the bargaining process; an ombudsperson to represent the interests of parents and students; educational "juries" to adjudicate grievances of parents and students against a school district; and the voucher plan whereby parents are transformed into the basic unit of educational decision-making.²⁵

The concept of a partnership in education came to the forefront on April 19, 1967, when the Board of Education of the City of New York issued a policy statement indicating a readiness to experiment with various forms of decentralization and community participation in the school system. A group of parents quickly moved to have the board's new policy implemented in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district. Berube and Gittell stated that the question essentially was

one of making democratic theory work, for what distinguishes a democratic system is its participatory character, and inherent in the democratic concept is the individual's right to take part in the formulation of policy if he

²⁴Guthrie, Thomason, Craig, p. 106.

²⁵Guthrie, Thomason, Craig, p. 115.

chooses. Therefore, the political system must provide for the opportunity to formulate policy."²⁶

The Ocean Hill-Brownsville project was subsidized through a grant by the Ford Foundation. The preliminary plans called for the local governing board to be composed of 8 parents, 5 community representatives, 8 teachers, and 2 supervisors for a unit comprising 8 schools. The functions of the future governing board were that it be

. . . responsible for hiring an administrator of the program; selecting principals in consultation with the administration as positions become vacant; setting educational goals and standards within the schools; recruiting and selecting staff; adopting curriculum; arranging contracts with an independent evaluative agency; developing policy toward other public and private agencies; and maintaining fiscal control of the central Board of Education's budget allocation. The local board will also be responsible for preparing community-school workers, for in-service training of inexperienced or new teachers and members of the student government.

The experimental unit is expected to include special reading programs, parent teacher liaison at each grade level to discuss curriculum standards and goals, and adult education in each school.²⁷

Because neither the Board of Education nor the state legislature would recognize the local board as the official governing authority, promised funds of \$250,000 from the Ford Foundation were refused in the fall of 1967. Also the Council of Supervisory Association (CSA) charged in court that the principals were hired illegally by the Ocean Hill governing board because they were not chosen from the civil service list of candidates. Judge Rinaldi ruled in favor of CSA on

²⁶Maurice R. Berube and Marilyn Gittell, Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1969), p. 5, 6.

²⁷Berube and Gittrell, p. 35.

March 4, 1968.²⁸ This decision was upheld by the Appellate Division on November 15, 1968, but overruled on January 15, 1969 by the Court of Appeals, thereby reinstating three principals to their positions in Ocean Hill.²⁹

On May 20, 1968, the day before the legislature was to pass a bill on decentralization, UFT President, Albert Shanker, and 500 New York City school teachers distributed leaflets at the state capitol stating that local school districts would operate "on the basis of local prejudices based on color, race, or religion".³⁰ This incident pointed out that the 50,000 teachers were the real power behind the status quo in New York schools and would affect the non-passage of the bill on decentralization.

An Appraisal of Community Control

The major participants judge the experiments generally in these terms. They consider their accomplishments even in so short a time as proof that the theory is correct but they are quick to note that. . . .the opposition (the professionals, the unions and city and state leadership) will not permit local communities (particularly black and Puerto Rican communities) to exercise control over their own schools sufficiently to change educational achievement.

. . . .Those who view the demonstrations as a failure generally point to their confrontation with the system and their lack of significant educational achievement as reasons for their judgment. They would reject changes in policy as at all relevant as an output. For some, the demonstration proved only that a small group of militants tried to use the districts for their own ends, to collect salaries and hire friends.

²⁸Berube and Gittell, p. 35

²⁹Berube and Gittell, p. 340

³⁰Berube and Gittell, p. 75

Somewhere between these two views is a realistic appraisal of the experiments. Local control will result in change if sufficient power is lodged in the local district. New participants will be engaged but they will be in conflict with the traditional holders of power. The more they seek power over the schools the greater will be the conflict. If educational achievement is to be effected it can likely come only through redistribution of power, yet the struggle will subvert educational goals to some degree. . . .It is not insignificant that prior to the creation of the districts it was common education parlance to blame minority students and their home life for their failure; in the last few years the schools and the system are more acceptable target. The burden for solution has, therefore, also shifted. This is the kind of change in attitude which suggests that local control may indeed be the instrument for change. The experiments in New York City then loom large in their relevance to future efforts for local control.³¹

Fantini notes that the concept of community control differs from other postwar era reforms in that it is more fundamental, comprehensive, and open-ended, providing a framework for change. Community control alters basic power relationships and is resistant to absorption because it is not confined to curriculum, personnel, or any other single function. The community-control concept emerged from two main tributaries -- the civil rights movement and the increasingly evident failure of public education to serve the children of urban ghettos.³²

³¹Marilyn Gittell and others, Local Control in Education, Three Demonstration School Districts in New York City (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 138.

³²Mario Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, Richard Magat. Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), p. 232-240.

. . . Finally, the community-control issue has posed for public education the fundamental issues addressed by Dewey, Counts, and others more than a generation ago. Will the public schools serve as the agent of a new social order, or will they continue to be reflections of whatever social order prevails? The philosophers of education framed the question in terms of the aims and content of the curriculum. The community-control movement had added a new dimension by calling for reform of the governing structure of public education.³³

Legal Aspects

Five pieces of legislation chart the history of federal involvement in the area of community participation: the Housing Act of 1949; the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act of 1961; the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; the Model Cities legislation of 1966; and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.³⁴

The Housing Act of 1949 required citizen participation in the planning and development projects before federal money could be spent on renewal projects. This participation took the form of "civic leaders" who represented various groups and interests sitting as board members of urban renewal agencies. Since poor people were generally excluded from these boards, spontaneous organizations were formed to resist urban renewal. As a result, urban renewal legislation forced city officials, at least city planners, to rethink their ideas of citizen participation and include residents of local neighborhoods.³⁵

³³Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, p. 251.

³⁴Reed and Mitchell, p. 187.

³⁵Ibid.

The Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 was important because it directly stimulated broad citizen participation. It contained the idea that citizens themselves should help plan welfare and crime-fighting programs.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 gave real meaning to the term "participation." In addition to deepening federal interest in participation through such programs as Headstart and Follow Through, this legislation provided for the establishment of Community Action Agencies in urban centers. Community action programs were to be "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the residents of the area and members of the group served."³⁶ Thus, the agency boards were not only to include civic leaders but also community members, the poor and minority citizens, who would be the direct beneficiaries of the programs. Total citizen participation was reduced when the 1967 Green Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act required that one-third of the board's membership be public officials, one-third be community people, and one-third by representatives of the poor.

The dismantling of the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) by the Nixon administration and the transfer of the continuing programs to other federal agencies seem to have brought an end to maximum feasible participation, at least insofar as it was experienced under the Economic Opportunity Act. The effort to involve the poor in designing and administering programs of which they would be beneficiaries was by and large unsuccessful.³⁷

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Reed and Mitchell, p. 188.

The Model Cities Act of 1966 restricted and defined more carefully citizen participation. The Model Cities Legislation re-established local control over federal funds and defined citizen participation so as to restore control of the programs to local officials and administrators.³⁸

These four pieces of federal legislation were important landmarks in the evolution of citizen participation. In the urban renewal legislation, citizen participation occurred as an unanticipated consequence; in the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act, a rationale was given for citizen participation; in the Economic Opportunity Act, citizen participation was mandated, but produced unforeseen consequences; and in the Model Cities legislation guidelines were established to regulate, control, and reduce broad citizen participation.³⁹ Through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 the federal government required a measure of citizen control over federal aid to the schools. Title I of the act was the major federal effort in compensatory education, requiring district-wide parent advisory councils as a condition for receiving the federal aid.⁴⁰

Levels of Participation

Sumption and Engstrom contend that there are two types of participation: formal and informal. Formal participation is "that

³⁸Reed and Mitchell, p. 189.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Reed and Mitchell, p. 190.

involvement which is provided by law, custom, or mutual agreement".⁴¹
 Informal participation "is by definition unstructured but, nevertheless, often quite effective in altering school plans and policies".⁴²

Arnstein designed a typology in the form of a ladder pattern, each rung corresponding to the extent of citizens' power in determining the plan and/or program. The first two bottom rungs (manipulation and therapy) describe the levels of non-participation. Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable powerholders to "educate" the participants. Rungs 3, 4 and 5 pertain to the three levels of tokenism. Rungs 3 (Informing) and 4 (Consultation) allow the have-nots to hear and to have a voice yet citizens lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded. Rung 5 (Placation) is a higher level of tokenism because the have-nots are permitted to advise, but the powerholders retain the right to decide. The last three levels are degrees of citizen power. Citizens may enter into Partnership (rung 6) which enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with the traditional powerholders. At the topmost rungs, (7) Delegated Power and (8) Citizen Control, have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power. This eight-rung ladder is acknowledged by Arnstein to be

⁴¹Sumption and Engstrom, p. 50.

⁴²Sumption and Engstrom, p. 52.

a simplification, but it does illustrate the point that there are significant gradations of citizen participation.⁴³

Kaplan and Tune designed a five-level pyramid depicting how levels of citizen participation vary in intensity and impact.

- Level 1: Citizen support rarely involves decision-making, but is more a "support of silence".
- Level 2: Citizen advisement provides for input into policy, but the people have no final decision-making authority.
- Level 3: Citizen sharing in certain decisions allows for limited shared responsibility for decision-making on certain issues such as textbook selection or budget prioritizing.
- Level 4: Citizen sharing in all decisions allows citizens the same power as professional educators and connotes equality in the decision-making process.
- Level 5: Citizen control exists when the people have full managerial power and final authority for decision-making.⁴⁴

Fantini categorized what he called the many "new faces of participation in the 1970's".

⁴³Sherry R. Arnstein, "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation", Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change, ed. Edgar C. Cahn, Barry A. Passett, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), p. 72-73.

⁴⁴Michael H. Kaplan and Robert D. Tune, "Citizen in Public Education: Five Levels of Participation", Community Educational Journal, 6:(3) 14-16, December, 1978.

1. Participation for public relations in which citizens are led to believe that the critical areas of budget, curriculum, and personnel are best left to the professionals.
2. Participation for instructional and curriculum support through use of volunteers and paraprofessionals, other community resources, and evening programs.
3. Participation for crisis resolution of an immediate situation.
4. Participation in school governance with various vehicles in decision-making, such as consultative (conferring), advisory (advisory councils), shared (equal partnership of professionals and consumers or laymen), community control (authority shifted to consumer or laymen, and individual or family control (in which families or individuals ultimately select the type of education that suits them).
5. Participation which applies legal resources to educational problem-solving, requiring litigation to determine parent and student rights.
6. Participation through citizen consumer lobbies for education. Such examples are the National Committee for Citizens in Education and the Institute for Responsive Education as nation-wide examples.⁴⁵

Types of Activities

The types of activities in which citizens engage at the local school might be called "traditional" and "new" (those begun during the last two decades). Traditional activities include school-sponsored programs that range from kindergarten Christmas programs to high school graduation ceremonies. These programs are of various kinds.

⁴⁵Mario D. Fantini, The People and their Schools: Community Participation. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, Fastback Series No. 62, 1975, p. 22-26.

The first involves students directly or focuses on the activities of the parents' own children, and emphasizes the good qualities of the school. A second kind of traditional participation involves citizens in school groups, such as PTA, booster clubs, and fund-raising groups. These groups share four characteristics: they are social in nature; they are directed by a small ingroup of leaders; they see themselves as "communication links" for disseminating school program information to the community; they provide auxiliary school services such as directly through time and talent or indirectly through fund-raising activities. A third kind centers around relations between parents and teachers, of which the most basic form is the report card. The fourth traditional activity is the parents' contact with the school principal.⁴⁶

In traditional participation, communication is from the school principal and other school officials to the parents and citizens, and it is either a matter of informing them about school plans and programs or sounding them out on contemplated policy and programs. Communication from parents to the school officials is largely personal and represents complaints or compliments that are evaluative of school programs only in a very narrow sense. In this way citizens rarely, if ever, initiate policy or prevent its implementation.⁴⁷

. . . It is unfortunate that these informal, traditional ways of resolving conflict work least well in large, urban districts. Here large populations, bureaucratization of school administration, sharp cultural differences, and the remoteness of school board members all contribute to a failure of informal ways in which a citizen might influence school policy.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Reed and Mitchell, p. 206.

⁴⁷Reed and Mitchell, p. 208

⁴⁸Reed and Mitchell, p. 209.

As a result new mechanisms have been developed and implemented. "Urban unrest and violence, the campaign by blacks for 'community control' in the mid 1960's, and new federal programs mandating citizen involvement in planning and spending encouraged the development of new types of participation."⁴⁹

In recent years different kinds of activities in and around schools have emerged. The phrase "citizen advisory committee" (CAC) is used to describe groups of different structures, methods of operation, and reasons for coming into existence. Frequently CAC's are mandated in federal legislation, although increasingly state legislative mandates and even local board action have been responsible for their creation. Although there is an increasing tendency to create general CAC's, there is also widespread use of special purpose advisory groups for particular school programs or problems, such as early childhood education and curriculum materials. "These councils, which produce administrative rather than political participation, are founded on an advisory concept rather than one that places them within the decision-making machinery. This 'advisory' focus is 'outside' of the structure of governance."⁵⁰

A school council with genuine legislative policy authority at each school site would go far toward providing an effective structure for citizen participation. If effective technical staff support were also utilized by state legislative committees and local school boards to ensure that their policy mandates were both intelligently constructed and effectively complied with, they would be able to "fine tune" the political

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

participation of citizens at these important but more remote policy levels. Continuing, and even more effective, administrative participation by citizens in understanding and cooperating with school administrators as they seek to provide effective educational services is, no doubt, vital to the ongoing success of education for every student and every citizen. But this administrative participation cannot be expected to substitute for the democratic process of political participation by which, in the words of John Adams, "The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people".⁵¹

Advisory Committee Functions and Activities

"It is important to note that local school board policies invariably define the activities of school councils, but typically in general and ambiguous terms".⁵² According to Davies in a review of surveys in (Flint) Michigan, Florida, and (Los Angeles) California, "most councils lack the power to address the most substantive policy decisions: selection and evaluation of the principal and staff, setting budget priorities, reviewing and approving the budget, approving new school programs, and reviewing and assessing the curriculum".⁵³

Davies divides the activities of school councils into two categories: school-related issues and council-related issues. School related issues include: (1) critical organizational issues (budget, personnel, and curriculum); (2) planning and evaluation issues (information acquisition, needs assessment, goal setting, evaluation, etc.);

⁵¹Reed and Mitchell, p. 215.

⁵²Davies, p. 41.

⁵³Davies, p. 42.

(3) school climate (discipline, rights and responsibilities, building conditions, etc.); (4) extra educational issues (transportation and safety, extracurricular, field trips); (5) school/community relations (communication, public relations, fund-raising). Council related issues include: (1) council organization and structure (membership by-laws, meetings, etc.); (2) council resources and support (staff, funds, workshops, etc.).⁵⁴

Davies presents a list comparing the council mandated responsibilities and the actual activities during the school year 1973-74 taken from the Community Involvement Committee Handbook, Lansing, Michigan, School District, in August, 1974. Davies makes a note that the committees have no delegated responsibility to initiate action on any issue nor does their involvement include participation in curriculum design and evaluation.

<u>MANDATED RESPONSIBILITIES</u>	<u>ACTUAL ACTIVITIES (1973-74)</u>
1. Needs assessment - curriculum advisors	1. Involvement in planning each school budget.
2. Budget consideration	2. Worked with senior citizens
3. Specially funded programs	3. Arranged for assisting in patrolling school area.
4. Discipline code	4. Organized hobby projects
5. Testing	5. CIC visited academic interest center.

⁵⁴Ibid.

6. Define problems or issues	6. Produced Christmas booklet.
7. Set role as community information service.	7. Helped with decisions on departmental study.
8. Attendance and tardiness	8. Assisted in bucket brigade.
9. Inspection and consideration of new materials and/or texts.	9. Assisted in school site study.
10. Physical plant	10. Assisted with resource people for multiethnic awareness.
11. Extracurricular activities	11. Participated with community newsletter.
12. Recruitment and membership of CIC	12. Involvement in community school evening program.
13. Evaluation techniques	13. Scheduled discussion sessions on school safety.
14. Safety	14. Worked on discipline code, state assessment.
	15. Met with some school board members.
	16. Assisted with reading concerns. ⁵⁵

Another activity for citizen participation is collective bargaining. In several cities and states, attempts are being made to reform the collective bargaining process. They include:

-- A "sunshine law" in Florida which throws open all city, county, state and school negotiations. People attending the meetings are now allowed to participate in the deliberations, but this "goldfish bowl" bargaining does place negotiations before the press and general public.

⁵⁵Davies, p. 49.

-- California's collective bargaining law (The Rodda Act) requires both labor and management to publish their negotiating proposals before bargaining begins and the public must be given an opportunity to respond at open board meetings.

The most pertinent clause of the Rodda Act is the "sunshine" clause, which calls for dissemination to the public and receipt of their reaction to the initial proposals of the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) and the Los Angeles School Board in collective bargaining agreements.

. . . .Citizens have extended rights to receive information and make responses; they are seeking measures to change the law and to provide for observations of closed negotiation sessions and the adoption of the concept of "three party bargaining".⁵⁶

-- In Rochester, New York, a citizen representative, selected from names suggested by neighborhood and parent groups in the city, is appointed by the school board as a full-working member of the board's negotiating team. The citizen representative is expected to bring the concerns of neighborhood and parent group to the negotiating table.⁵⁷

The National School Public Relations Association in 1973 sponsored a survey conducted by the editors of Education U.S.A. which indicated that citizen advisory committees have dealt with: building programs (including site selection); vocational education; adult education; finance (taxes, budget, bond issues); student behavior (including student rights, discipline, dress code, smoking) and sex education

⁵⁶ Marilyn Gittell and others, Citizen Organization: Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking, (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, July, 1979), p. 141-142.

⁵⁷ Diana Granat, Perspectives on Parent Participation in Schools, (Arlington Heights, Illinois, Ford Foundation Fellow in Educational Journalism, January 1, 1979), p. 49-50.

and drug programs; curriculum and other instructional matters (including report cards, guidance, gifted students, year-round school, new programs); boundaries, district organization, integration; transportation and lunch programs; federal programs, purchase of equipment and uniforms; special education; use of school facilities; human relations (ethnic, racial).⁵⁸

General functions have included: long-range planning, establishment of goals and objectives, setting policies and priorities, and evaluating programs; improving public relations, liaison with the community, taking surveys, disseminating information; needs assessment recommendations and suggestions, input, reaction to proposals; class visitations, screening paraprofessionals, recreational activities, legwork for task forces, and even "select principal".⁵⁹

Advisory committees have also been active as ombudsmen or as part of grievance procedures. For example, "Parkrose School District No. 3, Portland, Oregon, has formalized the ombudsman role of its advisory committees at both the building and district levels."⁶⁰ And Armada, Michigan, area schools provide parents' advisory committees

⁵⁸ Neild B. Oldham, Citizen Advisory Committees, Current Trends in School Policies and Programs (Arlington, Virginia, National School Public Relations Association, 1973), p. 9, 10.

⁵⁹ Oldham, p. 10.

⁶⁰ Oldham, p. 22.

(PAC) with procedures for processing 'recommendations, complaints, suggestions, and grievances'."⁶¹

Citizen groups have also been active in property tax reforms.

Proposition 13. . . . provided for property tax reform and thus directly affects the financing of education.

. . . . The Venturas and Margaritas held a public forum on the proposition at which Governor Brown and the School Board President opposed Proposition 13.⁶²

The Citizens for Limited Taxation in Natick, Massachusetts sponsored a program entitled Proposition 2 and 1/2 whereby no city or town could levy property taxes in excess of 2 and 1/2 percent of its total assessed valuation. "If a community taxed above this rate, and more than two-thirds of them did, Proposition 2 and 1/2 called for a reduction in local property taxes by 15% each year until the tax floor was reached."⁶³

"Missouri shares with Massachusetts the distinction of being the only state to enact a Proposition-13-type initiative in the November 1980 election."⁶⁴

Concerning court-mandated citizen participation, federal district judges, as part of their desegregation decrees, have ordered

⁶¹ Oldham, p. 22.

⁶² Marilyn Gittell and others, Citizen Organization: Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking, (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, July, 1979), p. 141.

⁶³ Richard A. Bunstead, "One Massachusetts School System Adapts to Proposition 2 1/2", Phi Delta Kappan 62: 721-725, June, 1981.

⁶⁴ Chris Pipho, "Rich States, Poor States", Phi Delta Kappan 66: 722-723, June, 1981.

that citizen monitoring committees be established. Some of the cities involved are Detroit, Michigan (August, 1975); Boston, Massachusetts (June 5, 1975); Dayton, Ohio (February 11, 1975); and Denver, Colorado (April 30, 1974).⁶⁵

Hofstrand and Phipps prepared a partial list of actual activities conducted by citizen advisory councils. This list includes:

1. Advise regarding the existing philosophy of the school
2. Advise regarding existing school policy.
3. Advise regarding existing and new school rules and regulations.
4. Advise regarding alternatives for resolving certain community needs.
5. Advise regarding curriculum offerings.
6. Advise regarding new educational programs planned.
7. Advise regarding new facilities to be constructed.
8. Advise regarding new equipment to be obtained.
9. Advise regarding financial considerations.
10. Advise regarding possible methods of resolving school-community differences.
11. Advise regarding safety programs.
12. Advise regarding pupil personnel services.
13. Advise regarding extracurricular activities.
14. Advise regarding course content.

⁶⁵Lila N. Carol, "Court-Mandated Citizen Participation in School Desegregation", Phi Delta Kappan 59:171-173, November, 1977.

15. Advise regarding content of parent handbooks.
16. Assist in identifying existing and emerging community needs.
17. Assist in developing new instructional programs.
18. Assist in improving school-community relations.
19. Assist in communicating ideas from the community to school board, and to administrative and instructional staffs.
20. Assist by serving as a filter for complaints directed to the board of education.
21. Assist in the communication process related to bond referendums.
22. Assist in determining bussing routes.
23. Assist by conducting continuous school evaluations.
24. Assist in conduct of safety programs and safety studies.
25. Assist in promoting voter participation in school board elections.
26. Assist in conducting "open house" and recognition event.
27. Assist in obtaining instructional resources (talent, equipment, audio visuals)⁶⁶

Traditional Parent Groups

The present status of councils seems strongly influenced by the widely held views of PTA (Parent Teacher Association) or PTSA (Parent, Teacher, Student Association). A statement in the Minneapolis Citizen's Committee on Public Education Report, "Citizen Participation in the Minneapolis Public Schools," states this view as follows:

⁶⁶Richard K. Hofstrand and Lloyd J. Phipps, Advisory Councils for Education, A Handbook, (Urbana, Illinois, Rurban Educational Development Laboratory, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1971), p. 4.

PTSA's may have suffered because of extensive school support. PTSA's maintain the structural outlines of democratic organization but fail to provide citizens with a useful wedge into educational policy making. In this sense, PTSA participation is not involvement in a democratic political process structured to win changes in the urban educational process; the PTSA is an example of an administratively controlled citizen participation process.

As described by a member of the Minneapolis PTSA Council:

PTSA units in this district run the whole gamut. Some are barely existing, without presidents, while others are active and powerful. PTSA membership is declining in Minneapolis, in the state and in the nation. Some parent groups have dropped their PTSA affiliation. The problem is that without organizational structure, they may then drop out altogether. The 'S' in PTSA (students) was added two years ago, but it is limited. At this time there are no students on the city-wide PTA council. The teachers in PTSA have offered cooperation, but there has never been active teacher involvement. Maybe they feel that the work of the PTSA is irrelevant to them. The organization does not have an action image. It is thought of as a support group, a yes group (although constructive criticism may be offered).⁶⁷

In summary, PTA's have been and in some cases continue to be very threatened by the existence of new, legitimate, parent-oriented groups whose primary base is the local school. At least in the cities, their size and influence has diminished with councils picking up a substantial portion of influence and perhaps likely members. The short term trend in cities seems to be that strong PTA's at local schools will survive, councils or not; weak PTA's will not survive. Where neither existed, councils are more likely to be the vehicle that comes into existence.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Community Participation in the Minneapolis Schools. Minnesota Council on Quality Education, May 1975, cited by Don Davies and others, Sharing the Power? A Report on the Status of School Councils in the 1970's (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1977), p. 55.

⁶⁸ Davies, p. 56.

Related Research

Mary Ellen Stanwick reports on a study conducted in 1974-75 by the Institute for Responsive Education in order to determine the nationwide status of citizen participation. The twelve major findings indicating a trend toward more citizen involvement included:

1. Administrative decentralization of some kind has been adopted in fourteen of the twenty-five cities surveyed, and in 279 of the responding school districts;
2. School Councils for all or some of the schools in the districts have been established in eleven of the twenty-five cities;
3. Advisory groups are more common than policy groups -- of the 574 groups identified in the survey, only 88 were reported to have a direct role in the decisionmaking process;
4. For groups with formal relationships to school systems, parent initiative is reported least often as the cause of their establishment;
5. Members of the groups are elected more frequently in cities than in smaller districts;
6. Most groups with a formal relationship to a school system are of recent origin. Over 50% were established after 1979; most groups are small, numbering between ten and twenty members; parents of children in schools constitute the majority of the membership of all groups;
7. A substantial majority of the participants in citizens organizations attempting to influence school policy are women;
8. There is strong agreement that there is too little citizen participation in educational decisionmaking;
9. Apathy is the most commonly cited explanation for "too little participation";
10. There is strong support for the prediction that citizen participation will increase in the next two years;

11. Most people believe that increased citizen participation will have positive results;
12. There is strong, general support for the idea of citizen participation.⁶⁹

Cook, in a review of research on citizen participation, cites a series of unpublished doctoral dissertations.

Liechty identified four modes of participation and five different types of participators. The four modes were: parochial -- 17% (child-oriented, non-conflictive); cooperative -- 23% (group-oriented, non-conflictive and some initiative; electoral -- 48% (voter-oriented, conflictive, and little initiative); dynamic -- 12% (school and community oriented, conflictive, and much initiative). The types of participation are: activists -- 51% of total activity (participators with highest educational level, greatest income level, and highest on cooperative, electoral, and dynamic mode activities); parents -- 30% (women with children in school, parent-status types, highest levels of educational awareness, participation orientation, and on parochial mode activities); citizens -- 10% (mostly males and blacks); voters -- 9% (persons living longest in the district); inactive -- (no educational activity, mostly elderly, high on traditional attitudes).⁷⁰

⁶⁹Mary Ellen Stanwick, Patterns of Participation: Report of a National Survey of Citizen Participation in Educational Decision-making (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1975), p. 7-9.

⁷⁰Thornton, Acheson Liechty, "Patterns of Citizen Participation in Education" (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1977), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 48-49.

Stromquist identified conditions of participation in educational planning. She concluded that (a) participation in planning appealed to highly educated people, especially those of an education-related field; (b) the willingness to give one's free time to volunteer activities, membership in educational groups, and a belief in the active role for parents in school decision-making had considerable effects on participation; (c) a high level of heterogeneity in planning teams had a strong and consistent effect on the intensity and quality of participation; (d) there was much association between the individual's perception of school authorities' receptivity to planning and accepting the role of planner; (e) educational participation in planning can be developed since it is preceded by participation in auxiliary and/or supportive activities at either the classroom or building level.⁷¹

Miller in his examination of a black community, attempting to determine how schools function as a determiner and reflector of a society on a community, discovered that: (a) the structure of school involvement is related to organizational alternatives and postures of community people; (b) there are four types of involvement modes:

⁷¹Nelly Penaloza Stromquist, "Antecedant and Concurrent Conditions of Participation: The Case of Participatory Educational Planning", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 49-50.

authoritarian (school officials dominate); interactive/partisan (community dominates); and partisan (community assumes active role, school officials, the passive role); (c) interactive modes have the highest degree of stability; the authoritarian mode is least desirable in reference to stability; yet the partisan mode has most potential; (d) school participants tend to be high-status people with positive attitudes toward the school.⁷²

Lopate in 1969 reported that parental involvement enhanced a child's development and academic achievement.⁷³

However, Washington also addressed the relationship between school performance and parent participation. In his study of a community control and non-community control school, parents were divided into four groups: teaching parents, governing parents, minimally involved parents, and nonparticipatory parents. His findings were: (a) there was no difference among the four groups on achievement measures; (b) children of governance parents had the highest absentee rate; (c) children of teaching parents tended to feel less punished;

⁷²Michael Ronald Miller, "The Structure and Process of School Community Involvement" (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 50-51.

⁷³Carol Lopate and others, Some Effects of Parent and Community Participation on Public Education. ERIC-IRCO Urban Disadvantaged Series, No. 3. (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, February, 1969), p. 36, 37.

(d) children in the community-control school saw their parents as more influential than those in the non-community control school; (e) children in the non-community control school had higher scores on arithmetic and spelling and had fewer days absent.⁷⁴

Concerning alienation, Curran discovered that alienation was higher in non-community than community school citizens. She concluded that the community school appears to be a vehicle which promotes community participation and increases the organizational involvement of the school's attendance area citizens.⁷⁵

Another effect of citizen involvement is evident in voter response. Jones' study showed that the community school districts have maintained their level of voter support over a five-year period, while that in traditional school districts has decreased substantially.⁷⁶

Another aspect of citizen participation is its involvement in educational decision-making. Lapinsky's study showed that conflict

⁷⁴Robert Arnold Washington, "The Relationship between Children's School Performances and Parent Participation as a Function of the Movement toward Community-Control of Schools", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1974), cited by Nancy C. Cook, pp. 52-53.

⁷⁵Mary E. Curran, "An Analysis of Parent, Associational Group and Lay Citizen Alienation in Selected Public Elementary Community and non-Community Schools", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1976), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 54.

⁷⁶James W. Jones, "Community Education Programs and Voter Response for Public Education Programs," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 54.

arises when movement for change arises from outside the community. The power structure and the decision-making processes of the school, the community, and the large society are crucial to the successful operation of a school district, and are not mutually exclusive.⁷⁷

Ester Davies in 1974 studied the transition from *Gemeinschaft* (community-based society) to *Gesellschaft* (the centralized/controlled society) and its reversal to citizen participation in the schools. She discovered that: advisory councils made effective changes in the schools only in the area of custodial services to children; they had little effect on school decisions; and they are not infiltrated by political groups.⁷⁸

Hull, in 1949, located and investigated lay committees which were working with professional staffs and school boards. He discovered that 70% of the identified councils were organized between 1946 and 1948; 11% were over ten years old; the oldest was established in 1919 in Berkeley, California, and no council activity was reported between 1925 and 1935. The most prominent function was that advisory, followed by information, and finally, action. Superintendents, school boards,

⁷⁷Anthony Lapinsky, "An Analysis of the Poser Structure and the Decision-making Process at the Community Level within a School District", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1973), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 55.

⁷⁸Ester Rose Greg Davies, "The Transition from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft* (1870-1920) and the Reversal to Community Participation in Schools", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1974), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 55-56.

and citizens supported advisory committees which strengthened existing institutions in the community.⁷⁹

In 1968, the AASA identified fifty-two continuing district-wide citizens' advisory committees.⁸⁰

Martin's study in 1974 examined the role of mandated school-community advisory councils and their relationship to shared-decision-making in the Los Angeles Unified School District. While advisory councils were established as a vehicle to promote active involvement of the community in the decision-making process, community councils were very slow in meeting that goal.⁸¹

Pumphrey studied successful advisory councils in Los Angeles. The councils he studied had participated in solving problems related to public safety, vandalism, campus security, retention of good teachers, homework policies, report cards, curriculum, book selection, allocation of funds, pupil discipline, and volunteer programs.⁸²

⁷⁹J. H. Hull, Lay Advisory Committees to Boards of Education in the U.S. (Pasadena, California: California Association of School Administrators, 1949), p. 12.

⁸⁰Cook, p. 58.

⁸¹Donald L. Martin, "School Community Advisory Councils and their Relationship to Shared Decision-Making", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974), p. 57.

⁸²Willard Pumphry, "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an emerging Middle-Class area in the Los Angeles City School District", (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971), cited by Nancy C. Cook, p. 59-60.

The Institute for Responsive Education in 1977 undertook a selective and impressionistic survey of the status of citizen participation in educational decision-making. According to Davies, the discrepancy between council mandates and their activities is due to environmental forces which shape the implementation of these mandates. The environmental forces include principals, school administrators, school boards, and other traditional parent groups. As most councils are filled by appointment or some combination of nomination and election, the principal is the key figure because he holds important powers over appointment or nomination. "Both documented and impressionistic evidence indicated that most principals try to exercise substantial control over the council's agenda."⁸³

Dale Mann supports this position when he says: "In involving communities, principals are responding to several needs: to keep the community informed; to build support for the school; to organize the school's friends and allies; and, to do those things in a way that will minimize interference with the professional's autonomy."⁸⁴

Tirozzi conducted a study of the perception of school administrators in Flint, Michigan, toward school councils, wherein school

⁸³Don Davies, p. 52.

⁸⁴Dale Mann, Shared Control in Urban Neighborhood Schools: An Interpretative Essay and Bibliography. A draft for National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Grant No. OEG0-72-4401, September, 1973, p. 2.

administrators thought that school councils should be more involved in extracurricular policies and less involved in such issues as personnel, curriculum, budget and in-service training.⁸⁵

Caldwell noted that principals, as an administrative group, perceive school advisory councils to be of little or no value in the overall operation of the school's program.⁸⁶

Mary E. Stanwick's study reported that there is too little participation due to citizen apathy, scheduling of meetings, fear of reprisals, and opposition of superintendents and administrators. "A surprisingly large percentage of board members (13%) thought that their fellow board members were opposed to citizen participation. About 15% of all respondents thought that board opposition contributed to lack of participation."⁸⁷

A survey of principals in Los Angeles, who do not yet have councils established at their schools, showed that the reasons for the slow pace of council formation would be ranked in the following order:

- (1) Principals need guidance in this area; (2) Too time consuming;
- (3) There are no real leaders in the community; (4) Night meetings will

⁸⁵G.N. Tirozzi, "An Assessment of the Expectations of School Administrators Concerning the Involvement of School Community Advisory Councils in the Educational Decision Making Process," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973), Don Davies, p. 52.

⁸⁶T.P. Caldwell, "An Assessment of Perceptions of Arizona Community School Administrators Concerning School Community Advisory Councils in Educational Decision-Making," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974), cited by Don Davies, p. 52.

⁸⁷Mary E. Stanwick, Patterns of Participation (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1975), p. 91.

be a problem; (5) Insufficient support from staff; (6) Principal new to school. Several other hindrances to council formation voiced by principals were: beliefs that councils might become pressure groups followed by community take-over of schools; public apathy; and the principal belief that councils are not worthwhile.⁸⁸

The National School Public Relations Association's survey in 1973, conducted by the editors of Education, U.S.A., estimate that less than 5 percent of all school districts are without advisory committees of one sort or another.⁸⁹

The Education U.S.A. editors warned that the "administrator and board that make no effort to involve citizens, or involve them only in a window-dressing role, sooner or later pay the piper either in steady loss of support or a cataclysmic outbreak."⁹⁰

Talmage and Ornstein examined superintendents' attitudes toward community participation at the advisory and control levels in four areas of educational policy making: curriculum, student affairs, finances and personnel. The results of this study showed that superintendents as a group hold more favorable attitudes toward

⁸⁸G.K. Tisdale, "A Survey of Organizational Structure and Operational Patterns of School Community Advisory Councils in Elementary School of the Los Angeles Unified District" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971), p. 57, 58.

⁸⁹Oldham, p. 7.

⁹⁰Oldham, p. 28

community advisement than community control. In both attitudes toward community advisement and community control, the superintendents were more inclined to having the community involved in school finance issues than in the other three issues. Also, in both advisement and control, the superintendents indicated less positive attitudes toward community involvement in personnel questions than in the other areas. Also the attitudes of superintendents responding to the study did not differ significantly on community advisement and community control based on the geographic location of their school districts or based on the type of community involvement presently practiced in their schools. However, concerning school system size, superintendents from large school systems were more favorably disposed to community participation at the advisory level than superintendents from smaller districts. Only on the school finance area were the small district superintendents more favorable in their attitude toward community control than superintendents from larger school districts. Also, concerning the independent variable, school setting, superintendents of city school systems were more favorable in their attitude on community advisement in student policy than superintendents from suburban school systems. However, the attitude of superintendents from city school systems was less favorable toward community control of school finances.⁹¹

⁹¹Harriet Talmage and Allan C. Ornstein, "School Superintendents: Attitudes Toward Community Participation: Advisement versus Control", The Journal of Educational Administration, 14:162-175, October, 1976.

Ornstein conducted a survey of school systems with 50,000 or more students concerning administrative decentralization and community participation. The top eight cited reasons for decentralization were to: (1) enhance school/community relations, (2) provide greater community input at the local school level, (3) provide local school with more field and resource personnel, (4) provide more efficient maintenance and support of local schools, (5) reduce administrative span of control, (6) provide greater linkages between the local and central school boards, (7) redirect spending for local school needs, and (8) provide greater curriculum continuity. These reasons accounted for 79% of the total responses; in general, they focus on school/community relations, local school needs, administrative organization, and curriculum matters.⁹²

Community participation was reported at the local, decentralized, and central levels on a scale of one to four -- one representing minimal, two - average, three - extensive, and four - very extensive or community control. The average community participation score at the local level was 2.6; at the decentralized level was 2.3; at the central level was

⁹²Allan C. Ornstein, "Decentralization and Community Participation Policy of Big School Systems", Phi Delta Kappan, 62:256, December, 1980.

2.4. "At all three school levels -- local, decentralized, and central -- community participation averaged out in rather similar fashion, although local school scores were somewhat higher. No school system reported very extensive community participation, which was defined as community control on any level."⁹³

School Boards

Davies points out that the relationship of school boards to school councils is not well researched or documented. Generally school boards seem not to see councils as a very high priority. The administration is far more prominent in relating to councils than the school board as the councils seek the administration for advice, information, and resources. As such, school councils feel more responsible to administration than to school boards. Since school boards receive secondhand information about council activity, there is an unstable and confusing relationship between the school boards and school councils.⁹⁴

Davies cites several school board member fears. First, councils may encroach on board prerogatives and responsibilities. Second, councils are nothing more than a political "farm system" which citizens use as a base for future school board candidacy. Third, school boards do not see councils as "their baby" as they have been established by administrative initiative, or state and federal mandate.⁹⁵

⁹³Allan C. Ornstein, p. 257.

⁹⁴Don Davies, p. 53.

⁹⁵Don Davies, p. 54.

"Given the continuing high level of public concern over the quality of education in the schools it is a little surprising that those two groups cannot identify their common interests and ways of interacting on different levels where they can be mutually supportive and reinforce the efforts of each other."⁹⁶

Iannacone and Lutz affirm that the typical school board is "a tightly closed political system that receives little if any input from more than a handful of residents of the school district."⁹⁷

Citizens participate politically in school policy making through school board campaigns, elections, and referendums on school budgets, taxes, and bond issues. Referendums are a legacy of the urban reform movement. They serve not only to secure needed capital and operating funds for the school district, but they are also a device for assessing the degree of harmony between the school boards and the voters in the community.⁹⁸

Reed and Mitchell point out from their study of school referendums that there are good reasons for school boards to keep school policy out of the limelight and to maintain themselves or their friends in

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Laurence Iannacone and Frank Lutz, Politics, Power, and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970), p. 52-68.

⁹⁸ Reed and Mitchell, p. 196.

power through a policy that is designed to preserve the status quo. They also point out that elected officials will not seek to increase sharply the rate of political participation in any system because the dangers to their own control are real and immediate. When participation increases, so do conflict and discomfort for everyone.⁹⁹

Norman D. Kerr, in a landmark study published in 1964, demonstrated that there are important reasons why we should not expect school boards to be particularly open to the participation of citizens in the policy-making process. Kerr examined the way in which a school board is transformed from a representational structure, which turns the interests of citizens into school policy, into a structure that receives policy decisions from the superintendents and renders them acceptable to citizens of the school district. Kerr became convinced that the reasons behind their lack of responsiveness are independent of their personal characteristics and have more to do with the way school boards typically operate in the policy-making process.¹⁰⁰

Zeigler points out that school board members view themselves as "trustees" responsible for school policy rather than as "delegates" representing their constituencies. Citizens have a slight preference for board members who act as trustees rather than delegates.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹Reed and Mitchell, p. 197-198.

¹⁰⁰Norman D. Kerr, "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation", in Sociology of Education, ed. Ronald M. Pavalko (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1969), p. 361-388.

¹⁰¹Reed and Mitchell, p. 200 and 216.

Reed and Mitchell conclude that prospects are dim that citizens will be able to influence school board policy through political pressure on board members. Given the rapid growth of the so-called "accountability" laws, two strategies have emerged. One seeks to tighten the grip of school boards and superintendents on the performance of teachers and local administration. The other strategy seeks to move policy-making to the local school by creating school advisory councils, giving citizens an opportunity for direct participation.¹⁰²

In another study Zeigler and Jennings focused on a detailed report of interviews with four hundred and ninety board members and of 83 representative school districts across the country, trying to identify how school board decisions are made.

It documents a broad spectrum of superintendent-board-community relationships ranging between two extremes: board deference to professional direction on one hand; subordination of the superintendent's recommendations to the board's view of community values on the other. While the former relationship tends to predominate in cities and the latter in small towns, there is no pattern: complexities abound. Despite growing state and federal involvement, the findings place immediate control over school policies at the district level; but the study found, control is not in the boards. They "have been effectively insulated from the voting public . . . and increasingly dependent on superintendents for information on which to base decisions."¹⁰³

¹⁰² Reed and Mitchell, p. 200.

¹⁰³ L. Harmon Zeigler and M. Kent Jennings, with G. Wayne Peak, Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1974), pp. 154, 175-178.

. . . Boards are the mechanisms whereby schools can be made more responsive to their constituencies. Whatever the perils that more responsive schools may bring, the costs of insulation from the community are greater.¹⁰⁴

Profile of School Board Member

School board members as referred to in the literature below can be labeled as "suburban, white, middle or upper-middle class, and middle-aged" according to The American School Board Journal and Virginia Tech (ASBJ-VT) survey in 1978. But school board membership is not composed exclusively of males.¹⁰⁵ Women numbered 28 percent in 1979,¹⁰⁶ 27.5 percent of the total nationally in 1980,¹⁰⁷ and 32.8 percent in 1981.¹⁰⁸

Ethnic Breakdown

Considering the ethnic breakdown nationally, school board membership is predominantly Anglo-American (91.5 percent), and the other social categories including Afro-American, Hispanic, and Indian comprised 6.4 percent.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵Kenneth E. Underwood, Lawrence McCluskey and George R. Umberger, "A Profile of the School Board Member Today," The American School Board Journal 165:23-28, October, 1978.

¹⁰⁶Kenneth E. Underwood, Wayne P. Thomas, Tony Cooke, and Shirley Underwood, "Portrait of the American School Board Member," The American School Board Journal 167:23-29, January, 1980.

¹⁰⁷Kenneth E. Underwood, Wayne P. Thomas, and Mark Pace, "Your Portrait: Who you are, region by region," The American School Board Journal 168:20-25, January, 1981.

¹⁰⁸Kenneth E. Underwood, James C. Fortune, and Harold W. Dodge, "Your Portrait: School Boards have a Brand New Look," The American School Board Journal 169:17-20, January, 1982.

¹⁰⁹Underwood, Fortune, and Dodge, p. 18.

Family Income

The family income of a typical surveyed school board member subscriber of The American School Board Journal (ASBJ) is more than \$40,000. According to the 1981 ASBJ-VT survey, 9.6 percent earned less than \$20,000; 23.2 percent earned between \$20,000 and \$29,000; 24.1 percent had family income between \$30,000 and \$39,000; and 43.1 percent received more than \$40,000.¹¹⁰

Level of Education and Occupation

With regard to level of education, 65.9 percent of surveyed school board members reported having finished four years or more of college. Considering occupation, 61.1 percent of the respondents were in occupations classified as professional or managerial; 12.6 percent were skilled workers; 10.4 percent were homemakers; clerical/sales accounted for another 7.8 percent, and 5 percent were retirees. Overwhelmingly, the typical board member is in a professional or managerial position.¹¹¹

Major Concerns

According to the October, 1978, issue of The American School Board Journal, the 6th major concern of school board members was

¹¹⁰ Underwood, Fortune, and Dodge, p. 18

¹¹¹ Underwood, Fortune, and Dodge, p. 20.

public apathy, with the other major concerns centering around curriculum, finance, and student affairs.¹¹² According to the 1980 and 1981 ABSJ-VT survey, the primary concerns of school board members centered, in order of importance, in the areas of finance, personnel, student affairs, and curriculum, followed by public apathy.¹¹³

School Board Districts

Enrollment Size

Examining school district enrollment size, according to the 1981 ASBJ-VT Survey, 17 percent of the school board members surveyed served in districts with less than 1,000 students; 49 percent served in districts between 1,000 and 4,999 students; 17 percent served in districts between 5,000 and 9,999 students; 11.1 percent between 10,000 and 24,999; and 5.5 percent in districts with enrollments greater than 25,000.¹¹⁴

Rationale for Citizen Participation

Deshler and Erlich state four reasons for the increased involvement of local citizens in schools: (1) the community education

¹¹²Underwood, McCluskey and Umberger, p. 25.

¹¹³Kenneth E. Underwood, Wayne P. Thomas, and Mark Pace, "Your Portrait: Board Concerns vs. the Public's," The American School Board Journal 168: 20, January, 1981.

¹¹⁴Underwood, Fortune, and Dodge, p. 20.

movement is spreading rapidly; (2) local citizens in urban areas are pushing for radical changes in school government; (3) young people have generally suffered alienation; (4) the educational process is being demystified.¹¹⁵

Davies, et al., point out six reasons for citizen participation as an attempt to affect: (1) the development of effective and equitable school policies; (2) the improvement of the nature and quality of educational services; (3) the development of a healthy and stable community; (4) the development of a sense of efficacy and confidence for the constituents of citizen organizations; (5) the improved performance by students; (6) organizational effectiveness.¹¹⁶

The Value of Citizen Participation

The values inherent in citizen participation were synthesized and expressed by Cahn and Cahn. They proposed that citizen participation can be:

1. A means of mobilizing unutilized resources - a source of productivity and labor not otherwise tapped.
2. A source of knowledge - both corrective and creative - a means of securing feedback regarding policy and programs, and also a source of new, inventive and innovative approaches.

¹¹⁵Betty Deshler and John L. Erlich, "Citizen Involvement: Evolution in the Revolution," Phi Delta Kappan, 54:173, November, 1972.

¹¹⁶Don Davies, p. 12

3. An end in itself - an affirmation of democracy and the elimination of alienation and withdrawal, of destructiveness, hostility, and lack of faith in relying on the people.¹¹⁷

The National School Public Relations Association affirms that:
 "the value of citizen committees stems primarily from their continuing success in promoting special bond issues, getting voter approval on tax levies and pushing through school budgets."¹¹⁸

W. James Popham, in his Handbook for Concerned Citizens, states:

The advantage of having the advisory groups deal with policies instead of specific instances, of course, is simply the economy of such a strategy. Dealing with specific situations, one-by-one, is time-consuming and inefficient. Setting policies that influence a range of specific decisions makes far more sense.

. . . The three policy areas which are of potential concern to citizen advisors deal with (1) curriculum decisions, (2) instructional decisions, and (3) evaluating decisions.¹¹⁹

Ralph Turlington, Commissioner of Education in Florida, stated at the first statewide conference on citizen participation in education

¹¹⁷Edgar S. Cahn and Jean Camper Cahn, "Maximum Feasible Participation," Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change, edited by Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), p. 16.

¹¹⁸Oldham, p. 5.

¹¹⁹W. James Popham, Advising Schools: A Handbook for Concerned Citizens, Instructional Objectives Exchange, Los Angeles, California, 1977, p. 10.

that citizen participation in our public schools has many beneficial effects.

1. There is a need to have the people gain more control of their schools and to make schools more responsive to the people they serve. Increased citizen participation will serve as a counter balance to the greater influence of government education.
2. Citizens can play an important role in monitoring what schools do and how well they achieve their objectives. Schools are much too complex to be monitored at a centralized level -- they need local citizens looking at them, program by program, and from the inside.
3. Citizen participation builds support and confidence in education through people becoming more familiar with the problem of their schools, the resources of their schools and the prospects for their schools.
4. Research shows that citizen participation in schools tends to improve the educational achievement of students by developing stronger ties between the school and the home.
5. Citizen participation often results in promoting what schools are doing, and thus makes good sense from a public relations point of view.
6. Citizen participation in schools tends to improve the health and stability of a community by instilling a sense of collective effectiveness, confidence and ownership among the community members.¹²⁰

Conclusions

Jim Stanton, et al., summarized the effectiveness of school councils.

¹²⁰ Ralph Turlington, Proceedings of the First Statewide Conference on Citizen Participation in Education, March 21-22, 1980.

The two most basic ownership problems many councils face are: some councils feel confined and constrained by the top-down imposition of a burdensome "outside agenda," while others feel directionless and immobilized because they have been established without any clear mission. The resulting resistance and/or confusion works against developing a sense of ownership.¹²¹

Institutions, like councils, take root and grow not because they are mandated by law, and not simply because they are a good idea, but because they are able to harness the legitimate interests of all who are involved.¹²²

There is a considerable confusion caused by the lack of a clear delegation of authority. This works against councils' ability to achieve a productive collaboration with school boards, superintendents, and principals. Lack of authority to work on issues of importance to citizens and educators greatly reduces incentives to participation. Since councils are intended to relate to an existing authority structure, this can only be productive if the authority of councils in relation to each other part of the structure is clear.¹²³

Recommendations

The National Committee for Citizens in Education recommends "a council at each school with appropriate responsibility and authority. The school council should be elected and should share authority and

¹²¹Jim Stanton and others, Overcoming Barriers to School Council Effectiveness (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, March, 1979), p. 14.

¹²²Stanton, p. 15.

¹²³Stanton, p. 21-22.

responsibility for curriculum, school program budgeting, school program reports, and personnel evaluations."¹²⁴

Havighurst suggested three areas of school administration of special concern for community involvement: budget, personnel, and curriculum.¹²⁵

Huguenin, Zerchykov, and Davies specifically recommended that local school boards should assign to councils responsibilities for processing grievances, acting as a vehicle for citizen input to the school board, and assuming a role in principal selection.¹²⁶

¹²⁴Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell, Public Testimony on Public Schools, National Committee for Citizens in Education, (Berkeley, California; McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 221.

¹²⁵Robert J. Havighurst, "Local Community Participation in Educational Policy Making and School Administration," Community Participation in Education, ed. Carl A. Grant (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), p. 37-39.

¹²⁶Kathleen Huguenin, Ross Zerchykov, Don Davies, Narrowing the Gap Between Intent and Practice: A Report to Policymakers on Community Organizations and School Decisionmaking, (City University of New York: Institute for Responsive Education, July, 1979), p. 90.

Stanton has developed these recommendations:

Policymakers, school boards, educators, or parent/citizen groups should establish or support the establishment of a constituent assembly or a similar type of group composed of representatives of all the constituencies involved and affected by school councils to plan and implement councils.¹²⁷

The constituent assembly or other similar group should negotiate with the school board to define and clarify the authority necessary for councils to act effectively. Additionally, it should clarify how the authority and responsibilities of the council, principals, superintendent, and school board interact.¹²⁸

¹²⁷Stanton, p. 16, 17.

¹²⁸Stanton, p. 24.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology of this study, explain the sampling technique, describe the procedure used in devising the data gathering instrument and the administration of the questionnaire, and provide an explanation of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Research Methodology

Descriptive research methodology was utilized in this study.

No category of educational research is more widely used than the type known variously as the survey, the normative survey, or descriptive research. This is a broad classification comprising a variety of specific techniques and procedures, all similar from the standpoint of purpose - namely, to establish the status of the phenomenon under investigation.¹

Survey research deals with the incidence, distribution and interrelations of psychological and sociological variables.² Psychological

¹George J. Mouly, The Science of Educational Research (Litton Educational Publishing, Inc., 1970), p. 234.

²William Wiersma, Research Methods in Education (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980), p. 15, 16

variables include opinions and attitudes, on the one hand, and behavior, on the other.³ Sociological variables are "attributes of individuals that spring from their membership in social groups: sex, income, political and religious affiliation, socio-economic status, education, age, living expenses, occupation, race, and so on."⁴ Kerlinger states clearly, "survey research focuses on people, the vital facts of people, and their beliefs, opinions, and attitudes."⁵

This study surveyed a nationwide stratified sample by means of a mailed questionnaire (Appendix A).

Among the major advantages of the questionnaire is that it permits wide coverage at a minimum expense both in money and effort. It not only affords wider geographic coverage but it also reaches persons who are difficult to contact. This greater coverage makes for greater validity in the results through promoting the selection of a larger and more representative sample. Particularly when it does not call for a signature or other means of identification, the questionnaire may, because of its greater impersonality, elicit more candid and objective replies.⁶

³Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 411.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Mouly, p. 242.

According to Sax,

Another advantage claimed for the questionnaire is that each respondent receives the same set of questions phrased in exactly the same way, as they are on standardized tests. Questionnaires are, then, supposed to yield more comparable data than do interviews.⁷

For the above reasons, the researcher selected descriptive-survey procedures to determine the attitude of local school board members toward community participation through advisement or control and to study relationships between attitude and selected demographic and personal variables stated in the research questions.

Sample

For this study, regions of the United States, as identified by The American School Board Journal, were utilized (see Table 1). The researcher selected the technique of stratified random sampling because of the wide variance in the number of school board members from region to region. Stratified random sampling is the "process of selecting a sample in such a way that identified subgroups in the population are represented in the sample in the same proportion that they exist in the population."⁸

Stratified random sampling has several advantages over simple random samples.

⁷ Gilbert Sax, Foundations of Educational Research (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979), p. 245.

⁸ L. R. Gay, Educational Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1976), p. 71.

Table 1
Regions of the United States
According to National School Board Association Membership

Northeast Region (Membership: 5,776)		
Connecticut	Massachusetts	Pennsylvania
Delaware	New Hampshire	Rhode Island
District of Columbia	New Jersey	Vermont
Maine	New York	Virgin Islands
Maryland		
Central Region (Membership: 8,582)		
Illinois	Kentucky	Missouri
Indiana	Michigan	Ohio
Iowa	Minnesota	Wisconsin
Southern Region (Membership: 4,124)		
Alabama	Mississippi	Texas
Arkansas	North Carolina	Virginia
Florida	South Carolina	West Virginia
Georgia	Tennessee	
Louisiana		
Western Region (Membership: 3,112)		
Colorado	Nebraska	Oklahoma
Kansas	New Mexico	South Dakota
Montana	North Dakota	Wyoming
Pacific Region (Membership: 3,171)		
Alaska	Hawaii	Oregon
Arizona	Idaho	Utah
California	Nevada	Washington

In the first place, stratification takes advantage of whatever information is known concerning the characteristics of the population.

. . . Second, it can be demonstrated that sample errors arise only within strata, not between strata.

. . . Third, stratified sampling allows selection of cases within each stratum in different ways and in different proportions.⁹

The stratified random sample (see Table 2) was prepared from the list of subscribers of The American School Board Journal. Superintendents, professors of education, librarians, etc., were deleted from the list of subscribers so that only local school board members would be surveyed.

The researcher chose a 17 percent random sample of the population, the same random sample size as that chosen by Dodge in his 1981 study.¹⁰

Instrumentation

The survey form in this study was designed to accomplish two purposes (see Appendix A). One purpose was to collect selected attitudinal,

⁹Sax, p. 186.

¹⁰Harold W. Dodge, "A National Study of the Attitudes of School Board Members Toward the Reduction of Programs and Services," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981), p. 28.

Table 2
Population and Sample by Region

Region	School Board Member Subscribers	17% Sample
Northeast	5,776	982
Central	8,582	1,459
Southern	4,124	701
Western	3,112	529
Pacific	<u>3,171</u>	<u>539</u>
Total	24,765	4,210

personal, and demographic information about school board members surveyed in this study. The survey form also collected data which was requested by The American School Board Journal but was not utilized in this study.

The survey instrument was divided into three parts. Part I (Questions 1-6) gathered demographic information about the school board member's school district and the pressing management concerns of the same districts. Part II (Questions 7-14) provided personal information about school board member subscribers to The American School Board Journal. Part III sought information about school/community cooperation through a variety of questions. Question 15 in this study measured the extent of community groups' involvement in educational issues in response to research question 1.

Question 16 of the survey measured the attitude of local school board members toward community advisory group involvement in decision-making in the areas of curriculum, finance, personnel, and student affairs.

Question 17 of the survey was designed to validate the coherence of responses between the respondents' attitude to involvement and the current status of community participation.

Question 18 of the survey measured the attitudes of local school board members toward delegation of decisionmaking in the areas of curriculum, finance, personnel, and student affairs.

Question 19 of the survey form measured the attitude of local school board members toward Superintendent and Board relationship of responsibility. This information was collected for the benefit of The American School Board Journal.

Question 20 of the survey form sought information of congruency between respondents' opinions and the opinions of other school board members of their district.

Research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 were analyzed in group frequency distribution. Research questions 5-10 were analyzed using crosstabulation procedure to verify significance between variables.

In order to validate the questionnaire, eight school board members not included in the study sample were asked to review the questionnaire for the following:

1. Were the directions to the questionnaire stated and explained clearly?
2. Were the questions of sufficient interest and appeal to insure the respondent would be inclined to respond and complete it?
3. Were the questions relevant to current problems so as to elicit an accurate and realistic response?
4. Were the questions asked in a way that would not be embarrassing to the individual?

5. Were the questions too restrictive, limited or narrow in scope?

6. Were the questions designed in a manner which would, when taken as a whole, answer the basic philosophy of the study?

Responses from these board members were gathered and analyzed for possible misinterpretation of any items. The questionnaire was also extensively reviewed by the researcher with editors from The American School Board Journal for clarification of questions and item analysis.

Collection of Data

A total of 4,210 local school board members within the United States were identified and requested to participate in this study. Questionnaires were accompanied by a cover letter and self-addressed, postage paid return envelopes were mailed to each school board member selected for the sample. The researcher received the first set of returns on April 12, 1982, and the final set on May 10.

No attempt was made to perform a follow-up to respondents who did not participate. The American School Board Journal required anonymity in studies involving its subscribers and anonymity was maintained.

"Responses to mail questionnaires are generally poor. Returns of less than 40 or 50 percent are common."¹¹ Previous national studies of school board members reported returns of less than 33 percent.¹² Sax affirmed that the return of questionnaires depends upon its length,

¹¹Kerlinger, p. 414.

¹²Pace, doctoral dissertation, p. 39.

the reputation of the endorsing agency and the relative importance of the survey to the respondent.¹³ For these reasons, this researcher chose a topic of relevance today, and used a cover letter from the editors of The American School Board Journal. In this study a return rate of 27.0 percent was achieved.

Method of Analysis

The returned questionnaires were examined for correctness and completeness. Any questionnaires with one or more parts incomplete were discarded.

All data was coded and placed on computer terminal by the researcher. The data was analyzed through use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) packaged computer routines. Questions 1-5, 7-15, and 20 were analyzed according to frequency distributions and questions 16, 17 and 18 were analyzed according to cross-tabulation procedures. Only question 6 on the questionnaire was analyzed according to multi-response techniques. The computer facility at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University was utilized to process the data.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methodology of this study, the development of the instrument, the data collection procedures, the research questions, and the statistical methods of analysis of data.

¹³Sax, p. 245.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this chapter is to present a description of the response data and the applied statistical techniques. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the demographic and personal variables of the respondents involved in the survey. The second section presents the findings with respect to each research question; and the third section presents the conclusions for each research question and a summary of the chapter.

Description of the Population and Sample

The total population of school board member subscribers to The American School Board Journal was 24,765. From this population, a stratified random sample of 17% (4,210) was chosen from five regions of the United States as specified by the Journal. After eight weeks, 1,138 or 27% of the survey forms were returned. The distribution of returned surveys by region is reported in Table 3, with a range of 21.7% from the Southern Region to 28.7% from the Western Region. From this table it is apparent that the percentage of returns from each region was very similar, except for the Southern Region.

Table 3
Distribution of Returned Surveys by Regions

Region	Population	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent Returned	Percent of Total
Central	8,582	1,459	411	28.2	36.1
Northeast	5,776	982	276	28.1	24.2
Pacific	3,171	539	139	25.8	12.2
Southern	4,124	701	152	21.7	13.4
Western	3,112	529	152	28.7	13.4
No Response	---	---	8	---	0.7
Totals	24,765	4,210	1,138	27.0	100.0

Demographic and Personal Data Relative to Respondents

Classification

According to the 1,138 local school board member respondents, 28.2% reported that their school district was suburban; 27.9% reported theirs as small town; and 27.8% classified their district as rural. As shown in Table 4, respondents from suburban, rural and small town classifications were nearly equal, whereas urban districts returns came from only 122 or 10.7% of the respondents.

Enrollment

Most of the respondents (552, or 48.5%) reported a student enrollment of 1,000 to 4,999 students, and 213, or 18.7% reported a student enrollment of less than 1,000 students. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics show that nationally there are 8,379 school districts or 52.4% with enrollment less than 1,000 pupils (see Table 5). When comparing percentage of all returns with percentage of all systems, all categories are well represented except that of less than 1,000 pupils, however, this representation is not proportional. Therefore there may be a proportional bias when comparing districts with a student enrollment of less than 1,000 because respondents are heavily loaded to larger schools than the National Profile. As stated by Dodge, "The reason for this bias may be that larger systems may devote more financial resources toward membership in national organizations and journals from which this sample was drawn."¹

¹Harold W. Dodge, "A National Study of the Attitude of School Board Members Toward the Reduction of Programs and Services," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981), p. 39.

Table 4
Classification of School Districts by Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Urban	122	10.7
Suburban	322	28.2
Rural	316	27.8
Small Town	317	27.9
Other	49	4.3
No Response	12	1.1
Total	1,138	100.0

Table 5
Distribution of Returned Surveys by
Enrollment with National Indicators*

Enrollment	Surveys Returned	Percent of all Returns	School Systems National	Percent of all Systems
Less than 1,000	213	18.7	8,379	52.4
1,000 to 4,999	552	48.5	5,528	34.5
5,000 to 5,999	192	16.9	1,105	6.9
10,000 to 24,999	132	11.6	511	3.2
Greater than 25,000	47	4.1	184	1.2
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>0.2</u>	other <u>287</u>	<u>1.8</u>
Total	1,138	100.0	15,994	100.0

*National School Systems data/figures were obtained from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, Education Directory, Public School Systems, 1979-80.

Sex of Respondents

Males comprised 776, or 68.2% of the total local school board member respondents, whereas females comprised 361, or 31.7% (see Table 6). These figures are slightly different than those reported by Dodge of 66.1% males and 33.6% females.²

Method of Selection

Of the total number of respondents, 1,074, or 94.4% reported that they were elected to serve on local school boards while 59, or 5.2% were appointed to their positions (see Table 7). These results are also very similar to those reported by Dodge, 94.2% and 4.6% respectively.³

Age of School Board Member

According to respondents, 440, or 38.7% of school board members were in the 41-50 years of age range. Respondents in the age range of 36-60 comprised 79.4% of the total. Only 0.6% reported being in the category "under 25" and 10.7% reported being in the category "over 60" (see Table 8). These results are very similar to those reported by Dodge in his 1981 study.⁴

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Dodge, p. 44

Table 6
Sex of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Male	776	68.2
Female	361	31.7
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>0.1</u>
Total	1,138	100.0

Table 7
Method of Selection of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Elected	1,074	94.4
Appointed	59	5.2
No Response	<u>5</u>	<u>0.4</u>
Total	1,138	100.0

Table 8
Age of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Under 25	7	0.6
26-35	105	9.2
36-40	201	17.7
41-50	440	38.7
51-60	262	23.0
Over 60	122	10.7
No Response	1	0.1
Total	1,138	100.0

Educational Attainment of Respondents

Of the total respondents, 709, or 62.3% reported having at least a four-year college education. Only 1.2% reported having less than a high school diploma (see Table 9). Dodge reported similar results in his 1981 study with 65.9% having completed at least a four-year college education and 1.6% with less than a high school diploma.⁵

Family Income of Respondents

Most respondents, 271, or 23.8% reported having an income range of \$30,000-\$39,000. Of the total respondents, 544, or 47.8% reported having an income over \$40,000, which represents a 5.2% increase over the same combined income categories cited by Dodge in his 1981 study.⁶ Also the combined income categories of \$50,000-\$59,999 and over \$60,000 comprised 28.4% of the respondents (see Table 10). Dodge in his 1981 study stated that 24.6% of the respondents reported having an income over \$50,000.⁷ It is very probable that this increase in income categories "over \$40,000" is due to inflation.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Dodge, p. 44.

⁷Ibid.

Table 9
Educational Level of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Less than High School	14	1.2
High School Graduates	156	13.7
Post High School	255	22.4
Four-Year College	342	30.1
Advanced College Degree	367	32.2
No Response	4	0.4
Total	1,138	100.0

Table 10
Family Income of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Less than \$20,000	79	6.9
\$20,000 to \$29,999	216	19.0
\$30,000 to \$39,999	271	23.8
\$40,000 to \$49,999	221	19.4
\$50,000 to \$59,999	119	10.5
More than \$60,000	204	17.9
No Response	28	2.5
Total	1,138	100.0

Occupation Category of Respondents

Most respondents reported belonging to the managerial category (37.7%). The professional category comprised 28.9% of the total responses. The combined managerial and professional categories comprised 66.6% of the responses (see Table 11), which is an increase over the 61.1% reported by Dodge in his 1981 study.⁸

Years Served by Respondents

Most of the respondents, 383, or 33.7%, reported having served as board members from 4 to 7 years. The category of 2 to 3 years comprised 28.0%; and the category of over 7 years comprised 23.1% of the respondents. According to respondents, 14.6% served for less than or equal to 1 year (see Table 12). The respondents' average length of service was 5.5 years, which represented a decrease from the 6.1 years reported by Underwood, et al., in their 1981 study.⁹

Race of Respondents

Most of the respondents, 1,022, or 89.8%, reported belonging to the Anglo-American category. The other racial categories, including Afro-American, Hispanic and Indian comprised 4.9 percent (see Table 13). These figures show a slight decrease based on the 1981 study by Underwood, et al., which reported 91.5%, and 6.4%, respectively.¹⁰

⁸Dodge, p. 44.

⁹Kenneth E. Underwood, James C. Fortune, and Harold W. Dodge, "Your Portrait: School Boards have a Brand-New Look," The American School Board Journal 169:20, January, 1982.

¹⁰Underwood, Fortune & Dodge, p. 18.

Table 11
Occupation Categories of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Professional	329	28.9
Managerial	430	37.7
Clerk-Sales	70	6.2
Skilled	49	4.3
Semi-Skilled	2	0.2
Unskilled	0	0.0
Housewife	172	15.1
Retired	66	5.8
No Response	20	1.8
Total	1,138	100.0

Table 12
Years Served by Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Less than or equal to 1 year	166	14.6
2 to 3 years	319	28.0
4 to 7 years	383	33.7
over 7 years	263	23.1
No response	7	0.6
Total	1,138	100.0

Table 13
Race of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Afro-American	25	2.2
Anglo-American	1,022	89.8
Hispanic	22	1.9
American Indian	9	0.8
Oriental	3	0.3
Other	40	3.5
No Response	17	1.5
Total	1,138	100.0

Research Question 1

For each community group involved in educational issues, what percentage of school board members responded that the degree of involvement was heavy, moderate, none?

Parent Groups

Most of the respondents, 768, or 67.4%, reported that parent groups were moderately involved in educational issues, and 255, or 22.4% of the respondents believe parent groups in their district were heavily involved in educational issues (see Table 14).

Business Leaders

Of the school board member respondents, 610, or 53.5% reported that business leaders were moderately involved in educational issues; 488, or 42.9% of the respondents reported no involvement; and only 36, or 3.2% of the respondents reported heavy involvement of business leaders (see Table 14).

Community Leaders

Of the respondents, 664, or 58.3%, reported moderate involvement of community leaders and 430, or 37.8% of the respondents reported no involvement of community leaders (see Table 14).

Summary Table 14

Percentage of Respondent's Reporting
Degree of Community Group Involvement
in Educational Issues

Category/ Response	Heavy Frequency/Percent	Moderate Frequency/Percent	None Frequency/Percent	No Response Frequency/Percent
Parent Groups	255/22.4	768/67.4	111/ 9.8	4/ 0.4
Business Leaders	36/ 3.2	610/53.5	488/42.9	4/ 0.4
Community Leaders	40/ 3.5	664/58.3	430/37.8	4/ 0.4
Civic Groups	31/ 2.7	588/51.6	515/45.3	4/ 0.4
Labor Groups	49/ 4.3	187/16.4	892/78.4	10/ 0.9
Church Groups	17/ 1.5	416/36.6	698/61.3	7/ 0.6
Advocacy Groups	51/ 4.5	359/31.5	712/62.6	16/ 1.4
Mandated Groups	299/26.3	649/57.0	177/15.6	13/ 1.1

n = 1,138

Civic Groups

Similarly, most of the respondents, 588, or 51.6% reported moderate involvement of civic groups and 515, or 43.3% of the respondents reported no involvement of civic groups (see Table 14).

Labor Groups

Most of the respondents, 892, or 78.4%, reported no involvement of labor groups. Only 236, or 20.7% of the respondents reported moderate to heavy involvement of labor groups (see Table 14).

Church Groups

Most respondents, 698, or 61.3%, reported no involvement of church groups and 433 or 38.1% of the respondents reported moderate to heavy involvement of church groups (see Table 14).

Advocacy Groups

Similarly, most respondents, 712, or 62.6%, reported no involvement of advocacy groups, and 410, or 36% of the respondents reported moderate to heavy involvement of advocacy groups (see Table 14).

Mandated Groups

Of the respondents, 948, or 83.3%, reported moderate to heavy involvement of mandated groups and 177, or 15.6% of the respondents reported no involvement of mandated groups (see Table 14). More explicit tabular information is reported in Appendix B.

Research Question 2

For each area what percentage of school board members believed that representatives of one or more community advisory groups should be involved in decision-making?

Over 50% of the respondents believed that community advisory groups should be involved in decision-making in the following areas: Education Objectives - 900, or 79.1%; Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools - 886, or 77.8%; Curriculum Evaluation - 758, or 66.6%; Determination of Local Tax Rates - 653, or 57.4%; Student Discipline - 639, or 56.2%; and Expenditures for School Operation - 619, or 54.4% (see Table 15). Respondents reported that there should be no involvement by Community Advisory Groups in the following areas: Hiring of Teachers - 1,073, or 94.3%; Tenure and Promotion of School Personnel - 1,026, or 90.2%; Negotiation and Collective Bargaining - 1,023, or 89.9%; Student and School Personnel Disputes - 1,003, or 88.1%; Evaluation of Teachers - 955, or 83.9%; Ability Grouping - 942, or 82.8%; Evaluation of Administrators - 910, or 79.9%; Hiring of Administrators - 909, or 79.9%; Testing Programs - 851, or 74.8%; Student Progress - 841, or 73.9%; State and Federal Grant Proposals - 778, or 68.4%; Selection of Textbooks - 698, or 61.3%; Organization of Instructional Programs - 677, or 59.4%; and Initiation and Approval of New Courses - 608, or 53.4% (see Table 15).

Research Question 3

What were the actual areas of involvement by community advisory groups?

Most of the respondents ranging from 584, or 51.3% to 1,107, or 97.2% reported that there was no involvement by community advisory

Table 15

Percentage of Respondent's Belief in
Involvement of Community Advisory Groups

Areas	Yes Frequency/Percent	No Frequency/Percent	No Response Frequency/Percent
Curriculum Evaluation	758/66.6	371/32.6	9/ 0.8
Student Dis- cipline	639/56.2	492/43.2	7/ 0.6
Expenditures	619/54.4	511/44.9	8/ 0.7
Ability Grouping	190/16.7	942/82.8	6/ 0.5
Grant Proposals	344/30.2	778/68.4	16/ 1.4
Hiring of Teachers	54/ 4.7	1,073/94.3	11/ 1.0
Education Ob- jectives	900/79.1	225/19.8	13/ 1.1
Student-School Personnel Dis- putes	125/11.0	1,003/88.1	10/ 0.9
Local Tax Rates	653/57.4	459/40.3	26/2.3
Courses	515/45.3	608/53.4	15/ 1.3
Testing Program	275/24.2	851/74.7	12/ 1.1
Evaluation of Administrators	218/19.2	910/79.9	10/ 0.9
Student Progress	281/24.7	841/73.9	16/ 1.4
Selection of Textbooks	430/37.8	698/61.3	10/ 0.9
Hiring of Administrators	221/19.4	909/79.9	8/ 0.7
Organization of Instructional Programs	441/38.8	677/59.4	20/ 1.8
Evaluation of Teachers	168/14.8	955/83.9	15/ 1.3
Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools	886/77.8	240/21.1	12/ 1.1
Tenure/Promotion of Personnel	98/ 8.6	1,026/90.2	14/ 1.2
Negotiation and Collective Bargaining Process	100/ 8.8	1,023/89.9	15/ 1.3

groups in the selected areas. Over 20% of the respondents reported that the following areas presently have community advisory group involvement: Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools - 537, or 47.2%; Education Objectives - 516, or 45.3%; Curriculum Evaluation - 443, or 38.9%; Determination of Local Tax Rates - 332, or 29.2%; Expenditures for School Operation - 310, or 27.2%; Initiation and Approval of New Courses - 267, or 23.5%; Selection of Textbooks - 251, or 22.1%; and Student Discipline - 225, or 19.8% (see Table 16).

Research Question 4

For each area what percentage of school board members were willing to delegate the primary responsibility for decision-making to each of the following groups: Community at large, Community advisory group, teachers, no one?

Curriculum Evaluation

Within the areas of curriculum evaluation, 404, or 35.5% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups; 332, or 29.2% to Teachers; and 344, or 30.3% to no one (see Table 17).

Student Discipline

Within the area of student discipline, 434, or 38.1% of the respondents wished to retain decision-making. However, 408, or 35.9% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers and 211, or 18.5% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups (see Table 17).

Table 16

Percentage of Respondent's Belief in Status
of Involvement by Community Advisory Groups

Areas	Yes Frequency/Percent	No Frequency/Percent	No Response Frequency/Percent
Curriculum Evaluation	443/38.9	681/59.9	14/ 1.2
Student Dis- cipline	225/19.8	900/79.1	13/ 1.1
Expenditures	310/27.2	817/71.8	11/ 1.0
Ability Grouping	70/ 6.2	1,056/92.7	12/ 1.1
Grant Proposals	135/11.9	994/87.3	9/ 0.8
Hiring of Teachers	22/ 1.9	1,104/97.0	12/ 1.1
Education Ob- jectives	516/45.3	609/53.6	13/ 1.1
Student and School Personnel Dis- putes	58/ 5.1	1,068/93.8	12/ 1.1
Local Tax Rates	332/29.2	787/69.1	19/ 1.7
Courses	267/23.5	854/75.0	17/ 1.5
Testing Program	108/ 9.5	1,017/89.4	13/ 1.1
Evaluation of Administration	40/ 3.5	1,087/95.5	11/ 1.0
Student Progress	112/ 9.8	1,011/88.9	15/ 1.3
Selection of Textbooks	251/22.1	876/76.9	11/ 1.0
Hiring of Administrators	114/10.0	1,014/89.1	10/ 0.9
Organization of Instructional Programs	186/16.3	938/82.5	14/ 1.2
Evaluation of Teachers	29/ 2.5	1,095/96.3	14/ 1.2
Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools	537/47.2	584/51.3	17/ 1.5
Tenure/Promotion of Personnel	20/ 1.8	1,107/97.2	11/ 1.0
Negotiation and Collective Bargaining	19/ 1.7	1,102/96.8	17/ 1.5

Expenditures for School Operation

Of the respondents, 733, or 64.3% indicated they wanted to retain decision-making for themselves to determine expenditures for school operation. However, of the respondents, 216, or 19.0% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups; and 136, or 12.0% to the community at large (see Table 17).

Ability Grouping

Within the area of ability grouping, 726, or 63.7% were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers, whereas 305, or 26.8% wished to retain decision-making (see Table 17).

State and Federal Grant Proposals

Of the respondents, 600, or 52.8% desired to retain decision-making on State and Federal Grant Proposals; however, 262, or 23.0% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups and 208, or 18.3% to teachers (see Table 17).

Hiring of Teachers

Of the local school board member respondents, 994, or 87.3% indicated they wanted to retain decision-making in the area of hiring teachers (see Table 17).

Education Objectives

Within the area of determination of education objectives, 496, or 43.7% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups. In this same area, 367, or 32.2% wished to retain decision-making and 147, or 12.9% were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers (see Table 17).

Student and Student Personnel Disputes

A majority of the respondents, 829, or 72.9% wished to retain decision-making in the area of student and school personnel disputes. However, 138, or 12.2% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups and 115, or 10.1% were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers (see Table 17).

Local Tax Rates

Of the respondents, 570, or 50.1% wished to retain decision-making for determining local tax rates, whereas 307, or 27.0% were willing to delegate decision-making to the community at large and 213, or 18.7% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups (see Table 17).

Initiation and Approval of New Courses

More than a third of the respondents, 422, or 37.0% desired to retain decision-making for initiation and approval of new courses, but 373, or 32.8% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups and 272, or 23.9% were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers (see Table 17).

Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program

Of the respondents, a majority, 469, or 41.2% wished to retain decision-making in this area, however, 424, or 37.3% were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers and 179, or 15.7% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups (see Table 17).

Evaluation of Administrators

A majority of respondents, 892, or 78.4%, desired to retain decision-making in this area, however, 110, or 9.7% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups (see Table 17).

Reporting on Student Progress

A majority of the respondents, 712, or 62.6%, were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers; whereas 295, or 25.9% wished to retain decision-making for themselves (see Table 17).

Selection of Textbooks

Of the respondents, 485, or 42.6%, were willing to delegate decision-making in this area to teachers; 260, or 22.8% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups, and 324 or 28.5% desired to retain decision-making with school board members (see Table 17).

Hiring of Administrators

A majority of the respondents, 951, or 83.7%, desired to retain decision-making in this area for school board members; however, 112, or 9.8% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups (see Table 17).

Organization of Instructional Program

Of the respondents, 550, or 48.3% wished to retain decision-making in this area for school board members; however, 280 or 24.6% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups and 222, or 19.5% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to teachers (see Table 17).

Evaluation of Teachers

A majority of the respondents, 920, or 80.8% wished to retain decision-making for school board members; however, 103, or 9.1% were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups (see Table 17).

Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools

Of the respondents, 435, or 38.2% desired to retain decision-making in this area for school board members; however, 417, or 36.6% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to community advisory groups and 246, or 21.6% were willing to delegate decision-making to the community at large (see Table 17).

Tenure and Promotion of Personnel

Most of the respondents, 997, or 87.5% wished to retain decision-making in this area with school board members (see Table 17).

Negotiation and Collective Bargaining

Most of the respondents, 973, or 85.5% desired to retain decision-making in this area with school board members (see Table 17).

Since the respondents furnished the information that the administration should be included as a category for delegation of decision-making, the write-in 'administration' category has been included in Table 17.

Research Question 5

In what areas did school board members want community involvement but express unwillingness to assign responsibility for decision-making?

The researcher analyzed this research question through the use of frequency distribution and crosstabulation procedures. The respondent's attitude toward community involvement (Question 16, Table 15) was crossed against respondent's willingness to delegate decision-making (Question 18, Table 17) in all twenty areas. Only statistically significant relationships (.01) were reported in Table 18. This summary table presents responses in four ways: should be involved and delegated responsibility; should be involved but no responsibility delegated; should not be involved but delegated responsibility; and should not be involved, no responsibility delegated. Percentages reported in Table 18 are slightly different than those in Tables 15 and 17 because missing values have not been included in the calculations. More specific information as it relates to research question 5 may be found in Appendix C.

Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools

Most of the respondents, 605, or 54.9% reported that the community should be involved and delegated responsibility for decision-making in construction, renovation, or closing of schools. Another 258, or 23.5% reported that the community should be involved, however the respondents were not willing to delegate responsibility (see Table 18).

Education Objectives

Of the respondents, 541, or 48.9% reported that the community should be involved and delegated responsibility for decision-making

Table 17
Percentage of Respondents Willing to Delegate Decision-Making

Areas	Community at Large Frequency/Percentage	Community Advisory Group Frequency/Percentage	Teachers Frequency/Percentage	Administration* Frequency/Percentage	No One Frequency/Percentage	No Response Frequency/Percentage
Curriculum Evaluation	22/ 1.9	404/35.5	332/29.2	15/ 1.3	344/30.3	21/ 1.8
Student Discipline	39/ 3.4	211/18.5	400/35.9	20/ 1.8	434/38.1	26/2.3
Expenditures	136/12.0	216/19.0	19/ 1.7	9/ 0.8	733/64.3	25/ 2.2
Ability Grouping	4/ 0.4	75/ 6.6	726/63.7	11/ 1.0	305/26.8	17/ 1.5
Grant Proposals	13/ 1.1	262/23.0	208/18.3	24/ 2.1	600/52.8	31/ 2.7
Hiring of Teachers	4/ 0.4	62/ 5.4	24/ 2.1	26/ 2.3	994/87.3	28/ 2.5
Education Objectives	98/ 8.6	496/43.7	147/12.9	9/ 0.8	367/32.2	21/ 1.8
Student/School Personnel Disputes	5/ 0.4	138/12.2	115/10.1	21/ 1.8	829/72.9	30/ 2.6
Local Tax Rates	307/27.0	217/18.7	5/ 0.4	7/ 0.6	570/50.1	36/ 3.2
Initiation and Approval of New Courses	25/ 2.2	373/32.8	272/23.9	18/ 1.6	422/37.0	28/ 2.5
Initiation and Proposal of Student Testing Program	9/ 0.8	179/15.7	424/37.3	22/ 1.9	469/41.2	35/ 3.1
Evaluation of Administrators	22/ 1.9	110/ 9.7	64/ 5.6	13/ 1.1	892/78.4	37/ 3.3
Reporting on Student Progress	9/ 0.8	77/ 6.8	712/62.6	14/ 1.2	295/25.9	31/ 2.7
Selection of Textbooks	26/ 2.3	260/22.8	485/42.6	12/ 1.1	324/28.5	31/ 2.7
Hiring of Administrators	8/ 0.7	112/ 9.8	13/ 1.1	13/ 1.1	951/83.7	41/ 3.6
Organization of Instructional Program	28/ 2.5	280/24.6	222/19.5	18/ 1.6	550/48.3	40/ 3.5
Evaluation of Teachers	16/ 1.4	103/ 9.1	33/ 2.9	26/ 2.3	920/80.8	40/ 3.5
Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools	246/21.6	417/36.6	4/ 0.4	7/ 0.6	435/38.2	29/ 2.6
Tenure/Promotion of Personnel	8/ 0.7	77/ 6.8	10/ 0.9	9/ 0.8	997/87.5	37/ 3.3
Negotiation and Collective Bargaining	13/ 1.1	70/ 6.2	25/ 2.2	9/ 0.8	973/85.5	48/ 4.2
*A write-in response by respondents						

Summary Table 18

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Involvement and
the Delegation of Responsibility to the Community

Category/Response	Should be Involved and Delegated Responsibility Frequency/Percentage	Should be Involved but no Responsibility Delegated Frequency/Percentage	Should not be Involved but Delegated Responsibility Frequency/Percentage	Should not be Involved/ no Responsibility Delegated Frequency/Percentage
Curriculum Evaluation	364/32.8	380/34.2	61/ 5.5	305/27.5
Student Discipline	219/19.8	404/36.5	30/ 2.7	455/41.0
Expenditures for School Operation	272/24.6	332/30.0	79/ 7.2	424/38.2
Ability Grouping	45/ 4.1	139/12.5	34/ 3.0	899/80.4
Grant Proposals	176/16.1	163/14.8	98/ 9.0	658/60.1
Hiring of Teachers	19/ 1.8	32/ 2.9	46/ 4.2	1,004/91.1
Education Objectives	541/48.9	341/30.9	51/ 4.6	174/15.6
Student and School Personnel Disputes	59/ 5.4	61/ 5.6	84/ 7.7	897/81.3
Local Tax Rates	433/39.8	201/18.6	81/ 7.5	369/34.1
Initiation and Approval of New Courses	270/24.6	233/21.2	126/11.4	468/42.8
Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program	110/10.0	156/14.3	77/ 7.1	751/68.6
Evaluation of Administrators	93/ 8.5	119/10.9	38/ 3.5	844/77.1
Reporting on Student Programs	64/ 5.8	211/19.3	21/ 1.9	798/73.0
Selection of Textbooks	225/20.5	188/17.1	59/ 5.4	627/57.0
Hiring of Administrators	76/ 6.9	135/12.4	43/ 4.0	837/76.7
Organization of Instructional Program	198/18.3	224/20.7	107/ 9.9	554/51.1
Evaluation of Teachers	70/ 6.4	95/ 8.8	49/ 4.5	873/80.3
Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools	605/54.9	258/23.5	53/ 4.8	184/16.8
Tenure/Promotion of Personnel	35/ 3.3	60/ 5.5	48/ 4.4	947/86.8
Negotiation and Collective Bargaining	37/ 3.5	55/ 5.1	45/ 4.1	944/87.3

in education objectives. However, 341, or 30.9% of the respondents reported that the community should be involved, but with no delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

Local Tax Rates

Some of the respondents, 433, or 39.8% reported that they preferred community involvement and delegation of responsibility; however, 201, or 18.6% reported only community involvement with no delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

Curriculum Evaluation

A third of the respondents, 364, or 32.8% reported that they wanted community involvement and delegation of responsibility; however, 380, or 34.2% reported only community involvement with no delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

Expenditures for School Operation

A fourth of the respondents, 272, or 24.6% reported that the community should be involved and delegated responsibility in expenditures for school operation. Other school board member respondents, 332, or 30.0% reported community involvement with no delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

Initiation and Approval of New Courses

Of the respondents, 270, or 24.6% reported that they preferred community involvement and delegation of responsibility; however, other respondents, 233, or 21.2% reported that they preferred only community involvement with no delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

Selection of Textbooks

Only 225, or 20.5% of the respondents reported that the community should be involved and delegated responsibility for the selection of textbooks. Other respondents, 188, or 17.1%, preferred community involvement with no delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

Student Discipline

Only 219, or 19.8% of the respondents preferred community involvement with delegation of responsibility in student discipline. More than one third of the respondents (404, or 36.5%) preferred community involvement without delegation of responsibility (see Table 18).

The respondents reported all other areas of community involvement and delegation of responsibility with frequencies less than 20% (see Table 18).

Research Question 6

In what areas did school board members believe that the community should be involved but were not presently involved?

The researcher analyzed this research question through the use of frequency distribution and crosstabulation procedure. The respondent's attitude toward community advisory group involvement (Question 16, Table 15) was crossed against the status of involvement (Question 17, Table 16) in all twenty areas. Only statistically significant relationships (.01) were reported. A summary table

presents responses in four ways: Is involved and should be; is involved but probably should not be; not involved but probably should be; and not involved and probably should not be (see Summary Table 19). Percentages reported in Table 19 are slightly different than those in Tables 15 and 16 because missing values have not been included in the calculations. More specific information as it relates to research question 6 may be found in Appendix D.

Curriculum Evaluation

Of the total respondents, 750, or 67.1% who reported that community advisory groups should be involved in curriculum evaluation, 345, or 30.9% reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved in curriculum evaluation (see Summary Table 19).

Student Discipline

Of the total respondents, 631, or 56.3% who reported that community advisory groups should be involved in student discipline, 423, or 37.8% reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved in student discipline (see Summary Table 19).

Expenditures for School Operation

Of the total respondents, 614, or 54.8% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in determining expenditures for school operation; however, 342, or 30.5% of those respondents reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved in setting expenditure priorities for school operation (see Summary Table 19).

Summary Table 19
Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement by Status of Involvement

Category/Response	Is Involved and Should Be Frequency/Percentage	Is Involved but Probably Should Not Be Frequency/Percentage	Not Involved but Probably Should Be Frequency/Percentage	Not Involved and Probably Should Not Be Frequency/Percentage
Curriculum Evaluation	405/36.2	38/ 3.4	345/30.9	330/29.5
Student Discipline	208/18.6	17/ 1.5	423/37.8	472/42.1
Expenditures for School Operation	272/24.3	38/ 3.4	342/30.5	469/41.8
Ability Grouping	50/ 4.5	20/ 1.8	137/12.2	9.5/81.5
Grant Proposals	110/ 9.8	25/ 2.2	232/20.8	750/67.2
Hiring of Teachers	16/ 1.4	6/ 0.5	37/ 3.3	1,061/94.8
Education Objectives	493/44.2	22/ 2.0	401/35.9	200/17.9
Student/Personnel Disputes	37/ 3.3	21/ 1.9	85/ 7.6	977/87.2
Local Tax Rates	301/27.3	29/ 2.6	346/31.4	427/38.7
Initiation and Approval of New Courses	208/18.6	57/ 5.1	299/27.0	546/49.3
Initiation and Approval of Testing Program	81/ 7.3	27/ 2.4	190/17.0	818/73.3
Evaluation of Administrators	31/ 2.8	9/ 0.8	186/16.6	894/79.8
Student Progress	90/ 8.1	22/ 2.0	187/16.8	814/73.1
Selection of Textbooks	230/20.5	20/ 1.8	197/17.6	673/60.1
Hiring Administrators	94/ 8.4	19/ 1.7	125/11.1	885/78.8
Organization of Instruction	151/13.6	35/ 3.2	284/25.6	639/57.6
Evaluation of Teachers	21/ 1.9	7/ 0.6	143/12.9	941/84.6
Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools	509/45.8	26/ 2.3	365/32.8	212/19.1
Tenure and Promotion	14/ 1.3	5/ 0.4	82/ 7.3	1,017/91.0
Negotiation and Collective Bargaining	12/ 1.1	7/ 0.6	84/ 7.6	1,009/90.7
n = 1,138				

Education Objectives

Most of the respondents, 894, or 80.1%, reported that community advisory groups should be involved in education objectives; however, 401, or 35.9% of the respondents reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved in education objectives (see Summary Table 19).

Local Tax Rates

Of the respondents, 647, or 58.7% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in local tax rates; however, of this group, 346, or 31.4% of the respondents reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved in local tax rates (see Summary Table 19).

Initiation and Approval of New Courses

Less than half of the respondents, 507, or 45.6% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in the initiation and approval of new courses. Of this group, 299, or 27.0% reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved in the initiation and approval of new courses (see Summary Table 19).

Selection of Textbooks

More than one third of the respondents, 427, or 38.1%, reported that community advisory groups should be involved in the selection of textbooks. Of this group, 197, or 17.6% reported that community advisory groups are presently involved. (see Summary Table 19).

Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools

Most of the respondents, 874, or 78.6%, reported that community advisory groups should be involved in the construction, renovation, or closing of schools. However, of this group, 365, or 32.8%, reported that community advisory groups are not presently involved (see Summary Table 19).

Research Question 7

Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected demographic characteristics?

The research question was analyzed through the use of group frequency distribution with independent school district variables. The variables utilized with region, enrollment, and classification of school districts. Only statistically significant relationships (.02) were reported (see Summary Table 20).

Curriculum Evaluation

Of the total respondents, 67.1%, reported that community advisory groups should be involved in curriculum evaluation. In each region a sizeable majority of the respondents concurred with this opinion. The highest percentage of these respondents (76.3%) came from the Pacific Region (see Appendix Table R7-1).

Student Discipline

Of the total respondents, 56.4% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in student discipline in five regions. However, within the Central Region, more respondents, 51.7%, reported that there should be no involvement, compared to 48.3% who reported that there should be involvement. More respondents from the Pacific

Summary Table 20
 Analysis of Community Advisory Group Involvement
 Dependent by Demographic Variables

Dependent Variables	Region (χ^2) Significance	Enrollment (χ^2) Significance	Classification of School District
1. Curriculum Evaluation	(17.88) 0.0013	ns	ns
2. Student Discipline	(26.92) 0.0000	(37.12) 0.0000	(21.45) 0.0003
3. Expenditures	(26.40) 0.0000	(14.35) 0.0063	ns
4. Ability Grouping	(12.09) 0.0167	ns	ns
5. Grant Proposals	(13.94) 0.0007	ns	ns
6. Hiring of Teachers	(38.19) 0.0000	ns	ns
7. Education Objectives	ns	(11.33) 0.0231	ns
8. Local Tax Rates	(12.89) 0.0118	ns	ns
9. New Courses	(16.41) 0.0025	ns	ns
10. Selection of Textbooks	(60.34) 0.0000	(24.38) 0.0001	ns
11. Hiring of Administrators	(28.15) 0.0000	ns	ns
12. Organization of Instruction	ns	(12.46) 0.0142	(16.15) 0.0028
13. Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools	(14.95) 0.0048	ns	ns
14. Tenure and Promotion	(11.91) 0.0180	ns	ns
(χ^2) significance			
ns = not significant			

Region, 71.2%, reported that there should be involvement than respondents from any other region (see Appendix Table R7-2).

The researcher analyzed the respondent's attitude toward community involvement in student discipline according to student enrollment. Of the total respondents, 56.4% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in student discipline within the category of 'more than 25,000,' 83.0% of the respondents reported in favor of community involvement, whereas 17.0% of the respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved. However, within the category of less than 1,000 student enrollment, only 42.7% of the respondents reported favorably whereas 56.3% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in student discipline (see Appendix Table R7-3).

The researcher analyzed community involvement in student discipline according to the classification of school districts: Urban, Suburban, Rural, Small Town, and Other. Of the total respondents, 56.6% favored community group involvement and 43.4% reported negatively. More respondents, 53.7%, from the rural category reported against community group involvement than the 46.3% from the same category who reported in favor of community involvement in student discipline (see Appendix Table, R7-4).

Expenditures for School Operation

Of the total respondents, 54.9% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in expenditures for school operation. However, 45.1% of the total respondents reported negatively. Analyzing the five

different regions, 63.1% of the respondents from the Northeast Region favored community involvement and 36.9% reported negatively. Moreover, 60.5% of the respondents from the Western Region reported negatively, whereas 39.5% of the respondents from the same region favored community advisory group involvement in expenditures for school operation (see Appendix, Table R7-5).

Analyzing community group involvement in expenditures for school operation by student enrollment, 54.7% of the total respondents favored community advisory group involvement and 45.3% reported negatively. Within the category of less than 1,000 student enrollment, 54.0% reported negatively and 46.0% reported favorably. Also, more respondents, 66.4%, from the enrollment category of 10,000 to 24,000 pupils reported favorably toward community advisory group involvement than respondents from any other enrollment categories (see Appendix Table R7-6).

Ability Grouping

Of the total respondents, 83.2% reported across all five regions that community advisory groups should not be involved in ability grouping. The greatest percentage of these respondents, 87.5%, were from the Central Region. In each region the majority of the respondents concurred with this opinion (see Appendix Table R7-7).

Grant Proposals

Of the total respondents, 69.2% reported from all five regions that community advisory groups should not be involved in State and Federal Grant Proposals. The greatest percentage of these respondents,

75.7%, were from the Central Region. In each region the majority concurred with this opinion (see Appendix Table R7-8).

Hiring of Teachers

Of the total respondents, 95.3% reported from all five regions that community advisory groups should not be involved in the hiring of teachers. The greatest percentage of these respondents, 98.0%, were from the Western Region. In each region the majority of the respondents concurred with this opinion (see Appendix Table R7-9).

Education Objectives

Of the total respondents across all levels of student enrollment, 80% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in establishing education objectives. The highest percentage of these respondents, 93.6%, represented districts with a student enrollment of more than 25,000 pupils (see Appendix Table R7-10).

Local Tax Rates

Of the total respondents, 58.7% from all five regions reported that community advisory groups should be involved in determining local tax rates and 41.3% from all five regions reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in establishing local tax rates. Of the respondents from the Pacific Region, 69.6% were favorable to involvement and 30.4% were unfavorable to community advisory group involvement in determining local tax rates (see Appendix Table R7-11).

New Courses

Of the total respondents, 54.1% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in initiation and approval of new courses;

whereas 45.9% reported in favor of community involvement. According to the responses, there were differences between the five regions. Respondents from the Northeast (58.1%) and Central (58.7%) Regions reported negatively. However, only a slight majority (50.7%) of the respondents from the Southern Region reported favorably and a slight majority (50.7%) of the respondents from the Western Region reported negatively. From the Pacific Region, more respondents (58.7%) reported in favor of community involvement than the 41.3% of the respondents who reported negatively. In summary, only the Southern and Pacific Regions reported favorably to community advisory group involvement (see Appendix, Table R7-12).

Selection of Textbooks

Of the total respondents, 61.8% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the selection of textbooks. Moreover, 75.9% of the respondents from the Northeast Region supported this opinion as well as a majority of the respondents from the Central, Southern, and Western Regions. However, 59.7% of the respondents from the Pacific Region favored community advisory involvement compared to the 40.3% of the respondents who reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R7-13).

Of the total respondents, 62.0% from districts with a student enrollment of less than 10,000 pupils reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the selection of textbooks. However, a majority of the respondents from school systems with student enrollment greater than 10,000 pupils were slightly more favorable to community advisory group involvement (see Appendix, Table R7-14).

Hiring of Administrators

Of the total respondents, 80.5% from all five regions reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the hiring of administrators. Of these respondents, the highest percentage, 89.3%, were from the Southern Region (see Appendix, Table R7-15).

Organization of Instruction

Based on the student enrollment of their respective districts, 60.7% of the total respondents from districts with enrollment of less than 25,000 pupils reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the organization of instruction. Most of these respondents, 66.5%, came from districts with a pupil enrollment of less than 1,000 students. However, 53.2% of the respondents from districts with more than 25,000 pupils favored community advisory groups, even though 46.8% of the respondents from the same category disfavored community advisory groups (see Appendix, Table R7-16).

Across all classifications of school districts, 60.6% of the total respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the organization of instruction, whereas 39.4% reported favorably to community involvement. The highest percentage of the respondents (66.3%) came from the small town school district as being unfavorable to community advisory group involvement in the organization of instruction (see Appendix, Table R7-17).

Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools

Of the total respondents, 78.8% from all five regions reported that community advisory groups should be involved in the construction, renovation or closing of schools. The highest percentage of these respondents, 84.1%, were from the Pacific Region, and a majority of the respondents from the other regions concurred in their opinion (see Appendix, Table R7-18).

Tenure and Promotion

Of the total respondents, 91.3% from all five regions reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in tenure and promotion of school personnel. The highest percentage of these respondents, 96.6%, were from the Southern Region, and a majority of the respondents from the other regions concurred in their opinion (see Appendix, Table R7-19).

Research Question 8

Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected personal characteristics?

This research question was analyzed through the use of group frequency distribution with the following independent school district variables: education, years served, sex, race, age, occupation, and status. Only statistically significant relationships (.02) were reported. Summary Table 21 provides a listing of dependent variables and the respective independent variables.

Summary Table 21
Analysis of Community Advisory Group Involvement
Dependent by Personal Variables

Dependent Variable	Personal Independent Variables							
	Education (x ²) S	Years Served (x ²) S	Sex (x ²) S	Race (x ²) S	Age (x ²) S	Occupation (x ²) S	Status (x ²) S	
1. Curriculum Evaluation	(11.70) 0.0198	(10.07) 0.0180	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	
2. Student Discipline	(22.99) 0.0001	(22.92) 0.0000	(9.36) 0.0022	(14.56) 0.0124	ns	(15.28) 0.0182	ns	
3. Expenditures	(15.24) 0.0042	ns	ns	ns	ns	(18.98) 0.0042	ns	
4. Ability Grouping	ns	(10.27) 0.0164	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	
5. Grant Proposals	(16.23) 0.0027	(25.61) 0.0000	ns	(18.42) 0.0025	ns	ns	ns	
6. Hiring Teachers	ns	(13.27) 0.0041	ns	(22.43) 0.0004	(26.68) 0.0001	ns	ns	
7. Education Objectives	(16.14) 0.0028	ns	(5.55) 0.0229	ns	ns	ns	ns	
8. Student/Personnel Disputes	ns	(9.79) 0.0204	ns	(15.29) 0.0092	ns	ns	ns	
9. New Courses	(13.59) 0.0087	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	(6.45) 0.0111	
10. Student Testing Program	ns	(16.55) 0.0009	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	
11. Evaluation of Administrators	ns	(9.05) 0.0286	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	
12. Selection of Textbooks	ns	(10.73) 0.0133	ns	ns	ns	ns	(7.46) 0.0095	
13. Hiring of Administrators	(14.38) 0.0062	ns	(18.04) 0.0000	ns	ns	(18.52) 0.0051	ns	
14. Organization of Instruction	(18.25) 0.0001	(12.23) 0.0066	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	
15. Evaluation of Teachers	(12.41) 0.0061	ns	ns	(14.25) 0.0141	ns	ns	ns	
16. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools	ns	ns	(9.46) 0.0021	ns	ns	ns	ns	
17. Tenure and Promotion	ns	(14.68) 0.0021	ns	(14.92) 0.0107	ns	ns	ns	
18. Negotiation and Collective Bargaining	ns	ns	ns	ns	(14.70) 0.0117	ns	ns	
19. Local Tax Rates	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	
20. Student Progress	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	

S = Level of Significance

NS = Not Significant

Curriculum Evaluation

Of the total respondents, 67.2% across all levels of education reported that community advisory groups should be involved in curriculum evaluation. The highest percentage of these respondents, 73.4%, reported having more than a four year college education (see Appendix, Table R8-1).

Of the total respondents across all levels of years served on the board, 67.2% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in curriculum evaluation. The highest percentage of these respondents, 73.3%), reported having served for at least one year (see Appendix, Table R8-2).

Student Discipline

Of the total respondents, 56.5% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in student discipline; however, 43.5% reported negatively. Of those respondents with a high school diploma or less, 95 or 55.8% reported against community advisory group involvement and only 75, or 44.2% within the same level reported in favor of community advisory group involvement (see Appendix, Table R8-3).

Analyzing the attitude of respondents according to years served, 56.6% of the respondents reported in favor of community advisory group involvement in all levels except "more than 7." Within this category, 52.9% reported against community advisory group involvement as compared to the 47.1% of the respondents who reported in favor of community involvement (see Appendix, Table R8-4).

The majority of male and female respondents, 639, or 56.5% reported in favor of community advisory group involvement and 491, or 43.5% reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-5).

Of the total respondents across all racial categories, 56.8% reported in favor of community involvement and 43.2% reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-6).

Of the total respondents, 56.6%, across all levels of occupation except "skilled" reported that community advisory groups should be involved in student discipline. Within the "skilled" category only 40.8% of the respondents reported affirmatively, whereas 59.2% of the respondents reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-7).

Expenditures for School Operation

Across levels of education, 54.7% of the total respondents reported that community advisory groups should be involved in expenditures for school operation. However, 45.3% of the total respondents reported negatively. Of the respondents with less than high school education, 50.0% reported affirmatively and negatively. Of the respondents with a high school education, 50.6% reported negatively whereas 49.4% reported affirmatively. As the level of education of the respondents increased, they tended to respond affirmatively as is shown by the respondents with advanced college education. Of these respondents, 63.0% reported affirmatively, compared to 37.0% who reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-8).

According to respondent's occupation, 54.6% reported in favor of community advisory group involvement and 45.4% reported negatively. Within the areas of "managerial" and "skilled" more respondents reported negatively, 50.3% and 61.2% respectively (see Appendix, Table R8-9).

Ability Grouping

According to years served, 83.1% of the total respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in ability grouping of students in classes. Most of these respondents, 87.7%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-10).

Grant Proposals

According to levels of education, 69.4% of the total respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the preparation of federal and state grant proposals (see Appendix, Table R8-11).

Of the total respondents, 69.4%, across all levels of years served, reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the preparation of state and federal proposals. Most of these respondents, 79.5%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-12).

Based on an analysis of the racial composition of the total respondents, 69.3% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the preparation of state and federal grant proposals. Most of these respondents, 717, or 64.8% were Anglo-American. Of the respondents who reported affirmatively, 54.2% of the Afro-American respondents reported that community advisory groups should be involved in federal and state grant proposals (see Appendix, Table R8-13).

Hiring Teachers

According to the respondents' number of years served, 95.2% of the respondents across all levels reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in hiring teachers. The highest percentage of these respondents, 97.3%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-14).

Of the total respondents, 95.1% across all levels of race reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the hiring of teachers (see Appendix, Table R8-15).

Of the total respondents, 95.2% across all levels of age reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in hiring teachers. The highest percentage of these respondents, 97.3%, reported being in the age category of 51-60 (see Appendix, Table R8-16).

Education Objectives

Of the total respondents, 79.9%, across all levels of education, reported that community advisory groups should be involved in education objectives. The highest percentage of these respondents, 85.4%, reported having more than a college education (see Appendix, Table R8-17)

Of the male respondents, 78.1% reported in favor of community advisory group involvement in education objectives; however, 21.9% reported negatively. Of the female respondents, 84.1% reported affirmatively and 15.9% reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-18).

Student/Personnel Disputes

Of the total respondents across all levels of years served, 88.9% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in student/personnel disputes. The highest percentage of these respondents, 93.5%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-19).

Across all levels of race, 88.9% of the respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in student/personnel disputes (see Appendix, Table R8-20).

Initiation and Approval of New Courses

Considering the respondent's level of education, 54.1% of the respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the initiation and approval of new courses. However, 45.9% of the respondents reported affirmatively. Of the respondents with less than high school education, 50.0% reported affirmatively and negatively. Also, a majority of the respondents with a post high school or four year college education reported against community involvement; however, 51.2% of the respondents with an advanced college education reported affirmatively (see Appendix, Table R8-21).

According to respondent's status, 55.0% of the elected respondents reported negatively and 45.0% reported affirmatively. Of the appointed respondents, 37.9% reported negatively, but 62.1% reported that community advisory groups should be involved in the initiation and approval of new courses (see Appendix, Table R8-22).

Student Testing Program

Of the total respondents, 75.5%, across all levels of years served, reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the student testing program. The highest percentage of these respondents, 82.2%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-23).

Evaluation of Administrators

Considering all levels of years served, of the total respondents, 80.7% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in evaluation of administrators. The highest percentage of these respondents, 85.1%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-24).

Selection of Textbooks

Considering all levels of years served, of the total respondents, 61.9% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the selection of textbooks. Within the category of more than 7 years, 32.4% of the respondents reported in favor of community advisory group involvement; however, 67.6% of the respondents reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-25).

Of the elected respondents, 62.7% reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the selection of textbooks, and 37.3% reported affirmatively. However, 55.2% of the appointed respondents reported affirmatively compared to 44.8% of the respondents who reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-26).

Hiring of Administrators

According to level of education, 80.6% of the total respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the hiring of administrators (see Appendix, Table R8-27).

Of the total respondents, 57.4% of the male respondents and 23.0% of the female respondents reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-28).

Of the total respondents, 80.7%, across all levels of occupation, reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the hiring of administrators (see Appendix, Table R8-29).

Organization of Instruction

Of the total respondents, 60.5%, across all levels of education, reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the organization of instruction. A majority of the respondents across all educational levels supported this opinion (see Appendix, Table R8-30).

Considering years served by all the respondents, 60.6% of the total respondents reported against community advisory group involvement. Within the category of 4-7 years served, 65.0% of the respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the organization of instruction (see Appendix, Table R8-31).

Evaluation of Teachers

Of the total respondents, 84.9%, across all levels of years served, reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in the evaluation of teachers. The highest percentage of these

respondents, 88.3%, reported having served more than 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-32).

Similarly, across all levels of race, 84.9% of the respondents reported negatively (see Appendix, Table R8-33).

Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools

Of the total respondents, 52.1% of the male respondents and 26.7% of the female respondents reported that community advisory groups should be involved in the construction, renovation or closing of schools (see Appendix, Table R8-34).

Tenure and Promotion

According to respondents' years served, 91.2% of the total respondents reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in tenure and promotion of school personnel. Most of the respondents, 94.2%, reported having served between 4 and 7 years (see Appendix, Table R8-35).

Similarly, 91.2% of the total respondents across all levels of race reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in tenure and promotion of school personnel (see Appendix, Table R8-36).

Negotiation and Collective Bargaining

Of the total respondents, 91.1% across all levels of age reported that community advisory groups should not be involved in negotiation and collective bargaining. The highest percentage of these respondents, 93.4%, reported being in the age category of 36 to 40 (see Appendix, Table R8-37).

Research Question 9

Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision-making across selected demographic characteristics?

The researcher analyzed this research question through the use of frequency distribution and crosstabulation procedures. Attitudinal variables were analyzed for differences across the demographic variables of region, enrollment, and classification of school districts as specified in Summary Table 22. Only statistically significant relationships (.02) were reported.

For purposes of analysis, the categories of 'community at large' and 'community advisory group' were combined under one category called 'community' since their separate rankings were almost identical and both categories pertain to community. Since the respondents furnished the information that the administration should be included as a category, the write-in 'administration' category and the 'teachers' category were combined into a category called 'administration and instructional staff.' This was also done because the 'administration' category was of a very low percentage range (0.6 to 2.3) and the combining of 'administration' with 'teachers' did not alter the ranking of areas attributed to the 'teachers' category.

Curriculum Evaluation

Of the 406, or 36.6% respondents from the Central Region, 150, or 36.9% reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making to the community; 135, or 33.3% of the respondents reported that they

Summary Table 22

Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
Dependent by Independent Variables

Dependent Variable	Demographic Independent Variables					
	Region (χ^2) S		Enrollment (χ^2) S		Classification (χ^2) S	
1. Curriculum Evaluation	(23.69)	0.0026	(23.46)	0.0028	(27.52)	0.0006
2. Student Discipline	(23.26)	0.0030	(22.15)	0.0046	(23.23)	0.0031
3. Expenditures	(32.49)	0.0001	ns		ns	
4. Ability Grouping	(25.17)	0.0015	(27.20)	0.0007	(20.95)	0.0073
5. Grant Proposals	(23.76)	0.0025	ns		ns	
6. Education Objectives	ns		(20.19)	0.0096	(28.39)	0.0004
7. New Courses	ns		(29.10)	0.0003	(27.44)	0.0006
8. Testing Program	ns		ns		(22.45)	0.0041
9. Evaluation of Administrators	ns		ns		(20.15)	0.0098
10. Student Progress	ns		(22.07)	0.0048	(29.66)	0.0002
11. Selection of Textbooks	(42.09)	0.0000	(20.25)	0.0094	ns	
12. Hiring of Administrators	(20.38)	0.0090	ns		ns	
13. Evaluation of Teachers	ns		(19.09)	0.0144	ns	
14. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools	ns		ns		(22.23)	0.0045

S = Level of Significance

NS = Not Significant

were willing to delegate decision-making to administration-instructional staff; and 121, or 29.8% reported that they did not want to delegate decision-making responsibility. A majority of the respondents (47%) from the Western and Pacific Regions favored delegation of decision-making to the community. However, 39.6% of the respondents from the Southern Region favored administration and instructional staff and 35.1% from the Northeast Region favored willingness to retain decision-making with the Board (see Appendix, Table R9-1).

Most respondents, 40.1%, from districts with an enrollment size of less than 5,000 pupils, reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community. However, 38.6% of the respondents from school districts with enrollment greater than 5,000 pupils reported that they wanted decision-making responsibility to be retained by the board (see Appendix, Table R9-2).

Of the school districts analyzed according to classification, 42.3% of the respondents from both rural and small towns were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community; 37.5% and 36.9% of the respondents respectively from urban and suburban classifications wished that decision-making be retained by the board (see Appendix, Table R9-3).

Student Discipline

Most of the respondents from the Northeast Region (39.6%), Central Region (42.6%), and Pacific Region (39.3%) wished that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board. Of the respondents from the Southern Region, 41.6% wished to delegate

decision-making to the administration and instructional staff. Similarly, 51.0% of the respondents from the Western Region wished to delegate decision-making to the administration and instructional staff (see Appendix, Table R9-4)

A majority (316, or 42.0%) of the respondents from school districts with enrollment size of less than 5,000 pupils reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibilities in student discipline to the administration and instructional staff. A majority of respondents (152, or 42.5%) from school districts with pupil enrollment greater than 5,000 students reported that decision-making responsibility be retained with the board (see Appendix, Table R9-5).

Of the respondents from urban (42.4%) and suburban classifications (43.0%) each reported that decision-making be retained by the board. Of the rural respondents, 47.1% were willing to delegate decision-making to the administration and instructional staff. Also, of the small town respondents, 39.0% were willing to delegate decision-making to the administration and instructional staff (see Appendix, Table R9-6).

Expenditures for School Operation

Of the total respondents, 65.9% from all regions reported that they wished decision-making to be retained by the board. A majority of the respondents from all regions concurred in this opinion, the highest percentage being 76% from the Southern and Western Regions (Appendix, Table R9-7).

Ability Grouping

Of the total respondents, 65.7% from all five regions were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility in ability grouping to the administration and instructional staff. All five regions concurred in this opinion, with the highest percentage of respondents (76.2%) coming from the Western Region (see Appendix, Table R9-8).

Of the total respondents, 65.9% across all levels of enrollment size, were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility in ability grouping to the administration and instructional staff. The highest percentage of these respondents, 77.1%, reported having an enrollment of less than 1,000 pupils (see Appendix, Table R9-9).

A majority of the respondents, 65.8%, across all categories of classification, were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility in ability grouping to administration and instructional staff. Most of these respondents, 69.8% and 70.8% respectively, reported belonging to rural and small town districts (see Appendix, Table R9-10).

Grant Proposals

Of the total respondents, 54.3% reported across all regions that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board. However, 25.0% of the total respondents were willing to delegate decision-making to the community. Of this group, 30% of the respondents from the Southern and Pacific Regions reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making in grant proposals to the community (see Appendix, Table R9-11).

Education Objectives

Of the total respondents, 53.2%, across all levels of enrollment size, reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility in education objectives to the community. Of this group, 53.8% of the respondents belong to school districts of 1,000-4,999 students (see Appendix, Table R9-12).

A majority of the respondents, 53.5%, across all categories of districts except 'other' reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility in education objectives to the community. Of this group, 60.8% of the respondents belong to districts of rural classification (see Appendix, Table R9-13).

Initiation and Approval of New Courses

Within the category of 'less than 1,000 students, 37.6% of the respondents reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility for initiation and approval of new courses to the community and administration-instructional staff. Within the category of '1,000 to 5,000' students, 39.9% of the respondents retained decision-making responsibility; however, within the same category, 36.8% were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community. Similarly, in districts with more than 10,000 pupils the respondents retained decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R9-14).

Based on analysis of classification of school districts, respondents from urban (50.4%) and suburban (41.5%) retained decision-making responsibility; however, respondents from the rural (42.5%)

and small town (38.4%) were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community (see Appendix, Table R9-15).

Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program

Based on an analysis of the classification of school districts, most respondents from urban (47.4%) and suburban (48.6%) retained decision-making responsibility; however, most respondents from rural (47.1%) and small town (42.9%) were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration-instructional staff (see Appendix, Table R9-16).

Evaluation of Administrators

Across all categories of the classification of school districts, 81.9% of the total respondents reported that they did not want to delegate their decision-making responsibility. Most of these respondents reported belonging to the suburban classification (87.7%), the small town classification (80.9%), and the urban classification (78.9%) as specified in the Appendix, Table R9-17.

Student Progress

Of the total respondents, 65.6%, across all categories of student involvement, were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff in the area of student progress. Most of these respondents, 72.9%, reported belonging to school districts with a pupil enrollment of less than 1,000 students (see Appendix, Table R9-18).

Similarly, most of the respondents, 65.6%, across all classifications of school districts, were willing to delegate decision-making to the administration and instructional staff. Most of these respondents, 73.2%, belong to rural districts and 69.5% belong to small town districts (see Appendix, Table R9-19).

Selection of Textbooks

Across all regions except Pacific Region, a majority of the total respondents, 44.8%, were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff for the selection of textbooks. Of the respondents from the Pacific Region, 41.9% reported that they wished to delegate decision-making to the community (see Appendix, Table R9-20).

Across all categories of student enrollment, except 'more than 25,000,' 45.0% of the total respondents were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff. Most of these respondents reported belonging to districts with 1,000 to 4,999 pupils. In the category of 'more than 25,000,' 35.6% of the respondents chose to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community and another 37.8% of the respondents chose to retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R9-21).

Hiring of Administrators

Of the total respondents, 86.8%, across all regions, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility

for the hiring of administrators. Most of these respondents, 92.4%, reported belonging to the Southern Region (see Appendix, Table R9-22).

Evaluation of Teachers

Of the total respondents, 88.9%, across all levels of enrollment size, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the evaluation of teachers. Most of these respondents, 83.9%, reported belonging to districts with 5,000 to 10,000 pupils (see Appendix, Table R9-23).

Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools

A majority of the total respondents, 59.8%, across all classifications of school districts except 'other' reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community for construction, renovation, or closing of schools. Most of these respondents reported belonging to the rural classification (67.6%) and small town classification (61.0%) as specified in the Appendix, Table R9-24.

Research Question 10

Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision-making across selected personal characteristics?

The researcher analyzed this research question through the use of frequency distribution and crosstabulation procedures. Attitudinal variables were analyzed for differences across the personal variables of education, income, occupation, race, sex, and status.

Summary Table 23

Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
Dependent by Independent Variable

Dependent Variable	Personal Independent Variables					
	Education (χ^2) S	Income (χ^2) S	Occupation (χ^2) S	Race (χ^2) S	Sex (χ^2) S	Status (χ^2) S
1. Curriculum Evaluation	(25.10) 0.0015	(25.40) 0.0046	(26.86) 0.0081	ns	ns	ns
2. Student Discipline	(19.04) 0.0146	(26.78) 0.0028	ns	ns	ns	ns
3. Expenditures for School Operation	(22.45) 0.0041	ns	ns	(27.79) 0.0020	ns	ns
4. Ability Grouping	ns	ns	(34.15) 0.0006	ns	ns	ns
5. Hiring of Teachers	(28.58) 0.0004	ns	ns	(44.77) 0.0000	ns	ns
6. Education Objectives	ns	(25.69) 0.0042	ns	ns	ns	ns
7. Student/School Personnel Disputes	ns	(28.35) 0.0016	ns	(27.54) 0.0021	ns	ns
8. Local Tax Rates	(23.91) 0.0024	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
9. Initiation and Approval of New Courses	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	(9.84) 0.0073
10. Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program	(18.87) 0.0156	(23.98) 0.0076	ns	ns	ns	ns
11. Evaluation of Administrators	(36.53) 0.0000	ns	ns	(37.93) 0.0000	(14.29) 0.0008	(8.32) 0.0156
12. Hiring of Administrators	ns	(21.79) 0.0162	(29.33) 0.0035	(51.87) 0.0000	(8.77) 0.0124	ns
13. Evaluation of Teachers	(22.73) 0.0037	(23.72) 0.0084	ns	ns	ns	ns
14. Tenure and Promotion	(21.71) 0.0055	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
15. Negotiation and Collective Bargaining	(19.18) 0.0139	(26.72) 0.0029	ns	(42.17) 0.0000	ns	ns

Only statistically significant relationships (.02) were reported as shown in Table 23.

Curriculum Evaluation

Based on an analysis of the total respondents' level of education, 38.1% of the respondents were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community for curriculum evaluation. However, within the levels of education there were differences. Of the respondents with 'less than high school' education, 57.1% preferred delegation of responsibility to administration and instructional staff, compared to the 35.7% who preferred delegation of responsibility to the community. Those respondents with high school (40.3%) and post high school education (42.4%) preferred delegation of responsibility to the community. However, the respondents with four years college and advanced college degree (34.6% and 37.6%, respectively) chose almost equally delegation of responsibility to the community and to the board (see Appendix, Table R10-1).

In all categories of incomes between 'less than \$20,000 and \$59,000,' of the total respondents, 418, or 38.3%, reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community. Only those respondents, 77, or 38.3%, reporting an income 'more than \$60,000' retained their decision-making responsibility; whereas, 68, or 33.8% within the same category were willing to delegate decision-making to the community (see Appendix, Table R10-2).

Most respondents, 38.3%, across all categories of occupation, reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community. However, within the category of

'retired,' 50% of the respondents reported their preference for the administration and instructional staff (see Appendix, Table R10-3).

Student Discipline

Of those respondents with less than a high school education, 71.4% reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff, and similarly, 45.8% of the respondents who graduated from high school. However, those respondents with greater than a high school diploma, 388, or 41.2%, reported that they preferred the board to retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-4).

Of those respondents, 136, or 47.9% with income less than \$30,000 reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff; however, those respondents, 335, or 41.8%, with income levels above \$30,000 preferred that the board retain decision-making responsibility. Also noteworthy is the fact that of the total respondents, 420, or 38.7% chose administration and instructional staff and 421, or 38.8% chose the board to retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-5).

Expenditures for School Operation

Of the total respondents, 65.8%, across all levels of education, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility in the area of expenditures for school operation. Most of the respondents, 241, or 71.5%, and 246, or 68.9%, reported having a four year college education and advanced college education, respectively (see Appendix, Table R10-6).

Across all categories of race, 66.1% of the total respondents reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-7).

Ability Grouping

Of the total respondents, 65.8%, across all occupational categories, reported that they would be willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff in the area of ability grouping (see Appendix, Table R10-8).

Hiring of Teachers

Of the total respondents, 89.5%, across all levels of education reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for hiring teachers. Most of these respondents, 308, or 91.4%, and 329, or 91.6%, reported having completed a four year college education and advanced college education, respectively (see Appendix, Table R10-9).

Similarly, most respondents, 89.6%, across all levels of race, retained decision-making responsibility with the board (see Appendix, Table R10-10).

Education Objectives

A majority of the total respondents, 53.2%, across all income levels, reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community in the area of education objectives (see Appendix, Table 10-11).

Student-School Personnel Disputes

A majority of the total respondents, 74.8%, across all income levels, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility in the area of student-school personnel disputes. Most of these respondents, 80.2%, reported having an income level of \$40,000 to \$49,999 (see Appendix, Table R10-12).

Similarly, of the total respondents, 75.1%, across categories of race, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-13).

Local Tax Rates

Those respondents with a high school diploma or less, 93, or 56.0%, reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community. However, those respondents with more than a high school education, 500, or 53.6%, reported that the board should retain its decision-making responsibility. Of the total respondents, 518, or 47.2%, delegated decision-making responsibility to the community; however, 568, or 51.7% reported that the board should retain this decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-14).

Initiation and Approval of New Courses

Of the elected respondents, 404, or 38.5%, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility; 366, or 34.9% were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community; and 279, or 26.6% were willing to delegate decision-making to the administration and instructional staff for the initiation and approval of new courses. Of the appointed respondents, 31, or

55.4% were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community; 16, or 28.6% wanted to retain this responsibility; and 9, or 16.1% were willing to delegate this responsibility to the administration and instructional staff (see Appendix, Table R10-15).

Initiation and Approval of Testing Programs

Most respondents with post-high-school education or less, 190, or 46.5%, were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff for the initiation and approval of student testing programs. Most respondents with four year college or advanced college degrees, 322, or 46.6%, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for initiation and approval of student testing programs (see Appendix, Table R10-16)

Of the respondents with income less than \$30,000, 140, or 49.4%, reported that decision-making responsibility for student testing programs should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. However, of the respondents with income above \$30,000, 362, or 45.6% reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-17).

Evaluation of Administrators

Of the total respondents, 80.9%, across all levels of education, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the evaluation of administrators. Most of these respondents, 276, or 81.9% and 299, or 83.8%, reported having completed a four year college education and advanced college education, respectively (see Appendix, Table R10-18).

Most of the total respondents, 81.0%, across all categories of race reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for evaluation of administrators (see Appendix, Table R10-19).

Most respondents, both male (618, or 81.7%) and female (273, or 79.4%) reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-20).

Most respondents, both elected (850, or 81.7%) and appointed (39, or 69.6%) reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the evaluation of administrators (see Appendix, Table R10-21).

Hiring of Administrators

Of the total respondents, 86.8%, across all levels of income, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the hiring of administrators. The highest percentage respondents, 242, or 92.4%, reported having an income level of \$30,000 to \$39,999 (see Appendix, Table R10-22).

Of the total respondents, 86.7%, across all occupational categories reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility. The highest percentage of these respondents, 95.7%, reported belonging to the skilled occupational category (see Appendix, Table R10-23).

Similarly, most respondents, 86.8%, across all categories of race reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility (see Appendix, Table R10-24).

Likewise, most male (667, or 18.3%) and female (283, or 83.0%) respondents reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for hiring of administrators (see Appendix, Table R10-25).

Evaluation of Teachers

Of the total respondents, 83.7%, across all levels of education, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the evaluation of teachers. Most of these respondents reported having completed a post-high-school, four year college and advanced college education (see Appendix, Table R10-26).

Similarly, a majority of the total respondents, 83.9%, across all categories of race reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the evaluation of teachers (see Appendix, Table R10-27).

Tenure and Promotion

A majority of the total respondents, 90.5%, across all levels of education, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the tenure and promotion of school personnel. Most of these respondents, 310, or 92.5%, and 328, or 92.1%, reported having completed a four year college education and advanced college education, respectively (see Appendix, Table R10-28).

Negotiation and Collective Bargaining Process

Of the total respondents, 89.2%, across all levels of education, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for negotiation and collective bargaining process. Most of these respondents, 304, or 90.7%, and 316, or 90.0%, reported having completed a four year college education and advanced college education, respectively (see Appendix, Table R10-29).

Of the total respondents, 89.2%, across all levels of income, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility. The highest percentage of these respondents, 93.0%, reported having an income greater than \$60,000 (see Appendix, Table R10-30).

Similarly, most respondents, 89.5%, across all categories of race, reported that the board should retain decision-making responsibility for the negotiation and collective bargaining process (see Appendix, Table R10-31).

Conclusions

Research Question 1

For each community group involved in educational issues, what percentage of school board members responded that the degree of involvement was heavy, moderate, or none?

Respondents reported that mandated and parent groups were most involved in education issues. Respondents also reported as moderately involved in order from most to least involvement, the following groups: parent, mandated, community, business leaders and civic groups. Those groups reported as 'no involvement' were: labor groups, advocacy groups and church groups (see Summary Table 24-A and Summary Table 24-B).

Research Question 2

For each area what percentage of school board members believed that representatives of one or more community advisory groups should be involved in decision-making?

Between 54% and 79% of the respondents reported in order of importance that representatives of one or more community advisory groups should be involved in (1st) education objectives; (2nd) construction, renovation or closing of schools; (3rd) curriculum evaluation; (4th) determination of local tax rates; (5th) student discipline, and (6th) expenditures for school operation (see Summary Table 25).

Research Question 3

What were the actual areas of involvement by community advisory groups?

Between 19% and 47% of the respondents reported in order of importance the actual areas of community advisory group involvement as the following: (1st) construction, renovation or closing of schools; (2nd) education objectives; (3rd) curriculum evaluation;

Summary Table 24-A

Percentage of Respondent's Reporting Degree
of Community Group Involvement in
Educational Issues

Heavy No/%	Moderate No/%	None No/%
1) Mandated groups (299, 26.3%)	1) Parent groups (768, 67.5%)	1) Labor groups (892, 78.4%)
2) Parent groups (255, 22.4%)	2) Community leaders (664, 58.3%)	2) Advocacy groups (712, 62.6%)
	3) Mandated groups (649, 57.0%)	3) Church groups (698, 61.3%)
	4) Business leaders (610, 53.6%)	
	5) Civic groups (588, 51.7%)	

Summary Table 24-B

Percentage of Respondent's Reporting Degree of
Community Group Involvement in Educational Issues

Moderate to Heavy No/%	None No/%
1) Parent Groups (1,023, 89.9%)	1) Labor Groups (892, 78.4%)
2) Mandated Groups (948, 83.3%)	2) Advocacy Groups (712, 62.6%)
3) Community Leaders (704, 61.8%)	3) Church Groups (698, 61.3%)
4) Business Leaders (646, 56.8%)	
5) Civic Groups (619, 54.4%)	

Summary Table 25

Percentage of Respondent's Belief in
Involvement by Community Advisory Groups

Involvement Frequency/Percent	Non-Involvement Frequency/Percent
1) Educational Objectives (900, 79.1%) 2. Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools (886, 77.9%) 3. Curriculum Evaluation (758, 66.6%) 4. Determination of Local Tax Rates (653, 57.4%) 5. Student Discipline (639, 56.2%) 6. Expenditures of School Operation (619, 54.4%)	1) Hiring of Teachers (1,073, 94.3%) 2) Tenure & Promotion (1,026, 90.2%) 3) Negotiation and Collective Bargaining (1,023, 89.9%) 4) Student and School Personnel Disputes (1,003, 88.1%) 5) Evaluation of Teachers (955, 83.9%) 6) Ability Grouping (942, 82.8%) 7) Evaluation of Administration (910, 80.0%) 8) Hiring of Administrators (909, 79.9%) 9) Testing Programs (851, 74.8%) 10) Student Programs (841, 73.9%) 11) Grant Proposals (778, 68.4%) 12) Selection of Textbooks (698, 61.3%) 13) Organization of Instructional Programs (677, 59.5%) 14) Initiation and Approval of New Courses (608, 53.4%)
n = 1,138	

(4th) determination of local tax rates; (5th) expenditures for school operation; (6th) initiation and approval of new courses; (7th) selection of textbooks; and (8th) student discipline (see Summary Table 26).

Research Question 4

For each area what percentage of school board members were willing to delegate the primary responsibility for decision-making to each of the following groups: community at large, community advisory group, teachers, no one?

For purposes of analysis, the categories of 'community at large' and 'community advisory group' were combined under one category called 'community' since their separate rankings were almost identical. Since the percentage of responses for the write-in 'administration' category was so small (range 0.6 to 2.3), the 'administration' category will be ignored in this section.

Of the respondents, 58.2% reported that community should be delegated decision-making responsibility in construction, renovation, or closing of schools; 52.2% reported delegation of responsibility in education objectives; 45.7%, in local tax rates; 37.4% in curriculum evaluation; 35.0% in initiation and approval of new courses; 31.0% in expenditures for school operation; 27.1% in organization of instructional programs; and 25.1% in selection of textbooks (see Summary Table 27).

Of the respondents, 63.7% reported that the teachers should be delegated decision-making responsibility in ability grouping; 62.6% reported delegation of responsibility in student progress; 42.6% in selection of textbooks; 37.3% in student testing programs;

Summary Table 26

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Status of
Community Advisory Group Involvement

Areas of Involvement Frequency/Percent	Areas of Non-Involvement Frequency/Percent
1. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (537, 47.2%)	1. Tenure and Promotion (1,107, 97.3%)
2. Education Objectives (516, 45.3%)	2. Hiring of Teachers (1,104, 97%)
3. Curriculum Evaluation (443, 38.9%)	3. Negotiation and Collective Bargaining (1,102, 96.8%)
4. Determination of Local Tax Rates (332, 29.2%)	4. Evaluation of Teachers (1,095, 96.2%)
5. Expenditures for School Operation (310, 27.2%)	5. Student and School Personnel (1,068, 93.8%)
6. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (267, 23.5%)	6. Evaluation of Administrators (1,087, 95.5%)
7. Selection of Textbooks (251, 22.1%)	7. Ability Grouping (1,056, 92.8%)
8. Student Discipline (225, 19.8%)	8. Testing Program (1,017, 89.4%)
	9. Hiring of Administrators (1,014, 89.1%)
	10. Student Programs (1,011, 88.8%)
	11. Grant Proposals (994, 87.3%)
	12. Organization of Instruction (938, 82.4%)
	13. Student Discipline (900, 79.1%)
	14. Selection of Textbooks (876, 77.0%)
	15. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (854, 75.0%)
	16. Expenditures (817, 71.8%)
	17. Local Tax Rates (787, 69.2%)
	18. Curriculum Evaluation (681, 59.8%)
	19. Education Objectives (609, 53.5%)
	20. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (584, 51.3%)

35.9% in student discipline; 29.2% in curriculum evaluation, and 23.9% in initiation and approval of new courses (see Summary Table 27).

Of the respondents, 87.6% reported that the board retain decision-making responsibility in tenure and promotion of personnel; 87.3% reported board retention of decision-making in the hiring of teachers, 85.5% reported board retention of decision-making in the negotiation and collective bargaining process; 83.6% in hiring of administrators; 80.8% in evaluation of teachers; 78.4% in evaluation of administrators; 72.8% in student and school personnel disputes; 64.4% in expenditures for school operation; 52.7% in state and federal grant proposals; 50.1% in local tax rates; 48.3% in organization of instructional program; 41.2% in student testing program; 38.2% in construction, renovation, or closing of schools; 38.1% in student discipline; 37.1% in initiation and approval of new courses; 32.2% in education objectives; 30.2% in curriculum evaluation; 28.5% in selection of textbooks; 26.8% in ability grouping; and 25.9% in student progress (see Summary Table 27).

Research Question 5

In what areas did school board members want community involvement but express unwillingness to assign responsibility for decision-making?

Of the respondents, 36.5% reported that they wanted community involvement in student discipline but were unwilling to assign responsibility for decision-making. The other areas included:

Summary Table 27

Percentage of Respondents Willing to Delegate Decision-Making to
Community, Teachers, Board

Response: Community	Teachers	Board
1. Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools (663, 58.2%)	1. Ability Grouping (726, 63.7%)	1. Tenure and Promotion of Personnel (997, 87.6%)
2. Education Objectives (594, 52.2%)	2. Student Progress (712, 62.6%)	2. Hiring of Teachers (994, 87.3%)
3. Local Tax Rates (520, 45.7%)	3. Selection of Textbooks (485, 42.6%)	3. Negotiation and Collective Bargaining (973, 85.5%)
4. Curriculum Evaluation (426, 37.4%)	4. Student Testing Program (424, 37.3%)	4. Hiring of Administrators (951, 83.6%)
5. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (398, 35.0%)	5. Student Discipline (408, 35.9%)	5. Evaluation of Teachers (920, 80.8%)
6. Expenditures (352, 31.0%)	6. Curriculum Evaluation (332, 29.2%)	6. Evaluation of Administrators (892, 78.4%)
7. Organization of Instructional Program (308, 27.1%)	7. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (272, 23.9%)	7. Student and School Personnel Objectives (829, 72.8%)
8. Selection of Textbooks (286, 25.1%)		8. Expenditures (733, 64.4%)
		9. Grant Proposals (600, 52.7%)
		10. Local Tax Rates (570, 50.1%)
		11. Organization of Instructional Program (550, 48.3%)
		12. Student Testing Program (469, 41.2%)
		13. Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools (435, 38.2%)
		14. Student Discipline (434, 38.1%)
		15. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (422, 37.1%)
		16. Education Objectives (367, 32.2%)
		17. Curriculum Evaluation (344, 30.2%)
		18. Selection of Textbooks (324, 28.5%)
		19. Ability Grouping (305, 26.8%)
		20. Student Progress (295, 25.9%)

curriculum evaluation - 34.3%, education objectives - 30.9%, expenditures for school operation - 30.0%, construction, renovation or closing of schools - 23.5%, and initiation and approval of new courses - 21.2% (see Summary Table 28).

Research Question 6

In what areas did school board members believe that the community should be involved but was not presently involved?

Of the respondents, 37.8% reported that community advisory groups should be involved but are not presently involved in student discipline. Other areas reported by respondents in which community advisory groups should be involved but are not presently involved included: education objectives - 35.9%, construction, renovation or closing of schools - 32.8%, local tax rates - 31.4%, curriculum evaluation - 30.9%, expenditures for school operation - 30.5%, initiation and approval of new courses - 26.9%, and organization of instruction - 25.6% (see Summary Table 29).

Based upon an analysis of research questions 2-6, the researcher has developed a national profile of the areas of community involvement. The results of the survey indicate there are six major areas in which the community should be involved, are presently involved, and would receive delegated decision-making responsibility. These six areas are: Education Objectives; Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools; Curriculum Evaluation; Determination of Local Tax Rates; Student Discipline; and Expenditures for School Operation. Two other

Summary Table 28

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Involvement
and Delegation of Responsibility to the Community

Should be Involved and Willing to Delegate Responsibility	Should be Involved but Un- willing to Delegate Responsibility
No./%	No./%
1. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (605, 55.0%)	1. Student Discipline (404, 36.5%)
2. Education Objectives (541, 48.8%)	2. Curriculum Evaluation (380, 34.4%)
3. Local Tax Rates (433, 40.0%)	3. Education Objectives (341, 30.9%)
4. Curriculum Evaluation (364, 32.8%)	4. Expenditures for School Operation (332, 30.0%)
5. Expenditures for School Operation (272, 24.6%)	5. Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools (258, 23.5%)
6. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (270, 24.6%)	6. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (233, 21.2%)

Summary Table 29

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community
Advisory Groups Involvement

Should be and Is Involved No./%	Should be and Is Not Involved No./%
1. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (509, 45.8%)	1. Student Discipline (423, 37.8%)
2. Education Objectives (493, 44.2%)	2. Education Objectives (401, 35.9%)
3. Curriculum Evaluation (405, 36.2%)	3. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (365, 32.8%)
4. Local Tax Rates (301, 27.3%)	4. Local Tax Rates (346, 31.4%)
5. Expenditures for School Operation (272, 24.3%)	5. Curriculum Evaluation (345, 30.9%)
6. Selection of Textbooks (230, 20.5%)	6. Expenditures for School Operation (342, 30.5%)
7. Student Discipline (208, 18.6%)	7. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (299, 26.9%)
8. Initiation and Approval of New Courses (208, 18.6%)	8. Organization of Instruction (284, 25.6%)

areas which less than 50% of the respondents noted were: Selection of Textbooks and Initiation and Approval of New Courses (see Summary Table 30)

Research Question 7

Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected demographic characteristics?

The researcher analyzed the six predominant attitudinal dependent variables of community involvement identified in Table 30 according to region, enrollment, and classification of school district.

Region

Within the areas of construction, renovation, or closing of schools, curriculum evaluation and local tax rates, there were no regional differences. Within the area of student discipline, respondents from the Central Region preferred no community involvement. Respondents from the Western Region did not want community involvement within the area of expenditures for school operation. The statistical procedure applied to the respondents' attitude toward involvement in education objectives was not significant as indicated in Table 20.

Enrollment

Within the area of education objectives, there were no differences due to enrollment. However, within the areas of student discipline and expenditures for school operation, respondents from

Summary Table 30
Congruency of Action by Respondents
A National Profile

Areas of Should-Be Involvement (over 50%) %	Areas of Should-Be and Actual Involvement %	Areas of Should-Be Involvement and Delegated Responsibility %
Education Objectives (79.1%)	Education Objectives (44.2%)	Education Objectives (48.8%)
Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (77.9%)	Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (45.8%)	Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools (55.0%)
Curriculum Evaluation (66.6%)	Curriculum Evaluation (36.2%)	Curriculum Evaluation (32.8%)
Local Tax Rates (57.4%)	Local Tax Rates (27.3%)	Local Tax Rates (40.0%)
Student Discipline (56.2%)	Student Discipline (18.6%)	Student Discipline (19.8%)
Expenditures for School Operation (54.4%)	Expenditures for School Operation (24.3%)	Expenditures for School Operation (24.6%)
	Selection of Textbooks (20.5%)	Selection of Textbooks (20.5%)
	Initiation and Approval of New Courses (18.6%)	Initiation and Approval of New Courses (24.6%)

*The areas of 'selection of textbooks' and 'initiation and approval of new courses' were not reported by more than 50% of the respondents as areas in which the community should be involved.

n = 1,138

school districts with less than 1,000 pupils wanted less community involvement than respondents from school districts with enrollment greater than 1,000 pupils. The statistical procedures applied to the other three areas of community involvement were not significant as indicated in Table 20.

Classification of School Districts

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of the respondents from a rural school system reported that they wanted no community involvement. A majority of respondents from urban, suburban, and small town reported that they wanted community involvement. The statistical procedures applied to the other five areas of community involvement were not significant as indicated in Table 20.

Research Question 8

Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected personal characteristics?

The researcher analyzed the six predominant attitudinal dependent variables of community involvement identified in Table 30 according to education, years served, sex, race, age, occupation, and status.

Education

Within the areas of curriculum evaluation and education objectives a majority of the respondents across all levels of education reported that they wanted community involvement. However,

in the areas of student discipline and expenditures for school operation, those respondents with less than a high school education reported that there should be no community involvement; and those respondents with more than a high school education favored community involvement. The statistical procedure applied to the other two areas of community involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 21.

Years Served

A majority of the respondents across all levels of years served reported that the community should be involved in curriculum evaluation. Within the area of student discipline, respondents with less than seven years on the board also favored community involvement, but respondents with more than seven years did not favor community involvement. The statistical procedure applied to the other four areas of community involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 21.

Sex

Within the areas of student discipline, education objectives, and construction, renovation or closing of schools, a majority of male and female respondents reported that the community should be involved. The statistical procedure applied to the other three areas of community involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 21.

Race

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of the respondents across all racial categories reported that the community should be involved. The statistical procedure applied to the other five areas of major involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 21.

Age and Status

The statistical procedure applied to all six areas of major involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 21.

Occupation

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of those respondents who classified themselves as 'skilled' reported that there should be no community involvement. Within the areas of expenditures for school operation, a majority of those respondents who classified themselves as 'managerial and skilled' reported that there should be no community involvement. The statistical procedure applied to the other four areas of major involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 21.

Research Question 9

Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision-making across selected demographic characteristics?

The researcher analyzed the six predominant attitudinal dependent variables of community involvement identified in Table 30 according to region, enrollment size, and classification of school district.

Region

Within the area of curriculum evaluation, a majority of respondents from the Northeast reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board. A majority of respondents from the Southern Region reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. However, a majority of respondents from the Central, Pacific, and Western Regions reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community.

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of respondents from the Pacific, Central, and Northeast reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board. However, a majority of respondents from the Southern and Western Regions reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the administration and instructional staff.

Within the area of expenditures for school operation, a majority of respondents from all regions reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board.

The statistical procedure applied to the other three areas of major involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 22.

Enrollment

Within the area of curriculum evaluation, a majority of respondents from districts of less than 5,000 pupils reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community.

However, respondents from districts of more than 5,000 pupils reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board.

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of respondents from districts of less than 5,000 pupils reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. However, respondents from districts over 5,000 pupils reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board.

Within the area of education objectives, a majority of respondents from all categories of enrollment size reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community.

The statistical procedure applied to the other three areas of major involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 22.

Classification

Within the area of curriculum evaluation, a majority of respondents from the categories of urban, suburban, and other reported that decision-making responsibility should be retained by the board. A majority of rural and small town respondents reported that decision-making responsibilities should be delegated to the community.

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of respondents from the categories of urban, suburban and other reported that decision-making responsibility should be retained by the Board. A majority of the respondents from the categories of rural and small

town reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff.

Within the area of education objectives, a majority of respondents across all categories of school districts reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community.

Within the area of construction, renovation, or closing of schools, a majority of the respondents across all categories except 'other' reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community. Respondents from the category 'other' reported that decision-making be retained by the board.

The statistical procedure applied to the other two areas of major involvement was not significant as indicated in Table 22.

Research Question 10

Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision-making across selected personal characteristics?

The researcher analyzed the six predominant attitudinal dependent variables of community involvement identified in Table 30 according to education, income, sex, race, occupation, and status.

Education

Within the area of curriculum evaluation, a majority of those respondents with less than high school education reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. A majority of respondents with high

and post high school education reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community. A majority of those respondents with a college or advanced degree reported with equal response rate that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community and retained by the board.

Within the area of student discipline, a majority of those respondents with a high school diploma or less education reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. A majority of those respondents with post high school education, including advanced degree, reported that decision-making responsibility should be retained by the board.

Within the area of expenditures for school operation, a majority of the respondents across all levels of education reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board.

Within the area of local tax rates, a majority of those respondents with a high school education or less reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community. However, those respondents with more than a high school education reported that decision-making should be retained by the board.

The statistical procedure used to analyze the other two areas of major involvement was not significant as reported in Table 23.

Income

Within the area of curriculum evaluation, a majority of respondents with an income level up to \$60,000 reported that

decision-making should be delegated to the community. Only those respondents with income 'over \$60,000' reported that decision-making responsibility be retained by the board.

Within the area of student discipline, those respondents with an income level up to \$30,000 reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. A majority of those respondents with income level over \$30,000 reported that decision-making responsibility should be retained by the board.

Within the area of education objectives, a majority of the respondents across all levels of income reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community.

The statistical procedure applied to the other three areas of major involvement was not significant as reported in Table 23.

Sex

The statistical procedure applied to the six areas of major involvement was not significant as reported in Table 23.

Race

A majority of the respondents across all racial categories reported that decision-making responsibility in the area of expenditures for school operation be retained by the board.

The statistical procedure applied to the other five areas of major involvement was not significant as reported in Table 23.

Occupation

A majority of respondents across all occupational categories except 'retired' reported that decision-making responsibility in the area of curriculum evaluation should be delegated to the community. A majority of those respondents from the 'retired' occupational category reported that decision-making responsibility in curriculum evaluation should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff.

The statistical procedure applied to the other five areas of major involvement was not significant as reported in Table 23.

Status

The statistical procedure applied to the six areas of major involvement was not significant as reported in Table 23.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present an analysis of the data and the applied statistical procedures. The first section presented an analysis of the demographic and personal variables. The second section presented a report of the findings with respect to each research question, and the third section presented the conclusions for each of the research questions.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of the study that was conducted. The summary will include a review of need and purpose of the study, a restatement of the research questions, a synopsis of the related literature, the research methodology and the conclusions derived from the analysis of the data for each of the research questions. In addition, recommendations for further research will be made.

Summary

Need and Purpose of the Study

Community participation began to emerge in the late 1940's and early 1950's when stimulated by the post War increase in birth-rate and the call for educational support to returning veterans.¹ Federal programs involving community participation arose through these legislative acts: The Housing Act of 1949, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,

¹Mario D. Fantini, "Community Participation: Alternative Patterns and their Consequences in Educational Achievement," (Robert L. Sinclair and Others), A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1981), p. 13.

the American Indian Education Act of 1972², and the Model Cities Act of 1966.³

The states of Alaska and Florida, in 1974 and 1976 respectively, authorized community participation in the form of district advisory councils to the Board. Between the years of 1974 and 1977, the states of New Jersey, California, Texas, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and South Dakota mandated citizen involvement in planning or evaluation of school programs.⁴ The states of California (1977), Florida (1973), South Carolina (1977), and Hawaii (1981), also established more representative community advisory councils.⁵

As Krebs stated, "the boards of education have the major responsibility for school policies. Only boards of education can

²Robert J. Havighurst, "Local Community Participation in Educational Policy Making and School Administration," Community Participation in Education, ed. Carl A. Grant (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), p. 23.

³Don Davies and Others, Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979), p. 3.

⁴Davies, pp. 36-38.

⁵Kathleen Huguenin, Ross Zerchylgov, Don Davies, Narrowing the Gap Between Interest and Practice: A Report to Policy-Makers on Community Organization and School Decisionmaking (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979), p. 38.

enact school policies. However, advisory councils play a major role in the development of policies."⁶ But, as Davies points out, school boards seem not to see councils as a very high priority. Since school boards receive secondhand information about council activity, there is an unstable and confusing relationship between the school boards and school councils. This relationship has not been well documented or researched.⁷

The purpose of the study was to determine whether local school board members believe in community participation; to determine to what degree they believe community participation is appropriate within the selected areas of curriculum, finance, personnel, and student affairs; and to search for relationships between attitudinal variables and certain demographic and personal variables.

⁶Alfred H. Krebs, Organizing and Working with Departmental Advisory Councils in the Public Schools (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 24.

⁷Don Davies, p. 53.

Research Questions Restated

1. For each community group involved in educational issues, what percentage of school board members responded that the degree of involvement was heavy, moderate, or none?
2. For each area, what percentage of school board members believed that representatives of one and more community advisory groups should be involved in decision-making?
3. What were the actual areas of involvement by community advisory groups?
4. For each area, what percentage of school board members were willing to delegate the primary responsibility for decision making to each of the following groups: community at large, community advisory groups, teachers, no one?
5. In what areas did school board members want community involvement but express unwillingness to assign responsibility for decision-making?
6. In what areas did school board members believe that the community should be involved but were not presently involved?
7. Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected demographic characteristics?
8. Did school board members differ in their beliefs concerning community involvement across selected personal characteristics?

9. Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision making across selected demographic characteristics?

10. Did school board members vary in their willingness to delegate responsibility for decision making across selected personal characteristics?

Summary of Related Literature

The researcher presented a historical perspective of citizen participation emphasizing the family's right to participate in decisions about schooling since the Colonial Period in America. Cook pointed out that citizen involvement in the processes of education has been deeply rooted in American history.⁸

Two theories of participatory democracy emerged: a classical theory with its emphasis on the individual participant, and the elitist theory with its alternative faith in specialized professionals. The tension between these two theories outlined the philosophic framework for discussion of political participation in American society.

⁸Nancy C. Cook, "The State of the Art of Community Education in South Carolina: The Historical Basis and Current Status," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1977), cited by Nancy C. Cook, Citizen Participation Issues, Research Report 79-103 (Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979), p. 10-11.

Fantini summarized it best when he stated:

"In the education sector, it marks the opposing roles of available models of community participation in their present and historic forms.

. . . In loco parentis statutes preserve the ultimate authority of parents as participants in establishing school policy and in reviewing the procedure by which services are delivered to their children. It is, therefore, important to emphasize that the parent, like the citizen, still maintains the right to participate actively and effectively in all public matters, a right (not merely a privilege) based on the articulation of fundamental tenets and in the establishment of a public school system as the agent of society's civic mission.⁹

The researcher also presented a historical perspective of community control. Guthrie, Thomason, and Craig pointed out that "by the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century..., consolidation of school districts, attempts at depoliticization, growth of professional administration, burgeoning bureaucratization, increasing litigation, and unionization of teachers had combined to dilute dramatically public control over the schools.¹⁰ The efforts to restore citizen control have taken a number of forms: decentralization, accountability, and community control.¹¹

⁹Fantini, p. 11

¹⁰James W. Guthrie, Diana K. Thomason, and Patricia A. Craig, "The Erosion of Lay Control," Public Testimony on Public Schools, ed. Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell, (California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 106.

¹¹Guthrie, Thomason, and Craig, p. 115.

The concept of a partnership in education emerged on April 17, 1967, when the Board of Education of the City of New York signed a policy statement indicating a readiness to experiment with various forms of decentralization and community participation. A group of parents implemented this new policy in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district, but the experiment proved unsuccessful.¹²

Fantini noted that the concept of community control differs from other post-War era reforms in that it's more fundamental, comprehensive, and open-ended, providing a framework for change. Community control alters basic power relationships and is resistant to absorption because its not confined to curriculum, personnel or any other single function.¹³

A review of the literature showed that there are levels of participation: Sumption and Engstrom¹⁴ differentiated between formal

¹²Maurice R. Berube and Marilyn Gittell, Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1969), p. 5,6.

¹³Mario Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, Richard Magat. Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), p. 232-240.

¹⁴Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School-Community Relations: A New Approach (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966), p. 50.

and informal; Arnstein¹⁵ designed a typology in the form of a ladder (manipulation to control); and Kaplan and Tune¹⁶ designed a five-level pyramid (citizen support to citizen control).

The review of the literature presented many different activities and functions of advisory committees. Davies divided the activities of school councils into two categories: school-related issues and council-related issues. The school-related issues included budget, personnel, curriculum, planning and evaluation, school climate, extra educational and school/community relations. Council-related issues included council organization and structure, and council resources and support.¹⁷

The review of the literature summarized previous studies related to community participation. The National School Public Relations Association in 1973 sponsored a survey conducted by the editors of Education U.S.A. which identified citizen advisory committee activities.¹⁸ Hofstrand and Phipps also prepared a list

¹⁵Sherry R. Arnstein, "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation," Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change, ed. Edgar C. Cahn, Barry A. Passet (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), p. 72-73.

¹⁶Michael H. Kaplan and Robert D. Tune, "Citizen in Public Education: Five Levels of Participation." Community Educational Journal, 6:(3) 14-16, December, 1978.

¹⁷Davies, 42.

¹⁸Neild B. Oldham, Citizen Advisory Committees, Current Trends in School Policies and Programs (Arlington, Virginia, National School Public Relations Association, 1973), p. 9, 10.

of actual activities conducted by citizen advisory councils.¹⁹ Mary Ellen Stanwick reported on a study conducted in 1974-75 determining the nationwide status of citizen participation.²⁰ Cook, in a review of research on citizen participation, analyzed and reported unpublished doctoral dissertations covering community participation.²¹ Talmage and Orstein examined superintendents' attitudes toward community participation at the advisory and control levels in four areas of educational policy-making: curriculum, finance, personnel and student affairs.²² The results of the study showed these superintendents were more favorable to advisement than control, and in both areas superintendents were inclined to having the community involved in financial issues than in curriculum, personnel or student affairs. The geographic location nor the social setting of a school district

¹⁹Richard K. Hofstrand and Lloyd J. Phipps, Advisory Councils for Education, A Handbook, (Urbana, Illinois, Rurban Educational Development Laboratory, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1971), p. 4.

²⁰Mary Ellen Stanwick, Patterns of Participation: Report of a National Survey of Citizen Participation in Educational Decision-making (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1975), p. 7-9.

²¹Nancy C. Cook, Citizen Participation Issues, Research Report 79-103. (Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979).

²²Harriet Talmage and Allan C. Orstein, "School Superintendents: Attitudes Toward Community Participation: Advisement versus Control," The Journal of Educational Administration, 14:162-175, October, 1976.

influenced the superintendents' attitudes. However, superintendents from larger school systems were more favorable to community participation than those from smaller districts. And, only in the school finance area were the small district superintendents more favorable in their attitude toward community control than superintendents from larger school districts.

Concerning school board members, Kerr pointed out in a landmark study published in 1964 that school boards are not particularly open to the participation of citizens in the policy-making process.²³ The literature regarding the attitude of school board members toward community participation in specific areas relating to curriculum, finance, personnel and student affairs was found to be non-existent. This lack of information provided the rationale for conducting this study.

The variables of region, enrollment, school district classification, education level of school board members, sex, age, race, family income, occupation, status and years served were addressed; however, only the study by Talmage and Orstein identified some of the variables in relation to attitudes toward community participation.

²³Norman D. Kerr, "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation," in Sociology of Education, ed. Ronald M. Pavaiko (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1969), p. 361-388.

Research Methodology

This study utilized descriptive research methodology and survey technique to gather data from school board members about their attitudes toward community participation in the selected areas of curriculum, finance, personnel and student affairs.

The sample was drawn from the population of school board member subscribers to The American School Board Journal. The population was stratified by regions of the United States and a random sample of 17% was drawn.

The survey form used to collect the data was divided into three parts. Part I collected demographic information about the respondent's school district. Part II collected data relative to the personal characteristics of the school board member, and Part III gathered data about school board members' attitude toward community participation. A return rate of 27.0% was achieved.

The method of analysis and statistical treatments applied to the data were identified. Research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 were analyzed by means of frequency distributions. Research questions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 were analyzed using frequency distributions and chi-square procedures. The researcher analyzed the data for significance between attitudinal variables and the demographic or personal variables to determine the relationships that existed. All significant results were reported with the level of significance established at .01.

Results

The respondents were described by region of the United States, district classification, enrollment, sex, whether elected or appointed, age, race, family income, years served, level of education, and occupation.

Respondents reported that parent and mandated groups were the most involved in educational issues. Moderately involved groups were comprised of community leaders, business leaders and civic groups. Labor groups, advocacy groups, and church groups were least involved in educational issues.

The respondents reported, from highest to lowest percentage, that community advisory groups should be involved in education objectives; construction, renovation or closing of schools; curriculum evaluation; determination of local tax rates; student discipline; and expenditures for school operation.

The actual areas of community advisory group involvement, reported from highest percentage response to lowest, were: construction, renovation or closing of schools; education objectives; curriculum evaluation; determination of local tax rates; expenditures for school operation; initiation and approval of new courses; selection of textbooks and student discipline.

The respondents reported, in order from highest to lowest percentage, that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community in the following areas: construction, renovation, or closing of schools; education objectives; determination of local tax

rates; curriculum evaluation; initiation and approval of new courses; expenditures for school operation; organization of instructional program and selection of textbooks.

The respondents identified six areas in which they wanted community involvement but were unwilling to assign responsibility for decision-making. These areas, ranked in order from highest to lowest percentage response, were: student discipline; curriculum evaluation; education objectives; expenditures for school operation; construction, renovation or closing of schools and initiation and approval of new courses.

The respondents identified eight areas in which they reported that the community should be involved but was not presently involved. These areas, ranked in order from highest to lowest percentage response rates were: student discipline; education objectives; construction, renovation or closing of schools; local tax rates; curriculum evaluation; expenditures for school operation; initiation and approval of new courses; and organization of instruction.

Based upon an analysis of the responses for research questions 2-6, a national profile of community involvement emerged. The results of the study indicated that there were six major areas in which the community should be involved, are presently involved, and should be delegated decision-making responsibility. These six areas were: education objectives; construction, renovation, or closing of schools; curriculum evaluation; determination of local tax rates; student discipline; and expenditures for school operation.

Results indicated no differences across demographic and personal variables in the areas of education objectives; construction, renovation or closing of schools; curriculum evaluation, or determination of local tax rates. Only in the areas of student discipline and expenditures for school operation were differences evident.

Within the area of student discipline, respondents from rural districts, those from districts of less than 1,000 pupils and respondents in the Central Region, reported that there should be no community involvement. Also within the area of student discipline respondents who classified themselves as skilled, with less than a high school education and more than seven years of service on a board believed that there should be no community involvement.

Within the area of expenditures for school operation, respondents from the Western Region; and those in districts with less than 1,000 pupils, reported that there should be no community involvement. Also within the area of expenditures for school operation; respondents who classified themselves as being managerial and skilled as well as those having less than a high school education reported that there should be no community involvement (see Table 31).

Within the area of education objectives, no differences were found in the responses regarding the delegation of decision-making responsibility across levels of enrollment or classification. In the area of construction, renovation, or closing of schools, respondents from urban, suburban, rural and small town all reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making to the community.

Table 31
Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Involvement in Selected Areas
by Demographic and Personal Variables

Areas/Demographic & Personal Variables	Region	Enrollment	Classification	Education	Yrs. Served	Sex	Race	Occupation
1. Education Objectives	NS	ND	NS	ND	NS	ND	NS	NS
2. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools	ND	NS	NS	NS	NS	ND	NS	NS
3. Curriculum Evaluation	ND	NS	NS	ND	ND	NS	NS	NS
4. Local Tax Rates	ND	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
5. Student Discipline	D	D	D	D	D			D
	Central	Less than 1,000	Rural	Less than high school	more than seven yrs.	ND	ND	Skilled
6. Expenditures for School Operation	D	D		D				D
	Western	Less than 1,000	NS	Less than high school	NS	NS	NS	Managerial and Skilled

ND = No different from national profile although statistical significance (.01) was found.

NS = Not statistically significant

D = Difference as indicated in cell from national profile and significance (.01) was found.

In the area of curriculum evaluation, respondents who classified themselves as rural and small town; those from the Central, Pacific, and Western Regions; and those in districts with student enrollments less than 5,000 pupils reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community. Respondents from the Southern Region supported delegation of responsibility to the administration and instructional staff while those from the Northeast Region, in both urban and suburban systems and those in districts of more than 5,000 pupils retained decision-making for the board.

In the area of student discipline, respondents from the Southern and Western Regions were willing to delegate decision-making to the administration and instructional staff. Within this same area, respondents from districts with less than 5,000 pupils and those representing rural or small town school systems, reported that responsibility should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. Those respondents from the Pacific, Central, and Northeast Regions, of urban and suburban classification and those from more than 5,000 pupil enrollment districts reported that decision-making responsibility should be retained by the board. In the area of expenditures for school operation respondents from all regions indicated that delegation of responsibility should be retained by the board (see Table 32).

Within the area of education objectives, respondents across all levels of income reported that they were willing to delegate decision-making responsibility to the community. In the area of

Table 32

Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Decision-Making Responsibility
in Selected Areas by Demographic Variables

Areas/Demographic Variables	Region	Enrollment	Classification
1. Education Objectives			
a) Community	NS	ND	ND
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	NS	--	--
c) Board	NS	--	--
2. Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools			
a) Community	NS	NS	Urban, Suburban, Rural, Small Town
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	NS	NS	
c) Board	NS	NS	Other
3. Curriculum Evaluation			
a) Community	Central, Pacific, Western	Less than 5,000 Pupils	Rural and Small Town
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	Southern	--	--
c) Board	Northeast	More than 5,000 Pupils	Urban, Suburban, and Other
4. Local Tax Rates			
a) Community	NS	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	NS	NS	NS
c) Board	NS	NS	NS
5. Student Discipline			
a) Community	--	--	--
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	Southern & Western	Less than 5,000 Pupils	Rural & Small Town
c) Board	Pacific, Central, Northeast	More than 5,000 Pupils	Urban, Suburban, and Other
6. Expenditures for School Operation			
a) Community	--	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	--	NS	NS
c) Board	Pacific, Central, Southern, Western, Northeast	NS	NS

NS = Not statistically significant

ND = No difference from national profile although statistical significance (p. 01) was found.

-- = Empty Cell.

construction, renovation, or closing of schools, none of the variables were statistically significant. In the area of curriculum evaluation those respondents with more than a high school education; those with incomes from 0 to \$60,000 as well as those who indicated occupations except retired reported that decision-making responsibility should be delegated to the community. Within the same area, those respondents with less than a high school education and those who indicated they were retired reported that decision-making should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff. Also within the same area, those respondents with a college or advanced degree and those with an income level 'over \$60,000' recommended that decision-making be retained by the board.

Within the area of local tax rates, those respondents with less than a high school education suggested that decision-making be delegated to the community whereas those in the post-high-school and advanced degree categories believed that decision-making should be retained by the board. In the area of student discipline, those respondents with high school education or less; with an income level between 0 and \$30,000 believed that decision-making should be delegated to the administration and instructional staff and those respondents with more than a high school education and/or an income level over \$30,000 reported that decision-making should be retained by the board. In the area of expenditures for school operation respondents across all levels of education and race reported that decision-making responsibility should be retained by the board (see Table 33).

Table 33
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Decision-Making Responsibility
in Selected Areas by Personal Variables

Areas/Personal Variables	Education	Income	Race	Occupation
1. Education Objectives				
a) Community	NS	ND	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	NS	--	NS	NS
c) Board	NS	--	NS	NS
2. Construction, Renovation, & Closing of Schools				
a) Community	NS	NS	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	NS	NS	NS	NS
c) Board	NS	NS	NS	NS
3. Curriculum Evaluation				
a) Community	More than High School	Up to \$60,000	NS	All other Levels
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	Less than High School	--	NS	Retired
c) Board	College & Advanced	Over \$60,000	NS	--
4. Local Tax Rates				
a) Community	High School or Less	NS	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	--	NS	NS	NS
c) Board	Post High School & Advanced	NS	NS	NS
5. Student Discipline				
a) Community	--	--	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	High School or Less	Up to \$30,000	NS	NS
c) Board	High School to Adv.	Over \$30,000	NS	NS
6. Expenditures for School Operation				
a) Community	--	NS	NS	NS
b) Administration & Instructional Staff	--	NS	NS	NS
c) Board	ND	NS	ND	NS

NS = Not statistically significant

ND = No difference from national profile although statistical significance (p. .01) was found.

-- = Empty Cell

Conclusions

From this study there has emerged a national profile of community involvement. School board member respondents reported that the community should be involved, is involved, and should receive delegated decision-making responsibility in the following areas: education objectives; construction, renovation, or closing of schools; curriculum evaluation; determination of local tax rates; student discipline; expenditures for school operation.

The differences across demographic and personal variables related to community involvement were few. Only in the areas of student discipline and expenditures for school operation were differences evident. Within the area of student discipline respondents from rural districts, the Central Region and those serving schools with enrollments of less than 1,000 pupils did not want community involvement. Similar responses came from respondents with less than a high school education, those who reported belonging to the skilled occupational category and those having served more than seven years on the board.

In the area of expenditures for school operation respondents from school districts with less than 1,000 pupils and those from the Western Region reported that they did not want community involvement. In addition, respondents with less than a high school education and those belonging to the skilled and managerial occupations were also not supportive of community involvement.

The differences between demographic - personal variables and the delegation of decision-making responsibility to the community were more complex. Within the area of education objectives all levels of enrollment and classification of school districts reported in favor of delegation of responsibility. These respondents comprise all levels of income. In the area of construction, renovation or closing of schools respondents from urban, suburban, rural and small town districts all favored delegation of responsibility to the community. The personal variables in this area were not significant. In the area of curriculum evaluation respondents from the Central, Pacific, and Western Regions, those from districts of less than 5,000 pupils and those in rural or small town locations reported favorably toward delegation of responsibility. These respondents reported education levels between a high school and advanced college degree, an income level from 0 to \$60,000, and indicated all occupational categories except retired. In the area of local tax rates, the demographic variables were not significant. However, only those respondents with a high school education or less favored the delegation of decision-making responsibility. In the area of student discipline there was no delegation of decision-making responsibility to the community. The personal variables were not significant. In the area of expenditures for school operation neither the demographic nor the personal variables were significant.

Congruency of Respondent's Responses

Most of the respondents, 977, or 85.8%, reported that their responses were either very much the same or somewhat the same as other board members from their district. Only 117, or 10.3% reported that their responses were somewhat different from other board members and only 20, or 1.8% believed that their responses were likely to be different (see Table 34).

Recommendations for Further Study

Based upon the results and conclusions of this study of the attitudes of school board members and the relationship that exists between attitude and certain personal and demographic variables, the following recommendations are made for further study:

The study was limited to a nationwide sample of school board members who are subscribers to The American School Board Journal. As such, it cannot be assured that the population studied reflects the same characteristics as the population of school board members who have not subscribed to the Journal. A more comprehensive nationwide sample would result in more accurate information about school board members' attitude in this critical area.

Since it was not possible to assess the degree of community advisory group involvement due to a yes-no response mode, a follow-up study should investigate this aspect.

Table 34
Congruency of Respondent's Responses

Category	Frequency	Percent
Very Much the Same	311	27.3
Somewhat the Same	666	58.5
Somewhat Different	117	10.3
Very Different	20	1.8
No Response	24	2.1
Total	1,138	100.0

Since this study did not investigate the assessment of delegation of responsibility to the administration, a follow-up study should investigate this aspect. This recommendation for further study is being made because some of the respondents wrote in 'administration' as a viable alternative category for delegation of responsibility. Information gathered by the questionnaire (question No. 19) concerning Superintendent and Board responsibility showed that the areas of responsibility designated for the Superintendent were the same as those delegated to the write-in category of administration, with the exception of ability grouping, student progress and textbook selection which were delegated to teachers (see Appendix I for further details concerning Superintendent/Board responsibility).

The respondents in this study identified six major areas of community involvement, however, no attempt was made to ascertain whether the influence of community involvement bore positive or negative results. This aspect should be pursued in a follow-up study.

Researcher's Commentary

A review of the literature has shown that the community and community advisory groups should be involved in educational issues. Furthermore, community advisory groups should be delegated decision-making responsibility. The school board member respondents in this study confirmed that there should be community involvement and delegated responsibility in the areas of construction, renovation or closing of schools, education objectives, local tax rates, curriculum evaluation, expenditures for school operation, and student discipline. Noteworthy is the amazing consistency across these areas of involvement and the fact that 20% to 30% fewer respondents reported actual involvement or willingness to delegate decision-making responsibility than in the areas of desired involvement. This study emphasizes the point that school board members should pay more attention to and provide formal structures for involving community advisory groups. If school board members really believe in community involvement with delegated responsibility, mechanisms with the proper legal requirements should be created to make community involvement and delegated responsibility a reality.

The respondents, themselves, emphasized the importance of community involvement in this study (see Appendix J). They identified lack of parental interest as their third choice of most pressing concerns. In the 1980 and 1981 American School Board Journal - Virginia Tech Survey, public apathy was ranked as their sixth concern. It can be affirmed that school board members, if they desire community involvement, must provide a mechanism through which community

power can operate. Yet school board members who were elected to assume decision-making power have assumed that power in all areas directly related to their designated realm of authority. Even in areas where they express desired community control, delegation appears to be made with extreme caution.

Bibliography

- Berman, Jackie, Roberta Hughey and Joy Sovde. "School Council Legislation Executive Summary." Citizen Action in Education, 7:7. November, 1980.
- Berube, Maurice R. and Marilyn Gittell. Confrontation at Ocean Hill - Brownsville. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1969.
- Bunstead, Richard A. "One Massachusetts School System Adapts to Proposition 2 1/2." Phi Delta Kappan, 62:721-725. June, 1981.
- Cahn, Edgar S. and Barry A. Passett. Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Carol, Lila N. "Court-Mandated Citizen Participation in School Desegregation." Phi Delta Kappan, 59:171-173, November, 1977.
- Citizen Coalition on South Carolina School Financing. The South Carolina Education Finance Act of 1977. Reprinted by South Carolina Department of Education.
- Cook, Nancy C. "The State of the Art of Community Education in South Carolina: The Historical Basis and Current Status." Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1977.
- _____. Citizen Participation Issues, Research Report 79-103. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1979.
- Davies, Don and others. Federal and State Report on Citizen Participation in the Schools. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979.
- _____. Sharing the Power? A Report on the Status of School Councils in the 1970's. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1977.
- Deshler, Betty and John L. Erlich. "Citizen Involvement: Evolution in the Revolution." Phi Delta Kappan, 54:173-175. November, 1972.

- Dodge, Harold W. "A National Study of the Attitude of School Board Members Toward Reduction of Programs and Services." Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981.
- Fantini, Mario D. The People and their Schools: Community Participation. Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana. Fastback Series No. 62, 1975.
- Fantini, Mario D., Marilyn Gittell and Richard Mogot. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Gallup, George H. "The 13th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 62:33-47. September, 1981.
- Gary, L. R. Educational Research, Competencies for Analysis and Population. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1976.
- Gittell, Marilyn and others. Citizen Organization: Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979.
- _____. Local Control in Education, Three Demonstration School Districts in New York City. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.
- Glueck, William F. Personnel: A Diagnostic Approach. Dallas, Texas: Business Publications, Inc., 1978.
- Granat, Diana. Perspectives on Parent Participation in Schools. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Ford Foundation Fellow in Educational Journalism, 1979.
- Grant, Carl A. Community Participation in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.
- Hamlin, Herbert M. Citizens' Committees in the Public Schools. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1952.
- Henry, Nelson A. The Community School: The 52nd Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Hofstrand, Richard K. and Lloyd J. Phipps. Advisory Councils for Education, A Handbook. Urbana, Illinois: Rurban Educational Development Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1971.

- Huguenin, Kathleen, Ross Zerchykov and Don Davies. Narrowing the Gap Between Interest and Practice: A Report to Policy-Makers on Community Organizations and School Decisionmaking. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979.
- Hull, J. H. Lay Advisory Committees to Boards of Education in the U. S. Pasadena, California: California Association of School Administrators, 1949.
- Iannacone, Laurence and Frank Lutz. Politics, Power, and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970.
- Kaplan, Michael H. and Robert D. Tune. "Citizen in Public Education: Five Levels of Participation." Community Educational Journal, 6:(3) 14- . December, 1978.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Krebs, Alfred H. Organizing and Working with Departmental Advisory Councils in the Public Schools. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Lopate, Carol and others. Some Effects of Parent and Community Participation on Public Education. ERIC-IRCO Urban Disadvantaged Series, No. 3. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, February, 1969.
- Mann, Dale. School Control in Urban Neighborhood Schools: An Interpretative Essay and Bibliography. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Grant No. OEG0-72-4401, September, 1973.
- Martin, Donald L. "School Community Advisory Councils and Their Relationship to School Decision-making." Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974.
- Mouly, George J. The Science of Educational Research. 2nd Edition: Litton Educational Publishing, Inc., 1970.
- Oldham, Neild B. Citizen Advisory Committee, Current Trends in School Policies and Programs. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1973.

- Ornstein, Allan C. "Decentralization and Community Participation Policy of Big School Systems." Phi Delta Kappan, 62:255-257. December, 1980.
- Pace, Mark. "A National Study of the Attitude of School Board Members Toward Vocational Education." Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981.
- Pavolko, Ronald M. Sociology of Education. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1969.
- Pipho, Chris. "Rich States, Poor States." Phi Delta Kappan, 66:722-723. June, 1981.
- Popham, W. James. Advising Schools: A Handbook for Concerned Citizens. Los Angeles, California: Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1977.
- Pumphry, Willard. "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Emerging Middle-Class Area in the Los Angeles City School District." Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971.
- Register, Wray. Proceedings of the First Statewide Conference on Citizen Participation in Education. Florida Education Council, Florida School Board Association, Florida Department of Education, March 21-22, 1980.
- Rowell, J. Cy. "The Five Rights of Parents." Phi Delta Kappan, 62: 441-443. February, 1981.
- Ryan, Charlotte. The Open Partnership, Equality in Running the Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.
- Sax, Gilbert. Foundations of Educational Research. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.
- Sinclair, Robert L. and others. A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1981.
- Stanton, Jim and others. Overcoming Barriers to School Council Effectiveness. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1979.

- Stanwick, Mary Ellen. Patterns of Participation: Report of a National Survey of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1975.
- Sumption, Merle R. and Yvonne Engstrom. School-Community Relations: A New Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Talmage, Harriet and Allan C. Ornstein. "School Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Community Participation: Advisement Versus Controls." The Journal of Educational Administration, 14:162-175. October, 1976.
- Tisdale, G. K., "A Survey of Organizational Structure and Operational Patterns of School Community Advisory Councils in Elementary School of the Los Angeles Unified District." Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971.
- Turlington, Ralph. Proceedings of the First Statewide Conference on Citizen Participation in Education. Florida: State Department of Education, March 21-22, 1980.
- Tuttle, Edward M. School Board Leadership in America. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958.
- Underwood, Kenneth E., James C. Fortune, and Harold W. Dodge. "Your Portrait: School Boards have a Brand-New Look." The American School Board Journal, 169:17-20. January, 1982.
- Underwood, Kenneth E., Lawrence McCluskey and George R. Umberger. "A Profile of the School Board Member Today." The American School Board Journal, 165:23-27. October, 1978.
- Underwood, Kenneth E., Wayne P. Thomas, and Mark Pace. "Your Portrait: Who you are, Region by Region." The American School Board Journal, 168:20-25, 39. January, 1981.
- Underwood, Kenneth E., Wayne P. Thomas, Tony Cooke, and Shirley Underwood. "Portrait of the American School Board Member." The American School Board Journal, 167:23-29. January, 1980.
- Weinstein, Shelly and Douglas E. Mitchell. Public Testimony on Public Schools. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- Wiersma, William. Research Methods in Education. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.
- Zeigler, L. Harmon and M. Kent Jennings with G. Wayne Peek. Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1974.

APPENDIX A
Cover Letter and Questionnaire

The American School Board Journal

FOUNDED 1891

1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20007

(202) 337-7666

Dear Colleague:

Knowledge is our mutual business, and the accompanying questionnaire has been carefully designed to elicit information that will increase the effectiveness of school board members around the U.S.

Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey. A self-addressed, postage-paid envelope has been included for your convenience.

The results of this nationwide survey will be published in an early issue of The American School Board Journal. We're grateful for your important help.

Cordially,

The Editors

NATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE ON
ATTITUDES OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

This survey is intended to measure how school board members feel about school/community cooperation and board/superintendent relations. There are three parts to this survey. Part I is concerned with demographic information; part II, with personal information; and part III, with school/community cooperation and board/superintendent relations. This survey form will require no more than ten or fifteen minutes to complete. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

PART I - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: PLEASE RESPOND WITH THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION.

1. In what state is your school system? _____
2. Describe your school district's student population by checking ONE appropriate category:
 ___ less than 1,000; ___ 1,000-4,999; ___ 5,000-9,999; ___ 10,000-24,999; ___ more than 25,000.
3. Describe the community your school district serves by checking ONE appropriate category:
 ___ urban, ___ suburban, ___ rural, ___ small town, ___ other.
4. How many members of your board are ___ men, ___ women?
5. Are members of your board ___ elected, ___ appointed?
6. From the following list, please RANK THE FIRST THREE most pressing concerns in your school district:

___ Integration/busing	___ Pupils' lack of interest/truancy
___ Use of drugs	___ Poor curriculum/poor standards
___ Declining enrollment	___ Difficulty of getting good teachers
___ Large schools/overcrowding	___ Parents' lack of interest
___ Teachers' lack of interest	___ Lack of respect for other students/teachers
___ Lack of discipline	___ Lack of proper financial support
___ Crime/vandalism	

PART II - PERSONAL INFORMATION

Directions: PLEASE RESPOND WITH THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION.

7. Are you ___ male, ___ female?
8. Are you ___ Afro-American, ___ Anglo-American, ___ Hispanic, ___ American Indian,
 ___ Oriental, ___ Other (please specify) _____
9. Age: ___ under 25, ___ 26-35, ___ 36-40, ___ 41-50, ___ 51-60, ___ over 60.

10. What is your highest educational attainment?
 ___ less than high school graduate, ___ high school graduate, ___ post-high school training
 ___ four year college degree, ___ advanced college degree.
11. How many years have you served on a school board? _____
12. What is your current occupation? _____
13. Are you married? ___ Yes, ___ No.
14. What is your family income?
 ___ less than \$20,000; ___ \$20,000-\$29,999; ___ \$30,000-\$39,999; ___ \$40,000-\$49,999;
 ___ \$50,000-\$59,999; ___ more than \$60,000.

PART III - SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COOPERATION

15. Question: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE FOLLOWING GROUPS INVOLVED IN EDUCATIONAL ISSUES
 IN YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT?

Response: Check only <u>ONE</u> response per category.	Heavy Involvement	Moderate Involvement	No Involvement
A) Parent groups (PTA, etc.).	_____	_____	_____
B) Business leaders.	_____	_____	_____
C) Community leaders (other elected officials).	_____	_____	_____
D) Civic groups (Kiwanis, Junior League, etc.).	_____	_____	_____
E) Labor groups.	_____	_____	_____
F) Church groups.	_____	_____	_____
G) Special-interest advocacy groups (NAACP, Child Welfare Advocates, etc.).	_____	_____	_____
H) Federal or state mandated groups (for Title I, Special Education, etc.).	_____	_____	_____

16. Question: SHOULD COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUPS BE INVOLVED IN MAKING DECISIONS FOR YOUR
 SCHOOLS IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

Response: Check only <u>ONE</u> response per category.	Yes	No
A) Curriculum evaluation.	_____	_____
B) Student discipline.	_____	_____
C) Expenditures for school operation.	_____	_____
D) Ability grouping of students in classes.	_____	_____

	Yes	No
E) Preparation of state and federal grant proposals.	_____	_____
F) Hiring of teachers.	_____	_____
G) Development of the schools' education objectives.	_____	_____
H) Resolving disputes between students and school personnel.	_____	_____
I) Determination of local tax rates for schools.	_____	_____
J) Initiation and approval of new courses.	_____	_____
K) Initiation and approval of student testing programs.	_____	_____
L) Evaluation of school administrators.	_____	_____
M) Reporting on student progress.	_____	_____
N) Selection of textbooks.	_____	_____
O) Hiring of school administrators.	_____	_____
P) Organization of instructional program (open versus self-contained classrooms, class size, etc.).	_____	_____
Q) Evaluation of teachers.	_____	_____
R) Construction, renovation or closing of schools.	_____	_____
S) Tenure and promotion of school personnel (teachers, principals, and superintendent).	_____	_____
T) Negotiations and collective bargaining process.	_____	_____

17. Question: ARE COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUPS NOW INVOLVED IN MAKING DECISIONS FOR YOUR SCHOOLS IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

Response: Check only <u>ONE</u> response per category.	Yes	No
A) Curriculum evaluation.	_____	_____
B) Student discipline.	_____	_____
C) Expenditures for school operation.	_____	_____
D) Ability grouping of students in classes.	_____	_____
E) Preparation of state and federal grant proposals.	_____	_____
F) Hiring of teachers.	_____	_____
G) Development of the schools' education objectives.	_____	_____

	Yes	No
H) Resolving disputes between students and school personnel.	_____	_____
I) Determination of local tax rates for schools.	_____	_____
J) Initiation and approval of new courses.	_____	_____
K) Initiation and approval of student testing programs.	_____	_____
L) Evaluation of school administrators.	_____	_____
M) Reporting on student progress.	_____	_____
N) Selection of textbooks.	_____	_____
O) Hiring of school administrators.	_____	_____
P) Organization of instructional program (open versus self-contained classrooms, class size, etc.).	_____	_____
Q) Evaluation of teachers.	_____	_____
R) Construction, renovation or closing of schools.	_____	_____
S) Tenure and promotion of school personnel (teachers, principals, and superintendent).	_____	_____
T) Negotiations and collective bargaining process.	_____	_____

18. Question: TO WHOM WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO DELEGATE DECISION MAKING IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

Response: Check only <u>ONE</u> response per category.	Community At Large*	Community Advisory Group**	Teachers	No one
A) Curriculum evaluation.	_____	_____	_____	_____
B) Student discipline.	_____	_____	_____	_____
C) Expenditures for school operation.	_____	_____	_____	_____
D) Ability grouping of students in classes.	_____	_____	_____	_____
E) Preparation of state and federal grant proposals.	_____	_____	_____	_____
F) Hiring of teachers.	_____	_____	_____	_____
G) Development of the schools' education objectives.	_____	_____	_____	_____
H) Resolving disputes between students and school personnel.	_____	_____	_____	_____
I) Determination of local tax rates for schools.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Community At Large*	Community Advisory Group**	Teachers	No one
J) Initiation and approval of new courses.	_____	_____	_____	_____
K) Initiation and approval of student testing programs.	_____	_____	_____	_____
L) Evaluation of school administrators.	_____	_____	_____	_____
M) Reporting on student progress.	_____	_____	_____	_____
N) Selection of textbooks.	_____	_____	_____	_____
O) Hiring of school administrators.	_____	_____	_____	_____
P) Organization of instructional program (open versus self-contained classrooms, class size, etc.).	_____	_____	_____	_____
Q) Evaluation of teachers.	_____	_____	_____	_____
R) Construction, renovation or closing of schools.	_____	_____	_____	_____
S) Tenure and promotion of school personnel (teachers, principals, and superintendent).	_____	_____	_____	_____
T) Negotiations and collective bargaining process.	_____	_____	_____	_____

* via public referendums, surveys, etc.

** Community Advisory Group is a formally structured group appointed by the board or required by law.

19. Question: As duly elected (or appointed) school board members, you have final authority on all decisions regarding your schools. But in the following areas, WHO WOULD YOU PREFER HAVE THE LARGEST SHARE OF RESPONSIBILITY -- YOU OR THE SUPERINTENDENT?

Response: Check only <u>ONE</u> response per category.	Board	Superintendent
A) Curriculum evaluation.	_____	_____
B) Student discipline.	_____	_____
C) Expenditures for school operation.	_____	_____
D) Ability grouping of students in classes.	_____	_____
E) Preparation of state and federal grant proposals.	_____	_____
F) Hiring of teachers.	_____	_____
G) Development of schools' education objectives.	_____	_____

	Board	Superintendent
H) Resolving disputes between students and school personnel.	_____	_____
I) Determination of local tax rates for schools.	_____	_____
J) Initiation and approval of new courses.	_____	_____
K) Initiation and approval of student testing programs.	_____	_____
L) Evaluation of school administrators.	_____	_____
M) Reporting on student progress.	_____	_____
N) Selection of textbooks.	_____	_____
O) Hiring of school administrators.	_____	_____
P) Organization of instructional program (open versus self-contained classroom, class size, etc.).	_____	_____
Q) Evaluation of teachers.	_____	_____
R) Construction, renovation or closing of schools.	_____	_____
S) Tenure and promotion of school personnel (teachers, principals, and superintendent).	_____	_____
T) Negotiations and collective bargaining process.	_____	_____

20. Question: TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOUR ANSWERS ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE REFLECT THE OPINIONS OF MOST OTHER MEMBERS OF YOUR SCHOOL BOARD?

Response: Check only ONE response.

Very Much the Same	Somewhat the Same	Somewhat Different	Very Different
_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX B
Tables for Research Question 1

Table R 1-1
Involvement of Parent Groups

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	255	22.4
Moderate	768	67.4
None	111	9.8
No Response	4	0.4
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-2
Involvement of Business Leaders

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	36	3.2
Moderate	610	53.5
None	488	42.9
No Response	4	0.4
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-3
Involvement of Community Leaders

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	40	3.5
Moderate	664	58.3
None	430	37.8
No Response	4	0.4
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-4
Involvement of Civic Groups

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	31	2.7
Moderate	588	51.6
None	515	45.3
No Response	4	0.4
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-5
Involvement of Community Leaders

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	49	4.3
Moderate	187	16.4
None	892	78.4
No Response	10	0.9
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-6
Involvement of Church Groups

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	17	1.5
Moderate	416	36.6
None	698	61.3
No Response	7	0.6
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-7
Involvement of Advocacy Groups

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	51	4.5
Moderate	359	31.5
None	712	62.6
No Response	16	1.4
Total	1138	100.0

Table R 1-8
Involvement of Mandated Groups

Category	Frequency	Percent
Heavy	299	26.3
Moderate	649	57.0
None	177	15.6
No Response	13	1.1
Total	1138	100.0

Appendix C
Tables for Research Question 5

Table R5 - 1

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Curriculum Evaluation
by Delegation of Responsibility in Curriculum Evaluation

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	20 1.8%	344 31.0%	173 15.6%	4 0.4%	203 18.3%	744 67%
No	2 0.2%	59 5.3%	156 14.1%	10 0.9%	139 12.5%	366 33%
Total	22 2.0%	403 36.3%	329 29.6%	14 1.3%	342 30.8%	1110 100%

$\chi^2 = 116.49$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 2

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Student Discipline
by Delegation of Responsibility in Student Discipline

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	33 3.0%	186 16.8%	205 18.5%	4 0.4%	195 17.6%	623 56.2%
No	6 0.5%	24 2.2%	203 18.3%	15 1.4%	237 21.4%	485 43.8%
Total	39 3.5%	210 19.0%	408 36.8%	19 1.7%	432 39.0%	1108 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 139.10$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 3

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Expenditures for School Operation by
Delegation of Responsibility in Expenditures for School Operation

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	102 9.2%	170 15.4%	10 0.9%	0 0.0%	322 29.1%	604 54.6%
No	34 3.1%	45 4.1%	9 0.8%	9 0.8%	406 36.7%	503 45.4%
Total	136 12.3%	215 19.4%	19 1.7%	9 0.8%	728 65.8%	1107 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 117.18$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 4

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Ability Grouping
by Delegation of Responsibility in Ability Grouping

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	4 0.4%	41 3.7%	89 8.0%	3 0.3%	47 4.2%	184 16.5%
No	0 0.0%	34 3.0%	635 56.8%	7 0.6%	257 23.0%	933 83.5%
Total	4 0.4%	75 6.7%	724 64.8%	10 0.9%	304 27.2%	1117 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 110.55$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 5

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in State and Federal Grant Proposals
by Delegation of Responsibility in State and Federal Grant Proposals

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	10 0.9%	166 15.2%	53 4.8%	7 0.6%	103 9.4%	339 31.0%
No	3 0.3%	95 8.7%	151 13.8%	17 1.6%	490 44.7%	756 69.0%
Total	13 1.2%	261 23.8%	204 18.6%	24 2.2%	593 54.2%	1095 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 196.60$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 6

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Hiring of Teachers
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Hiring of Teachers

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	3 0.3%	16 1.5%	2 0.2%	0 0.0%	30 2.7%	51 4.6%
No	1 0.1%	45 4.1%	22 2.0%	25 2.3%	957 86.9%	1050 95.4%
Total	4 0.4%	61 5.5%	24 2.2%	25 2.3%	987 89.6%	1101 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 116.87$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 7

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Education Objectives
by Delegation of Responsibility in Education Objectives

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	90 8.1%	451 40.7%	97 8.8%	3 0.3%	241 21.8%	882 79.7%
No	7 0.6%	44 4.0%	48 4.3%	6 0.5%	120 10.8%	225 20.3%
Total	97 8.8%	495 44.7%	145 13.1%	9 0.8%	361 32.6%	1107 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 114.01$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 8

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Student and School Personnel Disputes
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Student and School Personnel Disputes

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	2 0.2%	57 5.2%	16 1.5%	0 0.0%	45 4.1%	120 10.9%
No	3 0.3%	81 7.4%	97 8.8%	21 1.9%	779 70.8%	981 89.1%
Total	5 0.5%	138 12.5%	113 10.3%	21 1.9%	824 74.8%	1101 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 164.63$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 9

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Local Tax Rates
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Local Tax Rates

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	259 23.9%	174 16.1%	1 0.1%	1 0.1%	199 18.4%	634 58.5%
No	44 4.1%	37 3.4%	3 0.3%	6 0.6%	360 33.2%	450 41.5%
Total	303 28.0%	211 19.5%	4 0.4%	7 0.6%	559 51.6%	1084 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 268.97\%$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 10

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Initiation and Approval of New Courses by
Delegation of Responsibility in Initiation and Approval of New Courses

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	19 1.7%	251 22.9%	89 8.1%	1 0.1%	143 13.0%	503 45.9%
No	6 0.5%	120 10.9%	178 16.2%	16 1.5%	274 25.0%	594 54.1%
Total	25 2.3%	371 33.8%	267 24.3%	17 1.5%	417 38.0%	1097 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 130.42$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 11

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Student Testing Program
by Delegation of Responsibility in Student Testing Program

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	6 0.5%	104 9.5%	82 7.5%	2 0.2%	72 6.6%	266 24.3%
No	3 0.3%	74 6.8%	337 30.8%	19 1.7%	395 36.1%	828 75.7%
Total	9 0.8%	178 16.3%	419 38.3%	21 1.9%	467 42.7%	1094 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 149.03$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 12

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Evaluation of Administrators
by Delegation of Responsibility in Evaluation of Administrators

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	18 1.6%	75 6.9%	19 1.7%	2 0.2%	98 9.0%	212 19.4%
No	4 0.4%	34 3.1%	44 4.0%	11 1.0%	789 72.1%	882 80.6%
Total	22 2.0%	109 10.0%	63 5.8%	13 1.2%	887 81.1%	1094 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 269.57$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 13

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Student Progress
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Student Progress

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	8 0.7%	56 5.1%	151 13.8%	2 0.2%	58 5.3%	275 25.1%
No	1 0.1%	20 1.8%	554 50.6%	12 1.1%	232 21.2%	819 74.9%
Total	9 0.8%	76 6.9%	705 64.4%	14 1.3%	290 26.5%	1094 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 124.74$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 14

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Selection of Textbooks
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Selection of Textbooks

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	24 2.2%	201 18.3%	102 9.3%	1 0.1%	85 7.7%	413 37.6%
No	2 0.2%	57 5.2%	380 34.6%	10 0.9%	237 21.6%	686 62.4%
Total	26 2.4%	258 23.5%	482 43.9%	11 1.0%	322 29.3%	1099 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 288.42$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 15

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Hiring of Administrators
by Delegation of Responsibility in Hiring of Administrators

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	6 0.5%	70 6.4%	2 0.2%	3 0.3%	130 11.9%	211 19.3%
No	2 0.2%	41 3.8%	11 1.0%	10 0.9%	816 74.8%	485 80.7%
Total	8 0.7%	111 10.2%	13 1.2%	13 1.2%	946 86.7%	1091 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 171.17$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 16

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Organization of Instruction
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Organization of Instruction

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	25 2.3%	173 16.0%	63 5.8%	3 0.3%	158 14.6%	422 39.0%
No	3 0.3%	104 9.6%	158 14.6%	14 1.3%	382 35.3%	661 61.0%
Total	28 2.6%	277 25.6%	221 20.4%	17 1.6%	540 49.9%	1083 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 128.88$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 17

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Evaluation of Teachers
by Delegation of Responsibility in Evaluation of Teachers

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	11 1.0%	59 5.4%	4 0.4%	4 0.4%	87 8.0%	165 15.2%
No	5 0.5%	44 4.0%	29 2.7%	21 1.9%	823 75.7%	922 84.8%
Total	16 1.5%	103 9.5%	33 3.0%	25 2.3%	910 83.7%	1087 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 200.04$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 18

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
 Involvement in Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools
 by Delegation of Responsibility in Construction, Renovation or Closing of School

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	230 20.9%	375 34.1%	3 0.3%	5 0.5%	250 22.7%	863 78.5%
No	14 1.3%	39 3.5%	1 0.1%	2 0.2%	181 16.5%	237 21.5%
Total	244 22.2%	414 37.6%	4 0.4%	7 0.6%	431 39.2%	1100 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 178.94$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 19

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Tenure and Promotion
by Delegation of Responsibility in Tenure and Promotion

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	5 0.5%	30 2.8%	1 0.1%	0 0.0%	59 5.4%	95 8.7%
No	3 0.3%	45 4.1%	9 0.8%	9 0.8%	929 85.2%	995 91.3%
Total	8 0.7%	75 6.9%	10 0.9%	9 0.8%	988 90.6%	1090 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 131.58$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R5 - 20

Percentage of Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Negotiation and Collective Bargaining
by Delegation of Responsibility in Negotiation and Collective Bargaining

Category/Response	Community At Large No/%	Community Advisory Group No/%	Teachers No/%	Administration No/%	Board No/%	Total No/%
Yes	4 0.4%	33 3.1%	3 0.3%	1 0.1%	51 4.7%	92 8.5%
No	9 0.8%	36 3.3%	22 2.0%	8 0.7%	914 84.6%	989 91.5%
Total	13 1.2%	69 6.4%	25 2.3%	9 0.8%	965 89.3%	1081 100.0%

$\chi^2 = 158.61$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Appendix D

Table for Research Question 6

Table R6 - 1

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Curriculum Evaluation
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	405 36.2	345 30.9	750 67.1
No	38 3.4	330 29.5	368 32.9
Total	483 39.6	675 60.4	1118 100.0

$\chi^2 = 196.83$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 2

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Discipline
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	208 18.6	423 37.8	631 56.3
No	17 1.5	472 42.1	489 43.7
Total	225 20.1	895 79.9	1120 100.0

$\chi^2 = 149.22$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R6 - 3

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Expenditures
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	272 24.3	342 30.5	614 54.8
No	38 3.4	469 41.8	507 45.2
Total	310 27.7	811 72.3	1121 100.0

$\chi^2 = 188.02$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 4

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Ability Grouping
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	50 4.5	137 12.2	187 16.7
No	20 1.8	915 81.6	935 83.3
Total	70 6.2	1052 93.8	1122 100.0

$\chi^2 = 161.20$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 5

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Grant Proposals
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	110 9.8	232 20.8	342 30.6
No	25 2.2	750 67.1	775 69.4
Total	135 12.1	982 89.9	1117 100.0

$\chi^2 = 187.01$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 6

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Hiring of Teachers
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	16 1.4	37 3.3	53 4.7
No	6 0.5	1061 94.7	1067 95.3
Total	22 2.0	1098 98.0	1120 100.0

$\chi^2 = 230.14$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 7

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Education Objectives
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	493 44.2	401 35.9	894 80.1
No	22 2.0	200 17.9	222 19.9
Total	515 46.1	601 53.9	1116 100.0

$\chi^2 = 146.43$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 8

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student/Personnel Disputes
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	37 3.3	85 7.6	122 10.9
No	21 1.9	977 87.2	998 89.1
Total	58 5.2	1062 94.8	1120 100.0

$\chi^2 = 176.35$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 9

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Local Tax Rates
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	301 27.3	346 31.4	647 58.7
No	29 2.6	427 38.7	456 41.3
Total	330 29.9	773 70.1	1103 100.0

$\chi^2 = 205.78$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 10

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Initiation and Approval of New
Courses by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	208 18.7	299 26.9	507 45.7
No	57 5.1	546 49.2	603 54.3
Total	265 23.9	845 76.1	1110 100.0

$\chi^2 = 151.07$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 11

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Testing Program
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	81 7.3	190 17.0	271 24.3
No	27 2.4	818 73.3	845 75.7
Total	108 9.7	1008 90.3	1116 100.0

$\chi^2 = 167.28$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 12

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Evaluation of Administrators
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	31 2.8	186 16.6	217 19.4
No	9 0.8	894 79.8	903 80.6
Total	40 3.6	1080 96.4	1120 100.0

$\chi^2 = 89.72$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 13

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Progress
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	90 8.1	187 16.8	277 24.9
No	22 2.0	814 73.1	836 75.1
Total	112 10.1	1001 89.9	1113 100.0

$\chi^2 = 204.97$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 14

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Selection of Textbooks
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	230 20.5	197 17.6	427 38.1
No	20 1.8	673 60.1	693 61.9
Total	250 22.3	870 77.7	1120 100.0

$\chi^2 = 395.99$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 15

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Hiring Administrators
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	94 8.4	125 11.1	219 19.5
No	19 1.7	885 78.8	904 80.5
Total	113 10.1	1010 89.9	1123 100.0

$\chi^2 = 324.60$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 16

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Organization of Instruction
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	151 13.6	284 25.6	435 39.2
No	35 3.2	639 57.6	674 60.8
Total	186 16.8	923 83.2	1109 100.0

$\chi^2 = 165.04$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 17

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Evaluation of Teachers
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	21 1.9	143 12.9	164 14.7
No	7 0.6	941 84.6	948 85.3
Total	28 2.5	1084 97.5	1112 100.0

$\chi^2 = 82.93$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R6 - 18

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Construction, Renovation and Closing
of Schools by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	509 45.8	365 32.8	874 78.6
No	26 2.3	212 19.1	238 21.4
Total	535 48.1	577 51.9	1112 100.0

$\chi^2 = 167.74$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6 - 19

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Tenure and Promotion
by Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	14 1.3	82 7.3	96 8.6
No	5 0.4	1017 91.0	1022 91.4
Total	19 1.7	1099 98.3	1118 100.0

$\chi^2 = 104.35$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R6 - 20

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Negotiation and Collective Bargaining
with Status of Involvement

Response	Yes	No	Total
Yes	12 1.1	84 7.6	96 8.6
No	7 0.6	1009 90.7	1016 91.4
Total	19 1.7	1093 98.3	1112 100.0

$\chi^2 = 72.86$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Appendix E
Tables for Research Question 7

Table R7 - 1

Respondent's Attitude toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Curriculum Evaluation by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	164	263	106	113	106	752
	14.6 59.9	23.5 64.6	9.5 70.7	10.1 74.8	9.5 76.3	67.1
No	110	144	44	38	30	369
	9.8 40.1	12.8 35.4	3.9 29.3	3.4 25.2	2.9 23.7	32.9
Total	274	407	150	151	139	1121
	24.4	36.3	13.4	13.5	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 17.88$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0013.

Table R7 - 2

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Discipline by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	163	197	93	81	99	633
	14.6 59.5	17.5 48.3	8.3 62.0	7.2 53.3	8.8 71.2	56.4
No	111	211	57	71	40	490
	9.9 40.5	18.8 51.7	5.1 38.0	6.3 46.7	3.6 28.8	43.6
Total	274	408	150	152	139	1123
	24.4	36.3	13.4	13.5	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 26.92$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7 - 3

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Discipline by Enrollment

Response/Enrollment	Less than 1,000	1,000 - 4,999	5,000- 9,999	10,000- 24,000	More than 25,000	Total
Yes	93 8.2 43.7	301 26.7 54.8	115 10.2 60.5	89 7.9 68.5	39 3.5 83.0	637 56.4
No	120 10.6 56.3	248 22.0 45.2	75 6.6 39.5	41 3.6 31.5	8 0.7 17.0	492 43.6
Total	213 18.9	549 48.6	190 16.8	130 11.5	47 4.2	1129 100.0

$\chi^2 = 37.12$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7 - 4

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Discipline
by Classification of School District

Response/Classification	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Small Town	Other	Total
Yes	80	199	145	180	29	633
	7.1 65.6	17.8 62.0	13.0 46.3	16.1 57.3	2.6 59.2	56.6
No	42	122	168	134	20	486
	3.8 34.4	10.9 38.0	15.0 53.7	12.0 42.7	1.8 40.8	43.4
Total	122	321	313	314	49	1129
	10.9	28.7	28.0	28.1	4.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 21.45$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0003.

Table R7 - 5

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Expenditures for School Operation by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	173	212	86	60	85	616
	15.4	18.9	7.7	5.3	7.6	54.9
	63.1	52.0	57.3	39.5	61.6	
No	101	196	64	92	53	506
	9.0	17.5	5.7	8.2	4.7	45.1
	36.9	48.0	42.7	60.5	38.4	
Total	274	408	150	152	138	1122
	24.4	36.4	13.4	13.5	12.3	100.0

$\chi^2 = 26.40$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7 - 6

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Expenditures for School Operation by Enrollment

Response/Enrollment	Less than 1,000	1,000 - 4,999	5,000- 9,999	10,000- 24,000	More than 25,000	Total
Yes	97	298	107	87	28	617
	8.6	26.4	9.5	7.7	2.5	54.7
	46.0	54.5	56.0	66.4	59.6	
No	114	250	84	44	19	511
	10.1	22.2	7.4	3.9	1.7	45.3
	54.0	45.6	44.0	33.6	40.4	
Total	211	548	191	131	47	1129
	18.7	48.6	16.9	11.6	4.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.35$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0063.

Table R7 - 7

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Ability Grouping by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	57	51	27	23	31	189
	5.1	4.5	2.4	2.0	2.8	16.8
	20.8	12.5	18.0	15.1	22.3	
No	217	358	123	129	108	935
	19.3	31.9	10.9	11.5	9.6	83.2
	79.2	87.5	82.0	84.9	77.7	
Total	274	409	150	152	139	1124
	24.4	36.4	13.3	13.5	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 12.09$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0167.

Table R7 - 8

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Grant Proposals by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	92	99	50	50	52	343
	8.3	8.9	4.5	4.5	4.7	30.8
	33.8	24.3	33.6	33.6	38.2	
No	180	309	99	99	84	771
	16.2	27.7	8.9	8.9	7.5	69.2
	66.2	75.7	66.4	66.4	61.8	
Total	272	408	149	149	136	1114
	24.4	36.6	13.4	13.4	12.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 13.94$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0075.

Table R7 - 9

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Hiring Teachers by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	16	10	4	3	20	53
	1.4	0.9	0.4	0.3	1.8	4.7
	5.9	2.4	2.7	2.0	14.4	
No	255	400	145	147	119	1066
	22.8	35.7	13.0	13.1	10.6	95.3
	94.1	97.6	97.3	98.0	85.6	
Total	271	410	149	150	139	1114
	24.2	36.6	13.3	13.4	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 38.19$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7 - 10

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Education Objectives by Enrollment

Response/Enrollment	Less than 1,000	1,000 - 4,999	5,000- 9,999	10,000- 24,000	More than 25,000	Total
Yes	157	446	151	100	44	898
	14.0	39.7	13.4	8.9	3.9	80.0
	74.1	81.4	80.7	77.5	93.6	
No	55	102	36	29	3	225
	4.9	9.1	3.2	2.6	0.3	20.0
	25.9	18.6	19.3	22.5	6.4	
Total	212	548	187	129	47	1123
	18.9	48.8	16.7	11.5	4.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 11.33$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0231.

Table R7 - 11

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Local Tax Rates by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	143	240	92	79	94	648
	13.0	21.7	8.3	7.2	8.5	58.7
	53.4	58.8	63.4	53.4	69.6	
No	125	168	53	69	41	456
	11.3	15.2	4.8	6.3	3.7	41.3
	46.6	41.2	36.6	46.6	30.4	
Total	268	408	145	148	135	1104
	24.3	37.0	13.1	13.4	12.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 12.89$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0118.

Table R7 - 12

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Initiation and Approval of
New Courses by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	114	168	75	74	81	512
	10.2	15.1	6.7	6.6	7.3	45.9
	41.9	41.3	50.7	49.3	58.7	
No	158	239	73	76	57	603
	14.2	21.4	6.5	6.8	5.1	54.1
	58.1	58.7	49.3	50.7	41.3	
Total	272	407	148	150	138	1115
	24.4	36.5	13.2	13.5	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.41$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0025.

Table R7 - 13

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Selection of Textbooks by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	66	143	73	63	83	428
	5.9	12.8	6.5	5.6	7.4	38.2
	24.1	35.0	49.0	42.0	59.7	
No	208	265	76	87	56	692
	18.6	23.7	6.8	7.8	5.0	61.8
	75.9	65.0	51.0	58.0	40.3	
Total	274	408	149	149	139	1120
	24.5	36.4	13.3	13.4	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 60.34$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7 - 14

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Selection of Textbooks by Enrollment

Response/Enrollment	Less than 1,000	1,000 - 4,999	5,000- 9,999	10,000- 24,000	More than 25,000	Total
Yes	68	187	80	66	27	428
	6.0	16.6	7.1	5.9	2.4	38.0
	32.2	34.1	42.1	50.8	57.4	
No	143	361	110	64	20	698
	12.7	32.1	9.8	5.7	1.8	62.0
	67.8	65.9	57.9	49.2	42.6	
Total	211	548	190	130	47	1126
	18.7	48.7	16.9	11.5	4.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 24.38$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0001.

Table R7 - 15

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Hiring of Administrators by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	67	69	16	23	44	219
	6.0	6.1	1.4	2.0	3.9	19.5
	24.5	16.8	10.7	15.3	31.7	
No	207	341	133	127	95	903
	18.4	30.4	11.9	11.3	8.5	80.5
	75.5	83.2	89.3	84.7	68.3	
Total	274	410	149	150	139	1122
	24.4	36.5	13.3	13.4	12.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 28.15$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7 - 16

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Organization of Instruction by Enrollment

Response/Enrollment	Less than 1,000	1,000 - 4,999	5,000- 9,999	10,000- 24,000	More than 25,000	Total
Yes	70	201	84	59	25	439
	6.3	18.0	7.5	5.3	2.2	39.3
	33.5	37.0	44.7	45.7	53.2	
No	139	342	104	70	22	677
	12.5	30.6	9.3	6.3	2.0	60.7
	66.5	63.0	55.3	54.3	46.8	
Total	209	543	188	131	47	1116
	18.7	48.7	16.8	11.6	4.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 12.46$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0142.

Table R7 - 17

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Organization of Instruction
By Classification of School District

Response/Region	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Small Town	Other	Total
Yes	45	154	114	105	18	436
	4.1	13.9	10.3	9.5	1.6	39.4
	37.5	48.4	37.0	33.7	37.5	
No	75	164	194	207	30	670
	6.8	14.8	17.5	18.7	2.7	60.6
	62.5	51.6	63.0	66.3	62.5	
Other	120	318	308	312	48	1106
	10.8	28.8	27.8	28.2	4.3	100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.15$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0028.

Table R7 - 18

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Construction, Renovation, or
Closing of Schools by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	218	331	100	116	116	881
	19.5 79.9	29.6 80.9	8.9 67.6	10.4 77.3	10.4 84.1	78.8
No	55	78	48	34	22	237
	4.9 20.1	7.0 19.1	4.3 32.4	3.0 22.7	2.0 15.9	21.2
Total	273	409	148	150	138	1118
	24.4	36.6	13.2	13.4	12.3	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.95$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0048.

Table R7 - 19

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Tenure and Promotion by Region

Response/Region	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific	Total
Yes	26	33	5	13	20	97
	2.3 9.5	3.0 8.0	0.4 3.4	1.2 8.7	1.8 14.7	8.7
No	247	377	143	136	116	1019
	22.1 90.5	33.8 92.0	12.8 96.6	12.2 91.3	10.4 85.3	91.3
Total	273	410	148	149	136	1116
	24.5	36.7	13.3	13.4	12.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 11.91$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0180.

APPENDIX F

Tables for Research Question 8

Table R8-1

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Curriculum Evaluation
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	9	97	154	229	267	756
	0.8	8.6	13.7	20.4	23.7	67.2
	64.3	62.6	61.4	67.2	73.4	
No	5	58	97	112	97	369
	0.4	5.2	8.6	10.0	8.6	32.8
	35.7	37.4	38.6	32.8	26.6	
Total	14	155	251	341	364	1125
	1.2	13.8	22.3	30.3	32.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 11.70$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0198.

Table R8 - 2

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Curriculum Evaluation
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	121	228	239	166	754
	10.8	20.3	21.3	14.8	67.2
	73.7	71.7	62.9	64.1	
No	44	90	141	93	368
	3.9	8.0	12.6	8.3	32.8
	26.7	28.3	37.1	35.9	
Total	165	318	380	259	1122
	14.7	28.3	33.9	23.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 10.07$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0180.

Table R8 - 3

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Student Discipline
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	4	71	137	189	236	637
	0.4	6.3	12.2	16.8	20.9	56.5
	28.6	45.5	54.6	55.3	64.8	
No	10	85	114	153	128	490
	0.9	7.5	10.1	13.6	11.4	43.5
	71.4	54.5	45.4	44.7	35.2	
Total	14	156	251	342	364	1127
	1.2	13.8	22.3	30.3	32.3	100.0

$\chi^2 = 22.99$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0001.

Table R8 - 4

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Discipline
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	104	207	203	122	636
	9.3	18.4	18.1	10.9	56.6
	63.0	64.9	53.3	47.1	
No	61	112	178	137	488
	5.4	10.0	15.8	12.2	43.4
	37.0	35.1	46.7	52.9	
Total	165	319	381	259	1124
	14.7	28.4	33.9	23.0	100.0

$\chi^2 = 22.92$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8 - 5

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student
Discipline by Sex

Response/Sex	Male	Female	Total
Yes	414 36.6 53.5	225 19.9 63.2	639 56.5
No	360 31.9 46.5	131 11.6 36.8	491 43.5
Total	774 68.5	356 31.5	1130 100.0

$\chi^2 = 9.36$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0022.

Table R8 -6

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Student Discipline by Race

Response/Race	Afro-American	Anglo-American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Yes	19	562	15	9	2	26	633
	1.7	50.4	1.3	0.8	0.2	2.3	56.8
	76.0	55.3	71.4	100.0	66.7	65.0	
No	6	454	6	0	1	14	481
	0.5	40.8	0.5	0	0.1	1.3	43.2
	24.0	44.7	28.6	0.0	33.3	35.0	
Total	25	1016	21	9	3	40	1114
	2.2	91.2	1.9	0.8	0.3	3.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.56$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0124.

Table R8 - 7

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Student Discipline by Occupation

Response/Occupation	Professional	Managerial	Clerical - Sales	Skilled	Semi - Skilled	Housewife	Retired	Total
Yes	201	229	36	20	1	110	32	629
	18.1	20.6	3.2	1.8	0.1	9.9	2.9	56.6
	61.3	53.3	52.9	40.8	50.0	64.3	50.8	
No	127	201	32	29	1	61	31	482
	11.4	18.1	2.9	2.6	0.1	5.5	2.8	43.4
	38.7	46.7	47.1	59.2	50.0	35.7	49.2	
Total	328	430	68	49	2	171	63	1111
	29.5	38.7	6.1	4.4	0.2	15.4	5.7	100.0

$\chi^2 = 15.28$ with 6 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0182.

Table R8 - 8

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Expenditures for School Operation
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	7	76	128	175	230	616
	0.6	6.7	11.4	15.5	20.4	54.7
	50.0	49.4	50.6	51.5	63.0	
No	7	78	125	165	135	510
	0.6	6.9	11.1	14.7	12.0	45.3
	50.0	50.6	49.4	48.5	37.0	
Total	14	154	253	340	365	1126
	1.2	13.7	22.5	30.2	32.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 15.24$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0042.

Table R8 - 9

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Expenditures for School Operation by Occupation

Response/Occupation	Professional	Managerial	Clerical - Sales	Skilled	Semi - Skilled	Housewife	Retired	Total
Yes	189	213	42	19	1	96	46	606
	17.0	19.2	3.8	1.7	0.1	8.6	4.1	54.6
	58.2	49.7	60.9	38.8	50.0	56.1	70.8	
No	136	216	27	30	1	75	19	504
	12.3	19.5	2.4	2.7	0.1	6.8	1.7	45.4
	41.8	50.3	39.1	61.2	50.0	43.9	29.2	
Total	325	429	69	49	2	171	65	1110
	29.3	38.6	6.2	4.4	0.2	15.4	5.9	100.0

$\chi^2 = 18.98$ with 6 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0042.

Table R8 - 10

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Ability Grouping
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	37	63	58	32	190
	3.3	5.6	5.2	2.8	16.9
	22.4	19.8	15.2	12.3	
No	128	255	323	229	935
	11.4	22.7	28.7	20.4	83.1
	77.6	80.2	84.8	87.7	
Total	165	318	381	261	1125
	14.7	28.3	33.9	23.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 10.27$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0164.

Table R8 - 11

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Grant Proposals
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	7	40	63	96	136	342
	0.6	3.6	5.6	8.6	12.2	30.6
	50.0	26.0	25.2	28.5	37.5	
No	7	114	187	241	227	776
	0.6	10.2	16.7	21.6	20.3	69.4
	50.0	74.0	74.8	71.5	62.5	
Total	14	154	250	337	363	1118
	1.2	13.8	22.4	30.1	32.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.23$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0027.

Table R8 - 12

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Grant Proposals
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	68	110	110	53	341
	6.1	9.9	9.9	4.8	30.6
	42.0	35.0	28.9	20.5	
No	94	204	271	205	774
	8.4	18.3	24.3	18.4	69.4
	58.0	65.0	71.1	79.5	
Total	162	314	381	258	1115
	14.5	28.2	34.2	23.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 25.61$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8 - 13

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Grant Proposals by Race

Response/Race	Afro-American	Anglo-American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Yes	13	292	10	4	2	19	340
	1.2	26.4	0.9	0.4	0.2	1.7	30.7
	54.2	28.9	47.6	44.4	66.7	47.5	
No	11	717	11	5	1	21	766
	1.0	64.8	1.0	0.5	0.1	1.9	69.3
	45.8	71.1	52.4	55.6	33.3	52.5	
Total	24	1009	21	9	3	40	1106
	2.2	91.2	1.9	0.9	0.3	3.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 18.42$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0025.

Table R8 - 14

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Hiring Teachers
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	15	20	12	7	54
	1.3	1.8	1.1	0.6	4.8
	9.2	6.3	3.1	2.7	
No	148	296	369	253	1066
	13.2	26.4	32.9	22.6	95.2
	90.8	93.7	96.9	97.3	
Total	163	316	381	260	1120
	14.6	28.2	34.0	23.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 13.27$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0041.

Table R8 - 15

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Hiring Teachers by Race

Response/Race	Afro-American	Anglo-American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Yes	1	45	2	3	1	2	54
	0.1	4.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	4.9
	4.2	4.4	9.5	33.3	33.3	5.1	
No	23	969	19	6	2	37	1056
	2.1	87.3	1.7	0.5	0.2	3.3	95.1
	95.8	95.6	90.5	66.7	66.7	94.9	
Total	24	1014	21	9	3	39	1110
	2.2	91.4	1.9	0.8	0.3	3.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 22.43$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0004.

Table R8 - 16

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Hiring of Teachers by Age

Response/Age	Under 25	26-35	36-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60	Total
Yes	2	11	16	14	7	4	54
	0.2	1.0	1.4	1.2	0.6	0.4	4.8
	28.6	10.8	8.0	3.2	2.7	3.3	
No	5	91	184	423	252	117	1072
	0.4	8.1	16.3	37.6	22.4	10.4	95.2
	71.4	89.2	92.0	96.8	97.3	96.7	
Total	7	102	200	437	259	121	1126
	0.6	9.1	17.8	38.8	23.0	10.7	100.0

$\chi^2 = 26.68$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0001.

Table R8 - 17

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Education Objectives
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	11	111	190	273	311	896
	1.0	9.9	16.9	24.4	27.7	79.9
	78.6	71.6	76.0	80.8	85.4	
No	3	44	60	65	53	225
	0.3	3.9	5.4	5.8	4.7	20.1
	21.4	28.4	24.0	19.2	14.6	
Total	14	155	250	338	364	1121
	1.2	13.8	22.3	30.2	32.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.14$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0028.

Table R8 - 18

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Education Objectives by Sex

Response/Sex	Male	Female	Total
Yes	602 53.6 78.1	297 26.4 84.1	899 80.0
No	169 15.0 21.9	56 5.0 15.9	225 20.0
Total	771 68.6	353 31.4	1124 100.0

$\chi^2 = 5.55$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0229.

Table R8 - 19

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student and School
Personnel Disputes by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	23	44	40	17	124
	2.1	3.9	3.6	1.5	11.1
	14.2	13.9	10.5	6.5	
No	139	273	341	244	997
	12.4	24.4	30.4	21.8	88.9
	85.8	86.1	89.5	93.5	
Total	162	317	381	261	1121
	14.5	28.3	34.0	23.3	100.0

$\chi^2 = 9.79$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0204.

Table R8 - 20

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Student - School Personnel
Disputes by Race

Response/Race	Afro-American	Anglo-American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Yes	7	104	2	3	0	7	123
	0.6	9.4	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.6	11.1
	29.2	10.2	10.0	33.3	0.0		
No	17	911	18	6	3	33	988
	1.5	82.0	1.6	0.5	0.3	3.0	88.9
	70.8	89.8	90.0	66.7	100.0		
Total	24	1015	20	9	3	40	1111
	2.2	91.4	1.8	0.8	0.3	3.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 15.29$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0092.

Table R8 - 21

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Initiation and Approval of New Courses
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	7	77	93	151	186	514
	0.6	6.9	8.3	13.5	16.6	45.9
	50.0	50.3	37.1	44.7	51.2	
No	7	76	158	187	177	605
	0.6	6.8	14.1	16.7	15.8	54.1
	50.0	49.7	62.9	55.3	48.8	
Total	14	153	251	338	363	1119
	1.3	13.7	22.4	30.2	32.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 13.59$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0087.

Table R8 - 22

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Initiation and Approval of
New Course by Status

Response/Status	Elected	Appointed	Total
Yes	477	36	513
	42.7	3.2	45.9
	45.0	62.1	
No	583	22	605
	52.1	2.0	54.1
	55.0	37.9	
Total	1060	58	1118
	94.8	5.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 6.45$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0111.

Table R8 - 23

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Student Testing Program
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	54	90	84	46	274
	4.8	8.0	7.5	4.1	24.5
	32.9	28.5	22.1	17.8	
No	110	226	296	213	845
	9.8	20.2	26.5	19.0	75.5
	67.1	71.5	77.9	82.2	
Total	164	316	380	259	1119
	14.7	28.2	34.0	23.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.55$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0009.

Table R8 - 24

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Evaluation of Administrators
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	41	70	66	39	216
	3.7	6.3	5.9	3.5	19.3
	25.0	22.1	17.4	14.9	
No	123	247	313	222	905
	11.0	22.0	27.9	19.8	80.7
	75.0	77.9	82.6	85.1	
Total	164	317	379	261	1121
	14.6	28.3	33.8	23.3	100.0

$\chi^2 = 9.05$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0286.

Table R8 - 25

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Selection of Textbooks
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	75	133	135	84	427
	6.7 45.7	11.9 42.0	12.0 35.4	7.5 32.4	38.1
No	89	184	246	175	694
	7.9 54.3	16.4 58.0	21.9 64.6	15.6 67.6	61.9
Total	164	317	381	259	1121
	14.6	28.3	34.9	23.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 10.73$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0133.

Table R8 - 26

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Selection of Textbooks
by Status

Response/Status	Elected	Appointed	Total
Yes	397	32	429
	35.4	2.8	38.2
	37.3	55.2	
No	668	26	694
	59.5	2.3	61.8
	62.7	44.8	
Total	1065	58	1123
	94.8	5.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 7.46$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0095.

Table R8 - 27

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Hiring of Administrators
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	2	23	35	68	91	219
	0.2	2.0	3.1	6.0	8.1	19.4
	14.3	14.8	13.9	20.0	24.9	
No	12	132	217	272	274	907
	1.1	11.7	19.3	24.2	24.3	80.6
	85.7	85.2	86.1	80.0	75.1	
Total	14	155	252	340	365	1126
	1.2	13.8	22.4	30.2	32.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.38$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0062.

Table R8 - 28

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group in Hiring of Administrators by Sex

Response/Sex	Male	Female	Total
Yes	125	96	221
	11.1	8.5	19.6
	16.2	27.0	
No	648	260	908
	57.4	23.0	80.4
	83.8	73.0	
Total	773	356	1129
	68.5	31.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 18.04$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8 - 29

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Hiring of Administrators
by Occupation

Response/Occupation	Professional	Managerial	Clerical - Sales	Skilled	Semi - Skilled	Housewife	Retired	Total
Yes	72	63	17	4	1	44	13	214
	6.5	5.7	1.5	0.4	0.1	4.0	1.2	19.3
	22.2	14.7	24.6	8.2	50.0	25.7	20.0	
No	253	366	52	45	1	127	52	896
	22.8	33.0	4.7	4.1	8.6	11.4	4.7	80.7
	77.8	85.3	75.4	91.8	50.0	74.3	80.0	
Total	325	429	69	49	2	171	65	1110
	29.3	38.6	6.2	4.4	0.2	15.4	5.9	100.0

$\chi^2 = 18.52$ with 6 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0051.

Table R8 - 30

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Organization of Instruction
by Level of Education

Response/Education	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Post High School	Four Year College	Advanced College	Total
Yes	4	50	79	137	170	440
	0.4	4.5	7.1	12.3	15.3	39.5
	28.6	33.3	31.5	40.8	46.8	
No	10	100	172	199	193	674
	0.9	9.0	15.4	17.9	17.3	60.5
	71.4	66.7	68.5	59.2	53.2	
Total	14	150	251	336	363	1114
	1.3	13.5	22.5	30.2	32.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 18.25$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0011.

Table R8 - 31

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Organization of Instruction
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	74	141	133	90	438
	6.7	12.7	12.0	8.1	39.4
	46.0	45.0	35.0	35.0	
No	87	172	247	167	673
	7.8	15.5	22.2	15.0	60.6
	54.0	55.0	65.0	65.0	
Total	161	317	380	257	1111
	14.5	28.2	34.2	23.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 12.23$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0066.

Table R8 - 32

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Evaluation of Teachers
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	33	60	45	30	168
	3.0	5.4	4.0	2.7	15.1
	20.1	19.0	11.9	11.7	
No	131	256	334	227	948
	11.7	22.9	29.9	20.3	84.9
	79.9	81.0	88.1	88.3	
Total	164	316	379	257	1116
	14.7	28.3	34.0	23.0	100.0

$\chi^2 = 12.41$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0061.

Table R8 - 33

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Evaluation of Teachers by Race

Response/Race	Afro-American	Anglo-American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Yes	2	148	1	4	1	11	167
	0.2	13.4	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.0	15.1
	8.3	14.6	5.0	44.4	33.3	27.5	
No	22	863	19	5	2	29	940
	2.0	78.0	1.7	0.5	0.2	2.6	84.9
	91.7	85.4	95.0	55.6	66.7	72.5	
Total	24	1011	20	9	3	40	1107
	2.2	91.3	1.8	0.8	0.3	3.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.25$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0141.

Table R8 - 34

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Construction, Renovation,
and Closing of Schools by Sex

Response/Sex	Male	Female	Total
Yes	586	300	886
	52.1 76.2	26.7 84.3	78.8
No	183	56	239
	16.3 23.8	5.0 15.7	21.2
Total	769	356	1125
	68.4	31.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 9.46$ with 1 degree of freedom. Significance = 0.0021.

Table R8 - 35

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Tenure and Promotion
by Years Served

Response/Years Served	1	2-3	4-7	More Than 7	Total
Yes	21	39	22	16	98
	1.9 12.9	3.5 12.3	2.0 5.8	1.4 6.2	8.8
No	142	278	357	242	1019
	12.7 87.1	24.9 87.7	32.0 94.2	21.7 93.8	91.2
Total	163	317	379	258	1117
	14.6	28.4	33.9	23.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.68$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0021.

Table R8 - 36

Respondent's Attitude Toward Community Advisory Group
Involvement in Tenure and Promotion by Race

Response/Race	Afro-American	Anglo-American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Yes	1	82	2	2	1	9	97
	0.1	7.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.8	8.8
	4.2	8.1	9.5	22.2	33.3	22.5	
No	23	928	19	7	2	31	1010
	2.1	83.8	1.7	0.6	0.2	2.8	91.2
	95.8	91.9	90.5	77.8	66.7	77.5	
Total	24	1010	21	9	3	40	1107
	2.2	91.2	1.9	0.8	0.3	3.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.92$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0107.

Table R8 - 37

Respondent's Attitudes Toward Community Advisory
Group Involvement in Negotiation and
Collective Bargaining by Age

Response/Age	Under 25	26-35	36-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60	Total
Yes	0	18	13	35	19	15	100
	0.0	1.6	1.2	3.1	1.7	1.3	8.9
	0.0	17.6	6.6	8.0	7.3	12.5	
No	7	84	184	402	240	105	1022
	0.6	7.5	16.4	35.8	21.4	9.4	91.1
	100.0	82.4	93.4	92.0	92.7	87.5	
Total	7	102	197	437	259	120	1122
	0.6	9.1	17.6	38.9	23.1	10.7	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.70$ with 5 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0117.

Appendix G
Tables for Research Question 9

Table R9-1
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Curriculum Evaluation by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	88 7.9% 32.8	150 13.5% 36.9	51 4.6% 34.2	71 6.4% 47.0	63 5.7% 46.7	423 38.1%
Administration and Instructional Staff	86 7.8% 32.1	135 12.2% 33.3	59 5.3% 39.6	36 3.2% 23.8	27 2.4% 20.0	343 30.9%
Board	94 8.5% 35.1	121 10.9% 29.8	39 3.5% 26.2	44 4.0% 29.2	45 4.1% 33.3	343 30.9%
Total	268 24.2%	406 36.6%	149 13.4%	151 13.6%	135 12.2%	1109 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.69$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0026

Table R9-2
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Curriculum Evaluation by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	87 7.8% 41.4	214 19.2% 39.6	65 5.8% 34.2	43 3.9% 33.0	16 1.4% 35.6	425 38.1%
Administration and Instructional Staff	79 7.1% 37.6	168 15.1% 31.1	51 4.6% 26.9	40 3.6% 30.8	9 0.8% 20.0	347 31.1%
Board	44 3.9% 21.0	158 14.2% 29.3	74 6.6% 38.9	47 4.2% 36.2	20 1.8% 44.4	343 30.8%
Total	210 18.8%	540 48.4%	190 17.0%	130 11.7%	45 4.0%	1115 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.46$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0028

Table R9-3
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Curriculum Evaluation by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	42 3.8% 35.0	106 9.6% 33.4	131 11.9% 42.4	131 11.9% 42.2	12 1.1% 24.5	422 38.2%
Administration and Instructional Staff	33 3.0% 27.5	94 8.5% 29.7	103 9.3% 33.3	101 9.1% 32.6	13 1.2% 26.5	344 31.1%
Board	45 4.1% 37.5	117 10.6% 36.9	75 6.8% 24.3	78 7.1% 25.2	24 2.2% 49.0	339 30.7%
Total	120 10.9%	317 28.7%	309 28.0%	310 28.1%	49 4.4%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=27.52$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0006

Table R9-4
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student Discipline by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	69 6.2% 25.7	79 7.1% 19.5	28 2.5% 18.8	31 2.8% 20.8	41 3.7% 30.4	248 22.4%
Administration and Instructional Staff	93 8.4% 34.7	153 13.8% 37.9	62 5.6% 41.6	76 6.9% 51.0	41 3.7% 30.4	425 38.5%
Board	106 9.6% 39.6	172 15.6% 42.6	59 5.3% 39.6	42 3.8% 28.2	53 4.8% 39.2	432 39.1%
Total	268 24.3%	404 36.6%	149 13.5%	149 13.5%	135 12.2%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.26$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0030

Table R9-5
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student Discipline by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	31 2.8% 14.9	124 11.2% 22.8	50 4.5% 27.1	35 3.2% 27.3	9 0.8% 20.0	249 22.4%
Administration and Instructional Staff	102 9.2% 49.0	214 19.3% 39.3	60 5.4% 32.4	36 3.2% 28.2	16 1.4% 35.6	428 38.6%
Board	75 6.8% 36.1	206 18.6% 37.9	75 6.8% 40.5	57 5.1% 44.5	20 1.8% 44.4	433 39.0%
Total	208 18.7%	544 49.0%	185 16.7%	128 11.5%	45 4.1%	1110 100.0%

$\chi^2=22.15$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0046

Table R9-6
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student Discipline by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	28 2.5% 23.7	81 7.4% 25.8	53 4.8% 17.3	79 7.2% 25.2	7 0.6% 14.3	248 22.5%
Administration and Instructional Staff	40 3.6% 33.9	98 8.9% 31.2	144 13.1% 47.1	122 11.1% 39.0	18 1.6% 36.7	422 38.4%
Board	50 4.5% 42.4	135 12.3% 43.0	109 9.9% 35.6	112 10.2% 35.8	24 2.2% 49.0	430 39.1%
Total	118 10.7%	314 28.5%	306 27.8%	313 28.5%	49 4.5%	1100 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.23$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0031

Table R9-7
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Expenditures for School Operation by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	116 10.5% 43.3	124 11.2% 30.8	31 2.8% 20.9	34 3.1% 22.7	46 4.2% 33.6	351 31.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	7 0.6% 2.6	9 0.8% 2.3	5 0.5% 3.4	2 0.2% 1.3	3 0.3% 2.2	26 2.4%
Board	145 13.1% 54.1	269 24.3% 66.9	112 10.1% 75.7	114 10.3% 76.0	88 8.0% 64.2	728 65.9%
Total	268 24.3%	402 36.4%	148 13.4%	150 13.6%	137 12.4%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=32.49$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0001

Table R9-8
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Ability Grouping by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	25 2.2%	20 1.8%	9 0.8%	6 0.5%	18 1.6%	78 7.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	160 14.4%	269 24.2%	106 9.5%	115 10.3%	81 7.3%	731 65.7%
Board	9.3	4.9	6.0	4.0	13.0	
	83 7.5%	117 10.5%	35 3.1%	30 2.7%	39 3.5%	304 27.3%
	59.7	66.3	70.7	76.2	58.7	
Total	268 24.1%	406 36.5%	150 13.5%	151 13.6%	138 12.4%	1113 100.0%
	31.0	28.8	23.3	19.8	28.3	

$\chi^2=25.17$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0015

Table R9-9
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Ability Grouping by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	6 0.5% 2.9	37 3.3% 6.8	22 2.0% 11.5	10 0.9% 7.6	3 0.3% 6.5	78 7.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	162 14.5% 77.1	360 32.2% 66.4	111 9.9% 58.1	73 6.5% 56.2	31 2.8% 67.4	737 65.9%
Board	42 3.8% 20.0	145 13.0% 26.8	58 5.2% 30.4	47 4.2% 36.2	12 1.1% 26.1	304 27.2%
Total	210 18.8%	542 48.4%	191 17.1%	130 11.6%	46 4.1%	1119 100.0%

$\chi^2=27.20$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0007

Table R9-10
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Ability Grouping by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	10 0.9% 8.3	29 2.6% 9.1	18 1.6% 5.8	22 2.0% 7.0	0 0.0% 0.0	79 7.1%
Administration and Instructional Staff	72 6.5% 60.0	192 17.3% 60.6	215 19.4% 69.8	223 20.1% 70.8	28 2.5% 57.1	730 65.8%
Board	38 3.4% 31.7	96 8.7% 30.3	75 6.8% 24.4	70 6.3% 22.2	21 1.9% 42.9	300 27.1%
Total	120 10.8%	317 28.6%	308 27.8%	315 28.4%	49 4.4%	1109 100.0%

$\chi^2=20.95$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0073

Table R9-11
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in State and Federal Grant Proposals by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	69 6.3% 26.1	81 7.4% 20.3	45 4.1% 30.0	39 3.5% 26.0	41 3.7% 30.4	275 25.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	72 6.6% 27.3	70 6.4% 17.4	28 2.5% 18.7	28 2.5% 18.7	29 2.6% 21.5	227 20.7%
Board	123 11.2% 46.6	249 22.7% 62.3	77 7.0% 51.3	83 7.6% 55.3	65 5.9% 48.1	597 54.3%
Total	264 24.0%	400 36.4%	150 13.6%	150 13.6%	135 12.3%	1099 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.76$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0025

Table R9-12
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Education Objectives by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	119 10.7% 57.2	292 26.2% 53.8	97 8.7% 51.1	64 5.7% 50.0	21 1.9% 45.7	593 53.2%
Administration and Instructional Staff	41 3.7% 19.7	70 6.3% 12.9	22 2.0% 11.5	13 1.2% 10.2	10 0.9% 21.7	156 14.0%
Board	48 4.3% 23.1	181 16.2% 33.3	71 6.4% 37.4	51 4.6% 39.8	15 1.3% 32.6	366 32.8%
Total	208 18.7%	543 48.7%	190 17.0%	128 11.5%	46 4.1%	1115 100.0%

$\chi^2=20.19$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0096

Table R9-13
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Education Objectives by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	58 5.2% 48.3	152 13.8% 48.3	188 17.0% 60.8	178 16.1% 57.1	15 1.4% 30.6	591 53.5%
Administration and Instructional Staff	18 1.6% 15.0	41 3.7% 13.0	43 3.9% 13.9	44 4.0% 14.1	8 0.7% 16.3	154 13.9%
Board	44 4.0% 36.7	122 11.0% 38.7	78 7.1% 25.3	90 8.1% 28.8	26 2.4% 53.1	360 32.6%
Total	120 10.9%	315 28.5%	309 28.0%	312 28.2%	49 4.4%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=28.39$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0004

Table R9-14
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Initiation and Approval of New Courses by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	79 7.1% 37.6	197 17.8% 36.8	69 6.2% 36.5	39 3.5% 30.5	13 1.2% 28.9	397 35.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	79 7.1% 37.6	125 11.3% 23.3	45 4.1% 23.8	32 2.9% 25.0	9 0.8% 20.0	290 26.2%
Board	52 4.7% 24.8	214 19.3% 39.9	75 6.8% 39.7	57 5.1% 44.5	23 2.1% 51.1	421 38.0%
Total	210 19.0%	536 48.4%	189 17.1%	128 11.6%	45 4.1%	1108 100.0%

$\chi^2=29.10$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0003

Table R9-15
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Initiation and Approval of New Courses by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	30 2.7% 25.7	104 9.5% 32.9	130 11.8% 42.4	119 10.8% 38.4	12 1.1% 24.5	395 36.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	28 2.6% 23.9	81 7.4% 25.6	88 8.0% 28.8	79 7.2% 25.5	11 1.0% 22.4	287 26.1%
Board	59 5.4% 50.4	131 11.9% 41.5	88 8.0% 28.8	112 10.2% 36.1	26 2.4% 53.1	416 37.9%
Total	117 10.7%	316 28.8%	306 27.9%	310 28.2%	49 4.5%	1098 100.0%

$\chi^2=27.44$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0006

Table R9-16
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Initiation and Approval of Testing Program by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	19 1.7% 16.4	54 4.9% 17.2	58 5.3% 19.0	51 4.7% 16.5	4 0.4% 8.3	186 17.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	42 3.8% 36.2	107 9.8% 34.2	144 13.2% 47.0	132 12.1% 42.9	16 1.5% 33.4	441 40.4%
Board	55 5.0% 47.4	152 13.9% 48.6	104 9.5% 34.0	125 11.5% 40.6	28 2.6% 58.3	464 42.5%
Total	116 10.6%	313 28.7%	306 28.0%	308 28.2%	48 4.4%	1091 100.0%

$\chi^2=22.45$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0041

Table R9-17
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Administrators by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	16 1.5% 14.1	19 1.7% 6.0	49 4.5% 16.4	40 3.7% 12.9	5 0.5% 10.2	129 11.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	8 0.7% 7.0	20 1.8% 6.3	25 2.3% 8.3	19 1.7% 6.2	5 0.5% 10.2	77 7.1%
Board	90 8.3% 78.9	278 25.5% 87.7	226 20.8% 75.3	250 23.0% 80.9	39 3.6% 79.6	883 81.1%
Total	114 10.5%	317 29.1%	300 27.5%	309 28.4%	49 4.5%	1089 100.0%

$\chi^2=20.15$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0098

Table R9-18
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student Progress by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	7 0.6% 3.3	39 3.5% 7.3	17 1.5% 9.1	15 1.4% 11.9	8 0.7% 17.7	86 7.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	153 13.8% 72.9	358 32.4% 66.7	120 10.9% 64.2	69 6.2% 54.8	25 2.3% 55.6	725 65.6%
Board	50 4.5% 23.8	140 12.7% 26.0	50 4.5% 26.7	42 3.8% 33.3	12 1.1% 26.7	294 26.6%
Total	210 19.0%	537 48.6%	187 16.9%	126 11.4%	45 4.1%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=22.07$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0048

Table R9-19
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student Progress by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	17 1.6% 14.4	32 2.9% 10.2	13 1.2% 4.2	21 1.9% 6.8	3 0.3% 6.2	86 7.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	71 6.5% 60.2	182 16.6% 58.0	224 20.5% 73.2	214 19.5% 69.5	28 2.6% 57.1	719 65.6%
Board	30 2.7% 25.4	100 9.1% 31.8	69 6.3% 22.6	73 6.7% 23.7	18 1.6% 36.7	290 26.5%
Total	118 10.8%	314 28.7%	306 27.9%	308 28.1%	49 4.5%	1095 100.0%

$\chi^2=29.66$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0002

Table R9-20
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Selection of Textbooks by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	41 3.7% 15.5	94 8.6% 23.3	47 4.3% 31.8	46 4.2% 31.0	57 5.2% 41.9	285 25.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	128 11.6% 48.5	194 17.7% 48.1	64 5.8% 43.2	63 5.7% 42.6	43 3.9% 31.6	492 44.8%
Board	95 8.6% 36.0	115 10.5% 28.6	37 3.4% 25.0	39 3.5% 26.4	36 3.3% 26.5	322 29.3%
Total	264 24.0%	403 36.7%	148 13.5%	148 13.5%	136 12.4%	1099 100.0%

$\chi^2=42.09$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R9-21
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Selection of Textbooks by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	46 4.2% 22.2	138 12.5% 25.6	54 4.9% 29.0	31 2.8% 24.2	16 1.4% 35.6	285 25.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	116 10.5% 56.0	241 21.8% 44.7	75 6.8% 40.3	53 4.8% 41.4	12 1.1% 26.6	497 45.0%
Board	45 4.1% 21.8	160 14.5% 29.7	57 5.2% 30.7	44 4.0% 34.4	17 1.5% 37.8	323 29.2%
Total	207 18.7%	539 48.8%	186 16.8%	128 11.6%	45 4.1%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=20.25$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0094

Table R9-22
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring of Administrators by Region

Category/Response	Northeast frequency/percent	Central frequency/percent	Southern frequency/percent	Western frequency/percent	Pacific frequency/percent	Total frequency/percent
Community	35 3.2% 13.5	34 3.1% 8.5	9 0.8% 6.2	15 1.4% 10.0	26 2.4% 19.4	119 10.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	9 0.8% 3.5	9 0.8% 2.2	2 0.2% 1.4	3 0.3% 2.0	2 0.2% 1.5	25 2.3%
Board	215 19.7% 83.0	358 32.9% 89.3	134 12.3% 92.4	132 12.2% 88.0	106 9.7% 79.1	945 86.8%
Total	259 23.8%	401 36.8%	145 13.3%	150 13.8%	134 12.3%	1089 100.0%

$\chi^2=20.38$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0090

Table R9-23
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Teachers by Enrollment

Category/Response	Less than 1,000 No./%	1,000- 4,999 No./%	5,000- 9,999 No./%	10,000- 24,999 No./%	More than 25,000 No./%	Total No./%
Community	31 2.8% 15.0	57 5.2% 10.8	11 1.0% 5.8	16 1.5% 12.6	4 0.4% 9.1	119 10.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	5 0.5% 2.5	32 2.9% 6.0	10 0.9% 5.3	5 0.5% 3.9	6 0.5% 13.6	58 5.3%
Board	170 15.5% 82.5	441 40.2% 83.2	168 15.3% 88.9	106 9.7% 83.5	34 3.0% 77.3	919 83.9%
Total	206 18.8%	530 48.4%	189 17.2%	127 11.6%	44 4.0%	1096 100.0%

$\chi^2=19.09$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0144

Table R9-24
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Construction, Renovation, or Closing of Schools by Classification

Category/Response	Urban No./%	Suburban No./%	Rural No./%	Small Town No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	65 5.9% 55.6	175 16.0% 55.4	207 18.9% 67.6	189 17.2% 61.0	20 1.8% 41.7	656 59.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 0.9	3 0.3% 0.9	3 0.3% 1.0	2 0.2% 0.6	2 0.2% 4.1	11 1.0%
Board	51 4.6% 43.5	138 12.6% 43.7	96 8.8% 31.4	119 10.8% 38.4	26 2.4% 54.2	430 39.2%
Total	117 10.7%	316 28.8%	306 27.9%	310 28.3%	48 4.4%	1097 100.0%

$\chi^2=22.23$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0045

Appendix H
Tables for Research Question 10

Table R10-1
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Curriculum Evaluation by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	5 0.4% 35.8	62 5.6% 40.3	106 9.5% 42.2	116 10.4% 34.6	135 12.1% 37.6	424 38.1%
Administration and Instructional Staff	8 0.7% 57.1	58 5.2% 37.7	83 7.5% 33.1	103 9.3% 30.8	94 8.4% 26.2	346 31.1%
Board	1 0.1% 7.1	34 3.1% 22.0	62 5.6% 24.7	116 10.4% 34.6	130 11.7% 36.2	343 30.8%
Total	14 1.3%	154 13.8%	251 22.6%	335 30.1%	359 32.3%	1113 100.0%

$\chi^2=25.10$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0015

Table R10-2
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Curriculum Evaluation by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	33 3.0% 42.3	91 8.3% 43.1	92 8.4% 35.1	82 7.5% 37.1	52 4.8% 44.1	68 6.2% 33.8	418 38.3%
Administration and Instructional Staff	30 2.7% 38.5	74 6.8% 35.1	89 8.2% 34.0	61 5.6% 27.6	28 2.6% 23.7	56 5.1% 27.9	338 31.0%
Board	15 1.4% 19.2	46 4.2% 21.8	81 7.4% 30.9	78 7.1% 35.3	38 3.5% 32.2	77 7.1% 38.3	335 30.7%
Total	78 7.1%	211 19.3%	262 24.0%	221 20.3%	118 10.8%	201 18.4%	1091 100.0%

$\chi^2=25.40$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0046

Table R10-3
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Curriculum Evaluation by Occupation

Category/Response	Professional	Managerial	Clerical/ Sales	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Housewife	Retired	Total
Community	117 10.7% 36.2	167 15.2% 39.2	30 2.7% 44.1	20 1.8% 41.7	2 0.2% 100.0	61 5.6% 36.5	23 2.1% 35.9	420 38.3%
Administration and Instructional Staff	92 8.4% 28.5	127 11.6% 29.8	26 2.4% 38.2	15 1.4% 31.3	0 0.0% 0.0	49 4.5% 29.4	32 2.9% 50.0	341 31.1%
Board	114 10.4% 35.3	132 12.0% 31.0	12 1.1% 17.7	13 1.2% 27.0	0 0.0% 0.0	57 5.2% 34.1	9 0.8% 14.1	337 30.7%
Total	323 29.4%	426 38.8%	68 6.2%	48 4.4%	2 0.2%	167 15.2%	64 5.8%	1098 100.0%

$\chi^2=26.86$ with 12 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0081

Table R10-4
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
Student Discipline by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	4 0.4% 28.6	39 3.5% 25.4	55 5.0% 22.2	74 6.7% 22.0	77 6.9% 21.6	249 22.5%
Administration and Instructional Staff	10 0.9% 71.4	70 6.3% 45.8	92 8.3% 37.1	119 10.7% 35.4	136 12.3% 38.1	427 38.5%
Board	0 0.0% 0.0	44 4.0% 28.8	101 9.1% 40.7	143 12.9% 42.6	144 13.0% 40.3	432 39.0%
Total	14 1.3%	153 13.8%	248 22.4%	336 30.3%	357 32.2%	1108 100.0%

$\chi^2=19.04$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0146

Table R10-5
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student Discipline by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	15 1.4% 20.3	47 4.3% 22.4	60 5.5% 22.6	46 4.2% 21.0	36 3.3% 31.0	41 3.8% 20.3	245 22.6%
Administration and Instructional Staff	33 3.0% 44.6	103 9.5% 49.0	102 9.4% 38.5	69 6.4% 31.5	40 3.7% 34.5	73 6.7% 36.1	420 38.7%
Board	26 2.4% 35.1	60 5.5% 28.6	103 9.5% 38.9	104 9.6% 47.5	40 3.7% 34.5	88 8.1% 43.6	421 38.8%
Total	74 6.8%	210 19.3%	265 24.4%	219 20.2%	116 10.7%	202 18.6%	1086 100.0%

$\chi^2=26.78$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0028

Table P10-6
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Expenditure for School Operation by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	7 0.6% 53.8	60 5.4% 39.5	92 8.3% 36.8	90 8.1% 26.7	102 9.2% 28.6	351 31.7%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 7.7	7 0.6% 4.6	5 0.5% 2.0	6 0.5% 1.8	9 0.8% 2.5	28 2.5%
Board	5 0.5% 38.5	85 7.7% 55.9	153 13.8% 61.2	241 21.7% 71.5	246 22.2% 68.9	730 65/8%
Total	13 1.2%	152 13.7%	250 22.5%	337 30.4%	357 32.2%	1109 100.0%

$\chi^2=22.45$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0041

Table R10-7
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Expenditures for School Operation by Race

Category/Response	Afro-American No./%	Anglo-American No./%	Hispanic No./%	American Indian No./%	Oriental No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	6 0.5% 27.3	310 28.3% 30.9	4 0.4% 19.1	5 0.5% 55.6	1 0.1% 33.3	18 1.6% 46.2	344 31.4%
Administration and Instructional Staff	2 0.2% 9.1	22 2.0% 2.2	2 0.2% 9.5	0 0.0% 0.0	1 0.1% 33.3	1 0.1% 2.7	28 2.6%
Board	14 1.3% 63.6	671 61.2% 60.9	15 1.4% 71.4	4 0.4% 44.4	1 0.1% 33.3	20 1.8% 51.3	725 66.1%
Total	22 2.0%	1003 91.4%	21 1.9%	9 0.8%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	1097 100.0%

$\chi^2=27.79$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0020

Table R10-8
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Ability Grouping by Occupation

Category/Response	Professional	Managerial	Clerical/ Sales	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Housewife	Retired	Total
Community	22 2.0% 6.7	31 2.8% 7.3	4 0.4% 6.1	3 0.3% 6.1	2 0.2% 100.0	8 0.7% 4.8	7 0.6% 10.9	77 7.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	203 18.4% 62.5	285 25.9% 66.9	45 4.1% 67.2	34 3.1% 69.4	0 0.0% 0.0	112 10.2% 66.7	45 4.1% 70.3	724 65.8%
Board	100 9.1% 30.8	110 10.0% 25.8	18 1.6% 26.9	12 1.1% 24.5	0 0.0% 0.0	48 4.4% 28.5	12 1.1% 18.8	300 27.2%
Total	325 29.5%	426 38.7%	67 6.1%	49 4.5%	2 0.2%	168 15.3%	64 5.8%	1101 100.0%

$\chi^2=34.15$ with 12 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0006

Table R10-9
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring of Teachers by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	3 0.3% 23.1	20 1.8% 13.3	17 1.5% 6.9	13 1.2% 3.9	13 1.2% 3.6	66 6.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 7.7	7 0.6% 4.6	9 0.8% 3.7	16 1.4% 4.7	17 1.5% 4.8	50 4.5%
Board	9 0.8% 69.2	124 11.2% 82.1	220 19.9% 89.4	308 27.8% 91.4	329 29.7% 91.6	990 89.5%
Total	13 1.2%	151 13.7%	246 22.2%	337 30.5%	359 32.5%	1106 100.0%

$\chi^2=28.58$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0004

Table R10-10
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring Teachers by Race

Category/Response	Afro-American No./%	Anglo-American No./%	Hispanic No./%	American Indian No./%	Oriental No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	3 0.3% 12.0	52 4.7% 5.2	1 0.1% 4.8	2 0.2% 22.2	2 0.2% 66.7	4 0.4% 10.3	64 5.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	0 0.0% 0.0	42 3.8% 4.2	3 0.3% 14.2	0 0.0% 0.0	1 0.1% 33.3	4 0.4% 10.3	50 4.6%
Board	22 2.0% 88.0	905 82.6% 90.6	17 1.6% 81.0	7 0.6% 77.8	0 0.0% 0.0	31 2.8% 79.4	982 89.6%
Total	25 2.3%	999 91.1%	21 1.9%	9 0.8%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	1096 100.0%

$\chi^2=44.77$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R10-11
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Education Objectives by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	41 3.8% 53.9	109 10.0% 51.4	149 13.6% 56.0	112 10.3% 50.7	69 6.3% 59.0	101 9.2% 50.5	581 53.2%
Administration and Instructional Staff	15 1.4% 19.8	47 4.3% 22.2	34 3.1% 12.8	28 2.6% 12.6	11 1.0% 9.4	20 1.8% 10.0	155 14.2%
Board	20 1.8% 26.3	56 5.1% 26.4	83 7.6% 31.2	81 7.4% 36.7	37 3.4% 31.6	79 7.2% 39.5	356 32.6%
Total	76 7.0%	212 19.4%	266 24.4%	221 20.2%	117 10.7%	200 18.3%	1092 100.0%

$\chi^2=25.69$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0042

Table R10-12
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student/School Personnel Disputes by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	12 1.1% 15.6	45 4.2% 21.5	30 2.8% 11.5	21 1.9% 9.7	14 1.3% 12.0	16 1.5% 8.0	138 12.7%
Administration and Instructional Staff	15 2.4% 19.5	27 2.5% 12.9	29 2.7% 11.0	22 2.0% 10.1	16 1.5% 13.0	26 2.4% 12.9	135 12.5%
Board	50 4.6% 64.9	137 12.7% 65.6	203 18.7% 77.5	174 16.1% 80.2	87 8.0% 74.4	159 14.7% 79.1	810 74.8%
Total	77 7.1%	209 19.3%	262 24.2%	217 20.0%	117 10.8%	201 18.6%	1083 100.0%

$\chi^2=28.35$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0016

Table R10-13
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Student/School Personnel Disputes by Race

Category/Response	Afro-American No./%	Anglo-American No./%	Hispanic No./%	American Indian No./%	Oriental No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	8 0.7% 23.3	117 10.7% 11.8	3 0.3% 14.3	4 0.4% 44.4	1 0.1% 33.3	8 0.7% 21.1	141 12.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	3 0.3% 12.5	119 10.9% 11.9	4 0.4% 19.0	2 0.2% 22.3	1 0.1% 33.3	2 0.2% 5.2	131 12.0%
Board	13 1.2% 54.2	761 69.7% 76.3	14 1.3% 66.7	3 0.3% 33.3	1 0.1% 33.3	28 2.6% 73.7	820 75.1%
Total	24 2.2%	997 91.3%	21 1.9%	9 0.8%	3 0.3%	38 3.5%	1092 100.0%

$\chi^2=27.54$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0021

Table R10-14
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Local Tax Rates by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	9 0.8% 75.0	84 7.7% 54.5	116 10.6% 46.8	148 13.5% 44.8	161 14.7% 45.5	518 47.2%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 8.3	4 0.4% 2.6	4 0.4% 1.6	0 0.0% 0.0	3 0.3% 0.8	12 1.1%
Board	2 0.2% 16.7	66 6.0% 42.9	128 11.7% 51.6	182 16.6% 55.2	190 17.3% 53.7	568 51.7%
Total	12 1.1%	154 14.0%	248 22.6%	330 30.1%	354 32.2%	1098 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.91$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0024

Table R10-15
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Initiation and Approval of New Courses by Status

Category/Response	Elected No./%	Appointed No./%	Total No./%
Community	366 33.1% 34.9	31 2.8% 55.4	397 35.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	279 25.2% 26.6	9 0.8% 16.0	288 26.1%
Board	404 36.6% 38.5	16 1.4% 28.6	420 38.0%
Total	1049 94.9%	56 5.1%	1105 100.0%

$\chi^2=9.84$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0073

Table R10-16
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	1 0.1% 7.1	25 2.3% 16.7	49 4.5% 20.0	58 5.3% 17.4	55 5.0% 15.4	188 17.1%
Administration and Instructional Staff	8 0.7% 57.1	77 7.0% 51.3	105 9.5% 42.9	123 11.2% 36.8	133 12.1% 37.3	446 40.5%
Board	5 0.5% 35.8	48 4.4% 32.0	91 8.3% 37.1	153 13.9% 45.8	169 15.4% 47.3	466 42.4%
Total	14 1.3%	150 13.6%	245 22.3%	334 30.4%	357 32.5%	1100 100.0%

$\chi^2=18.87$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0156

Table R10-17
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000- \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	13 1.2% 17.3	35 3.2% 16.8	34 3.2% 13.0	48 4.5% 22.0	22 2.0% 19.0	32 3.0% 16.1	184 17.1%
Administration and Instructional Staff	37 3.4% 49.3	103 9.6% 49.5	109 10.1% 41.8	78 7.2% 35.8	40 3.7% 34.4	69 6.4% 34.7	436 40.5%
Board	25 2.3% 33.4	70 6.5% 33.7	118 11.0% 45.2	92 8.5% 42.2	54 5.0% 46.6	98 9.1% 49.2	457 42.4%
Total	75 7.0%	208 19.3%	261 24.2%	218 20.2%	116 10.8%	199 18.5%	1077 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.98$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0076

Table R10-18
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Administrators by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	7 0.6% 53.8	27 2.5% 18.4	34 3.1% 14.0	36 3.3% 10.7	28 2.6% 7.8	132 12.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 7.7	8 0.7% 5.4	13 1.2% 5.3	25 2.3% 7.4	30 2.7% 8.4	77 7.0%
Board	5 0.5% 38.5	112 10.2% 76.2	196 17.9% 80.7	276 25.2% 81.9	299 27.3% 83.8	888 80.9%
Total	13 1.2%	147 13.4%	243 22.2%	337 30.7%	357 32.5%	1097 100.0%

$\chi^2=36.53$ with 3 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R10-19
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Administrators by Race

Category/Response	Afro-American No./%	Anglo-American No./%	Hispanic No./%	American Indian No./%	Oriental No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	2 0.2% 8.3	114 10.5% 11.5	1 0.1% 4.8	3 0.3% 37.5	1 0.1% 33.3	9 0.8% 23.0	130 12.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	3 0.3% 12.5	62 5.7% 6.2	4 0.4% 19.0	1 0.1% 12.5	2 0.2% 66.7	4 0.4% 10.3	76 7.0%
Board	19 1.7% 79.2	816 75.1% 82.3	16 1.5% 76.2	4 0.4% 50.0	0 0.0% 0.0	26 2.4% 66.7	881 81.0%
Total	24 2.2%	992 91.3%	21 1.9%	8 0.7%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	1087 100.0%

$\chi^2=37.93$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R10-20
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Administrators by Sex

Category/Response	Male No./%	Female No./%	Total No./%
Community	99 9.0% 13.1	33 3.0% 9.6	132 12.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	39 3.5% 5.2	38 3.5% 11.0	77 7.0%
Board	618 56.2% 81.7	273 24.8% 79.4	891 81.0%
Total	756 68.7%	344 31.3%	1100 100.0%

$\chi^2=14.29$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0008

Table R10-21
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Administrators by Status

Category/Response	Elected No./%	Appointed No./%	Total No./%
Community	124 11.3% 11.9	8 0.7% 14.3	132 12.0%
Administration and Instructional Staff	67 6.1% 6.4	9 0.8% 16.1	76 6.9%
Board	850 77.5% 81.7	39 3.6% 69.6	889 81.0%
Total	1041 94.9%	56 5.1%	1097 100.0%

$\chi^2=8.32$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0156

Table R10-22
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring of Administrators by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	14 1.3% 18.7	34 3.2% 16.6	17 1.6% 6.5	20 1.9% 9.2	9 0.8% 8.0	22 2.1% 11.0	116 10.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	2 0.2% 2.6	5 0.5% 2.4	3 0.3% 1.1	7 0.7% 3.2	2 0.2% 1.8	6 0.6% 3.0	25 2.3%
Board	59 5.5% 78.7	166 15.5% 81.0	242 22.6% 92.4	190 17.7% 87.6	101 9.4% 90.2	172 16.1% 86.0	930 86.8%
Total	75 7.0%	205 19.1%	262 24.5%	217 20.3%	112 10.5%	200 18.7%	1071 100.0%

$\chi^2=21.79$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0162

Table R10-23
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring of Administration by Occupation

Category/Response	Professional	Managerial	Clerical/ Sales	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Housewife	Retired	Total
Community	27 2.5% 8.5	49 4.5% 11.7	9 0.8% 13.7	1 0.1% 2.1	1 0.1% 50.0	18 1.7% 11.0	13 1.2% 21.0	118 10.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	3 0.3% 0.9	7 0.6% 1.6	3 0.3% 4.5	1 0.1% 2.1	0 0.0% 0.0	7 0.6% 4.3	4 0.4% 6.4	25 2.3%
Board	288 26.7% 90.6	364 33.8% 86.7	54 5.0% 81.8	45 4.2% 95.8	1 0.1% 50.0	138 12.8% 84.7	45 4.2% 72.6	935 86.7%
Total	318 29.5%	420 39.0%	66 6.1%	47 4.4%	2 0.2%	163 15.1%	62 5.8%	1078 100.0%

$\chi^2=29.33$ with 12 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0035

Table R10-24
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring Administrators by Race

Category/Response	Afro-American No./%	Anglo-American No./%	Hispanic No./%	American Indian No./%	Oriental No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	2 0.2% 9.1	98 9.1% 9.9	2 0.2% 9.5	5 0.5% 55.6	2 0.2% 66.7	8 0.7% 20.5	117 10.8%
Administration and Instructional Staff	0 0.0% 0.0	22 2.0% 2.2	2 0.2% 9.5	0 0.0% 0.0	1 0.1% 33.3	1 0.1% 2.6	26 2.4%
Board	20 1.9% 90.9	867 80.2% 87.9	17 1.6% 81.0	4 0.4% 44.4	0 0.0% 0.0	30 2.8% 76.9	938 86.8%
Total	22 2.0%	987 91.3%	21 1.9%	9 0.8%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	1081 100.0%

$\chi^2=51.87$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table P10-25
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Hiring of Administrators by Sex

Category/Response	Male No./%	Female No./%	Total No./%
Community	76 6.9% 10.1	44 4.0% 12.9	120 10.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	12 1.1% 1.6	14 1.3% 4.1	26 2.4%
Board	667 60.9% 88.3	283 25.8% 83.0	950 86.7%
Total	755 68.9%	341 31.1%	1096 100.0%

$\chi^2=8.77$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0124

Table R10-26
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Teacher by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	5 0.5% 38.5	25 2.3% 16.8	28 2.6% 11.5	29 2.6% 8.7	32 2.9% 9.0	119 10.9%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 7.7	10 0.9% 6.7	8 0.7% 3.3	17 1.6% 5.0	23 2.1% 6.5	59 5.4%
Board	7 0.6% 53.8	114 10.4% 76.5	208 19.0% 85.2	289 26.4% 86.3	299 27.3% 84.5	917 83.7%
Total	13 1.2%	149 13.6%	244 22.3%	335 30.6%	354 32.3%	1095 100.0%

$\chi^2=22.73$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0037

Table R10-27
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Evaluation of Teachers by Race

Category/Response	Afro- American	Anglo- American	Hispanic	American Indian	Oriental	Other	Total
Community	2 0.2% 8.7	103 9.5% 10.4	1 0.1% 4.7	1 0.1% 12.5	2 0.2% 66.7	7 0.6% 17.9	116 10.7%
Administration and Instructional Staff	2 0.2% 8.7	49 4.5% 5.0	3 0.3% 14.3	0 0.0% 0.0	1 0.1% 33.3	3 0.3% 7.7	58 5.4%
Board	19 1.8% 82.6	837 77.3% 84.6	17 1.6% 81.0	7 0.6% 87.5	0 0.0% 0.0	29 2.7% 74.4	909 83.9%
Total	23 2.1%	989 91.3%	21 1.9%	8 0.7%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	1083 100.0%

$\chi^2=23.72$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0084

Table R10-28
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Tenure and Promotion by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	4 0.4% 30.8	19 1.7% 12.8	19 1.7% 7.8	21 1.9% 6.3	22 2.0% 6.2	85 7.7%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 7.7	2 0.2% 1.3	6 0.5% 2.4	4 0.4% 1.2	6 0.5% 1.7	19 1.7%
Board	8 0.7% 61.5	128 11.7% 85.9	219 20.0% 89.8	310 28.3% 92.5	328 29.9% 92.1	993 90.5%
Total	13 1.2%	149 13.6%	244 22.2%	335 30.5%	356 32.5%	1097 100.0%

$\chi^2=21.71$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0055

Table R10-29
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Negotiation and Collective Bargaining by Level of Education

Category/Response	Less than High School No./%	High School Graduate No./%	Post High School No./%	Four Year College No./%	Advanced College No./%	Total No./%
Community	4 0.4% 30.8	15 1.4% 10.3	21 1.9% 8.7	24 2.2% 7.2	19 1.7% 5.4	83 7.6%
Administration and Instructional Staff	1 0.1% 7.7	4 0.4% 2.7	6 0.6% 2.5	7 0.6% 2.1	16 1.5% 4.6	34 3.1%
Board	8 0.7% 61.5	127 11.7% 87.0	214 19.7% 88.8	304 28.0% 90.7	316 29.1% 90.0	969 89.2%
Total	13 1.2%	146 13.4%	241 22.2%	335 30.8%	351 32.3%	1086 100.0%

$\chi^2=19.18$ with 8 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0139

Table R10-30
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Negotiation and Collective Bargaining by Income

Category/Response	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	More than \$60,000	Total
Community	6 0.6% 8.3	28 2.6% 13.6	18 1.7% 6.9	14 1.3% 6.6	7 0.7% 6.2	8 0.8% 4.0	81 7.6%
Administration and Instructional Staff	6 0.6% 8.3	10 0.9% 4.9	6 0.6% 2.3	4 0.4% 1.9	2 0.2% 1.8	6 0.6% 3.0	34 3.2%
Board	60 5.6% 83.4	167 15.7% 81.5	237 22.3% 90.8	195 18.3% 91.5	103 9.7% 92.0	187 17.6% 93.0	949 89.2%
Total	72 6.8%	205 19.3%	261 24.5%	213 20.0%	112 10.5%	201 18.9%	1064 100.0%

$\chi^2=26.72$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0029

Table R10-31
Respondent's Attitude Toward Delegation of Responsibility for Decision-Making
in Negotiation and Collective Bargaining by Race

Category/Response	Afro-American No./%	Anglo-American No./%	Hispanic No./%	American Indian No./%	Oriental No./%	Other No./%	Total No./%
Community	3 0.3% 13.0	68 6.3% 6.9	1 0.1% 4.8	0 0.0% 0.0	1 0.1% 33.3	6 0.6% 15.3	79 7.3%
Administration and Instructional Staff	3 0.3% 13.0	25 2.3% 2.5	2 0.2% 9.5	2 0.2% 25.0	1 0.1% 33.3	1 0.1% 2.6	34 3.2%
Board	17 1.6% 74.0	888 82.6% 90.6	18 1.7% 85.7	6 0.6% 75.0	1 0.1% 33.3	32 3.0% 82.1	962 89.5%
Total	23 2.1%	981 91.3%	21 2.0%	8 0.7%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	1075 100.0%

$\chi^2=42.17$ with 10 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Appendix I
Superintendent/Board Responsibility

Additional Information
 Percentage of Respondents with Preference for
 Largest Share of Responsibility for Decision-Making Authority

Areas	Board No./%	Shared No./%	Superintendent No./%	No Response No./%
Curriculum Evaluation	347/30.5	9/0.8	772/67.8	10/0.9
Student Discipline	193/17.0	9/0.8	927/81.5	9/0.8
Expenditures	835/73.4	13/1.1	282/24.8	8/0.7
Ability Grouping	48/4.2	6/0.5	1073/94.3	11/1.0
Grant Proposals	46/4.0	7/0.6	1075/94.5	10/0.9
Hiring of Teachers	221/19.4	15/1.3	895/78.6	7/0.6
Education Objectives	731/64.2	29/2.5	368/32.3	10/0.9
Student & School Personnel Disputes	118/10.4	7/0.6	997/87.6	16/1.4
Local Tax Rates	977/85.9	19/1.7	107/9.4	35/3.1
Initiation and Approval of New Courses	401/35.2	24/2.1	699/61.4	14/1.2
Initiation and Approval of Student Testing Program	213/18.7	16/1.4	892/78.4	17/1.5
Evaluation of Administrators	599/52.6	32/2.8	496/43.6	11/1.0
Reporting on Student Progress	23/2.0	5/0.4	1099/96.5	11/1.0
Selection of Textbooks	220/19.3	14/1.2	887/77.9	17/1.5
Hiring of Administration	747/65.6	36/3.2	347/30.5	8/0.7
Organization of Instruc- tional Program	375/33.0	19/1.7	729/64.1	15/1.3
Evaluation of Teachers	90/7.9	12/1.1	1022/89.8	14/1.2
Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools	982/86.3	28/2.5	117/10.3	11/1.0
Tenure/Promotion of Personnel	735/64.6	39/3.4	349/30.7	15/1.3
Negotiation and Collec- tive Bargaining	822/72.2	31/2.7	261/22.9	24/2.1

n = 1,138

Appendix J
Respondent's Concerns

Listing of Respondent's
Most Pressing Concerns

Category	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	Total/%
Integration/busing	8	26	12	46/ 4.0
Use of Drugs	27	132	106	265/23.3
Declining Enrollment	248	318	52	618/54.3
Large Schools/ Overcrowding	20	41	10	71/ 6.2
Teachers' Lack of Interest	20	90	53	163/14.3
Lack of Discipline	17	101	73	191/16.8
Crime/Vandalism	--	38	21	59/ 5.2
Pupils' Lack of Interest/Truanny	12	73	40	125/10.9
Poor Curriculum/ Poor Standards	22	66	43	131/11.5
Difficulty of Getting Good Teachers	31	88	59	178/15.6
Parents' Lack of Interest	46	214	129	389/34.2
Lack of Respect for other Students/Teachers	12	73	49	134/11.8
Lack of Proper Financial Support	357	310	58	725/63.7

n = 1,138

Appendix K

Comparison of Sex of Respondents by Sex of Serving Board Members

Comparison of Sex of Respondents by Sex of Serving Board Members

Category	Respondents	Board Members
Male	68.2	71.7
Female	31.7	28.3
No Response	0.1	----
Total	100.0	100.0

Note: There is a slight bias in female response because more female board member subscribers responded to the questionnaire than are presently serving on boards of education.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

A National Study of the Attitude of School Board
Members Toward Community Participation-Community Control

by

James A. Meyer

(ABSTRACT)

Community participation has increased over the last twenty years. The states of California, Florida, Hawaii and South Carolina have mandated representative community advisory councils. The purpose of this study was to investigate on a national level the attitude of local school board members toward community participation-community control within the selected areas of curriculum, finance, personnel and student affairs, and the relationship of this attitude to selected demographic and personal data. The population for this descriptive research was school board member subscribers to The American School Board Journal. A stratified random sample of 17% received the National Questionnaire on Attitudes of School Board Members. Responses were analyzed according to frequency distribution and crosstabulation procedures to determine significance between respondent's attitude and demographic and personal variables. Respondents reported that there were six areas in which the community should be involved, are presently involved, and to which they would be willing to delegate decision-making

responsibility. These areas were: Education Objectives; Construction, Renovation or Closing of Schools; Curriculum Evaluation; Determination of Local Tax Rates; Student Discipline; and Expenditures for School Operation. The respondents differed in attitude toward the six areas mentioned above across demographic and personal variables.