

A NATIONAL STUDY OF THE SELECTION
OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

by

Beatrice H. Cameron

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. Ronald L. McKeen

Dr. Katherine E. Keough

May, 1987

Blacksburg, Virginia

©1987

BEATRICE HILL CAMERON

All Rights Reserved

A NATIONAL STUDY OF THE SELECTION OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

by

Beatrice H. Cameron

Committee Chairman: Kenneth E. Underwood
Education Administration

(ABSTRACT)

The study, tenth in a series sponsored by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and the National School Boards Association, proposed to determine salient factors in the recruitment and selection of school board members and, further, how these factors related to selected demographic and personal variables and/or the method (elected or appointed) by which school board members' were selected. In addition, the study examined board members' preferences for a trustee versus delegate role in relation to their communities.

The study utilized descriptive research methodology and survey technique to gather data from a national sample of school board members. A stratified random sample of board members was selected from the list of subscribers to The American School Board Journal. The survey was designed to collect attitudinal, personal, and demographic information about school board members and obtain information regarding

selected characteristics of their school board and factors related to their recruitment and selection to that board. Appropriate descriptive research methodology and statistical treatments were utilized. Findings were related to six major research questions as well as historical information and previous research on this topic.

The study's results described respondents by region of the United States, enrollment size, type of community, sex, race, age, educational level, occupation, length of board service, size of school board, coterminousness of boundaries, and fiscal relationship of the school districts. Ten factors related to the recruitment and selection of school board members were described including prior community service, sources of encouragement, reason for seeking membership, representative structure, political status, format and competition, the campaign process, selection, recall, and future intentions. Data were analyzed to provide a descriptive summary and determine differences according to method of selection (elected versus appointed) and 12 variables related to demographic, personal, and school board characteristics. Differences between elected and appointed board members were viewed as representing statistically significant as well as "true" phenomenological differences. Data revealed a preference for a trustee role suggesting that the majority of school board members sought, were selected, and were motivated to represent the interests of their communities.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to express her deepest appreciation to The American School Board Journal and to the following individuals, without whose help, completion of this study would not have been possible.

Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood for the wisdom of his counsel, his unflagging enthusiasm, "can do" philosophy, and most of all that benign tolerance of less-than-perfect performance which stimulates one's reach to exceed her grasp.

My husband, Bern, for his many expeditious readings of the manuscript as it came off the pen, his insight into issues central to my hypotheses, and his moral support in the face of dinners unserved, family obligations unmet, and the inevitable procession of two years' of hundred-hour work weeks.

My parents, Uno and Sophia, for their unwavering belief in the importance of education which has resulted in all three of their children having achieved doctorates in the separate fields of medicine, music, and education.

Dr. Maurice Fisher who provided invaluable assistance with the extensive raw data and who executed multiple short-turn-around computer runs on impossible time lines.

Virginia Thompson, who typed the manuscript, and forfeited nights and week-ends beyond number in the interest of professional pride in producing a document not only technically correct, but quite elegant.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Statement of Need.....	4
	Statement of the Problem.....	6
	Research Questions.....	6
	Definitions.....	7
	Limitations of the Study.....	8
	Organization of the Study.....	9
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
	Historical Perspectives.....	10
	Selection of School Board Members.....	19
	Factors Related to Recruitment and Selection...	25
	Demographic, Personal, and School Board	
	Characteristics Related to the Recruitment	
	and Selection of School Board Members.....	37
	● Demographic Characteristics.....	37
	● Personal Characteristics.....	38
	● School Board Characteristics.....	41
	Modes of Representation.....	45
	Summary.....	47
3	METHODOLOGY.....	49
	Research Methodology.....	49
	Sample.....	51

Chapter		Page
	Instrumentation.....	55
	Collection of Data.....	59
	Method of Analysis.....	60
	Summary.....	61
4	RESULTS.....	62
	Description of the Sample.....	62
	• Demographic Data Relative to the Respondents.....	62
	• Personal Data Relative to Respondents....	66
	• School Board Characteristics Relative to Respondents.....	69
	Findings for Each Research Question.....	75
	• Question 1.....	75
	• Question 2.....	112
	• Question 3.....	123
	• Question 4.....	133
	• Question 5.....	143
	• Question 6.....	153
	Summary.....	158
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	159
	Summary.....	159
	• Purpose of the Study.....	159
	• Research Questions Restated.....	161
	• Summary of Related Literature.....	162
	• Research Methodology.....	166

Chapter	Page
Results.....	168
Conclusion.....	178
Recommendations for Further Study.....	184
REFERENCES.....	186
APPENDIX.....	190
VITA.....	200

List of Tables

Table 1:	Elected Versus Appointed School Boards by States.....	20
Table 2:	Regions of the United States According to National School Board Association.....	53
Table 3:	Population and Sample by Region.....	54
Table 4:	Relationship of Study Factors to Questionnaire Items.....	58
Table 5:	Distribution of Returned Surveys by Region and in Relation to National Distribution of School Districts.	63
Table 6:	Distribution of Returned Surveys by Enrollment Size and in Relation to National Distribution of School Districts.	65
Table 7:	Distribution of Returned Surveys by Community Description.....	67
Table 8:	Personal Characteristics of Respondents by Number and Percent (Sex, Ethnic Designation, Age, Educational Level, and Occupation.....	68
Table 9:	Distribution of Respondents by Length of Board Service.....	70
Table 10:	Size of School Boards Served On by Respondents.....	72
Table 11:	Coterminous Boundaries of School Districts with Other Governmental Units of School Boards Served On by Respondents.....	73
Table 12:	Fiscal Relationship of School Districts in States of School Boards Served On by Respondents.....	74

Table 13:	Method of Selection of the School Board in School Districts of Respondents.....	76
Table 14:	Method of Selection to the School Board by Respondents.....	77
Table 15:	Amount of Service Prior to Board Membership by Sector and Combinations of Sectors as Reported by Respondents.....	79
Table 16:	Service Prior to Board Membership by Sector as Reported by Respondents.....	81
Table 17:	Source(s) of Encouragement to Seek Board Membership as Reported by Respondents.....	84
Table 18:	Form of Nomination of Candidates for School Board Membership as Reported by Respondents.....	85
Table 19:	Number of Reasons for Membership on the School Board as Reported by Respondents.....	87
Table 20:	Reason for Membership on the School Board as Reported by Respondents.....	88
Table 21:	The Single Most Important Reason for Seeking Membership on the School Board as Reported by Respondents.....	90
Table 22:	Representative Structure for the Selection of School Board Members as Reported by Respondents.....	92
Table 23:	Political Status of School Board Members at Time of Selection as Reported by Respondents.....	93
Table 24:	Format and Competition in the Selection Process for Board Membership as Reported by Respondents.....	95
Table 25:	Incumbents Unseated by Selection of Board Member as Reported by Respondents.....	97

Table 26:	Presence of Elements of the Campaign Process: Platform, Issue Differences, Formal Campaign, and Public Support as Reported by Respondents.....	99
Table 27:	Month in which School Board Selection Completed as Reported by Respondents.....	103
Table 28:	Presence of Other Issue(s) on the Ballot at Time of Election as Reported by Respondents.....	105
Table 29:	Voter Participation in Most Recent Election as Reported by Respondents.....	106
Table 30:	Recall Provisions as Reported by Respondents.....	108
Table 31:	Intention to Serve Another Term on the School Board or to Seek Another Public Office as Reported by Respondents..	110
Table 32:	Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Demographic, Personal, and School Board Characteristics for Elected and Appointed School Board Members as Reported by Respondents.....	113
Table 33:	Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members for Elected and Appointed Respondents, as Reported.....	117
Table 34:	Summary of Cross-Tabulations of 10 Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by Demographic Variables (Region, Size, and Type) of School District as Reported by Respondents	124
Table 35:	Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by Personal Variables (Sex, Ethnic, Age, Education, and Occupation) of Respondents as Reported by Respondents.....	134

Table 36:	Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by School Board Variables (Length of Service, Size of Board, Coterminous Boundaries, and Fiscal Relationship) as Reported by Respondents..	145
Table 37:	Preference for Mode of Representation as Reported by Respondents.....	154
Table 38:	Summary of Significance of Cross-Tabulations Regarding Preferred Mode of Representation by Method of Selection and Demographic and Personal Characteristics.....	156
Table 39:	Percent of Respondents According to Preference for Delegate Versus Trustee Mode of Representativeness by Region, Size of School District, Type of School District, and Educational Level.....	157

Chapter 1

Introduction

School Board membership is the highest form of public service. (The Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc. (IEL), 1986, p. 14)

In the United States, lay control of public institutions, especially schools, has had a profound impact on society and the nation. Lay governance of education has been credited as a critical feature of American education since the early colonial period and has been seen as essential to the establishment of universal free public education (Cremin, 1970). Understanding and examining the process of determining lay control of education can form the basis for projecting future changes in the governance of education.

The United States' experience with and commitment to lay boards of education is far-reaching. There are over 95,000 American citizens serving on school boards. They make decisions which affect the educational welfare of millions of school children enrolled in public schools. The school board is the spokesman for the community on public education; school boards represent the people. The power to establish local policies governing a local school system is delegated to the school board by the

state; school board members are, in effect, agents of the state (Campbell et al., 1985).

In the organized political life of a community, governing bodies function to carry out the administrative, legislative, judicial, and other responsibilities entrusted to them. Whatever their specific sphere of responsibility, they exercise authority to regulate the behavior of the population within the community and commit the resources of the community. The school board is one such governing body. Local governing bodies share two common features: (a) They must be constituted; that is, offices are constitutionally defined in terms of the functioning of the body and, then, through the selection of individuals to fill these offices, the set of specifications in a legal code is transformed into a governing body; (b) governing bodies comprise only a fraction of the total population; that is, a very few come to govern the very many. All forms of government, from the largest to the smallest, share this attribute (Prewitt, 1970).

Selecting the few who will occupy the governing positions in a community is a generic political process, a process that determines how political elites are recruited. Recruitment is, according to Cistone (1975), a process that includes: (a) demonstration of eligibility,

and (b) selection and assignment of individuals for such specific roles as that of school board member. The process of leadership selection is completed once the electorate chooses among the candidates.

Not only is it important to acknowledge the linkage of political processes and education, it is critical to understand this linkage as politics and power go hand in hand. If political processes allocate values and resources, then the distribution and exercise of power determine who gets what, when, and how. Power relationships are critical in the governing of public education through educational decision-making. The real decision-makers in the government of education are people who are successful in resolving school issues and school policies in accord with their own values, judgments, and perceptions (Rosenthal, 1969).

It is said, however, that school boards are in trouble (IEL, 1986). In its study, the Institute for Educational Leadership found that although there is strong support for keeping school boards close to the people, that there is apathy and indifference. The study also found, however, that there is almost a universal belief that school boards are important, that they have a serious public service to render, and that a free democratic society cannot do without them.

It is important, as we approach education in the 21st century, to assess the recruitment and selection process by which local school board members become empowered to act on behalf of their communities in the shaping of public school policy. Few efforts have been made to study the recruitment and selection of local school board members. Fewer efforts have been made to relate an understanding of these factors to modes of decision-making. Identifying and understanding the recruitment and selection process and relating these factors to modes of decision-making is potentially useful to promote greater awareness of the important role of school boards and to assist in efforts to strengthen their membership, role, and functioning. Finally, this information is potentially useful to add to the limited body of knowledge about school boards and their members.

Statement of Need

The pattern of having public schools directed and controlled by elected or appointed lay officials at the local district level is uniquely American (Callahan in Cistone, 1975). If school boards are to realize their obligations and responsibilities, exercise leadership, and shape American public education to meet the

needs and expectations of citizens, it is important to understand the process of recruitment and selection of school board members. Who are they? What are their affiliations? Why did they run? What was the issue or were there issues? How hotly contested are school board elections? How many vote? Are voters overturning boards? How often? How much money is spent? Where do board members derive support? Have they run for office before? Will they run again? Will they run for "higher" office? How do school board members view their representative role? Do their perceptions of major issues reflect those of the general public?

The recruitment and selection of school board members reflects the political process. At this time in education, it is important to assess and reflect on the shifts and changes in the American public and surmise how this impact will be felt by school boards. Changing demographics of the population may mean that education will not be able to rely on the "good will" of an electorate of which the majority do not have children in school. Education will need the support from an electorate who may have other priorities or other ideas about the role and functioning of public education. Information, therefore, is vital to understand those influences, processes, and factors which relate to the selection of school board members. How have

these changed in the last 20 years? Are there differences by region, by nature of the school districts, or by size of the community?

This study is intended to provide current data on the recruitment and selection of school board members and their modes of decision-making and indicate how these processes varied among school board members and school districts across the United States. The study also could provide useful information to local school board members and their associations regarding the process and factors in the selection of governing bodies in order to maintain and strengthen the vitality of educational leadership.

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of this study was to determine the salient factors in the recruitment and selection of school board members; board members' preference for a trustee versus delegate mode of representativeness; and how these factors related to selected demographic, personal, and school board variables and/or to the method by which school board members are selected.

Research Questions

The research questions to be addressed were:

1. What are the most salient factors which describe the selection process of school board members?

2. Do these factors differ significantly as a function of the method of selection of the school board?

3. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of (a) size of school districts; (b) type or location of school district; or (c) region of the country?

4. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of the (a) size; (b) ethnic designation; (c) age; (d) education; or (e) occupation of school board members?

5. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of (a) length of term or membership; (b) size of the school board; (c) relationship of the school board to other local governmental units; or (d) type of fiscal control?

6. Do school board members differ in their preference for a trustee versus delegate role model of representativeness as a function of their method of selection to the school board or demographic and personal characteristics?

Definitions

The following terms used in this study have certain restrictions placed on their usage:

School board member. The term school board member, as used in this study, identifies an individual either elected or appointed who is a member of a local or regional board of education.

Demographic characteristics. This term refers to relevant variables descriptive of a local school district such as region of the country, type or location, or size.

Personal characteristics. This term refers to socially relevant variables such as age, sex, race, education, and occupation as noted by the respondent.

Mode of representativeness. This phrase refers to a political indicator of the extent to which school board members act on the basis of the expressed preferences of constituents. Each board member's perception of his/her mode of representativeness was classified as delegate or trustee. Classically defined by Edmund Burke, these terms were defined by Lutz and Garmon (1979): trustee, the representative who acts in the public's interest as he or she sees that interest; delegate, the representative who seeks the public's opinion and acts upon it.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study were:

1. The population from which the sample was drawn was that of subscribers to The American School Board Journal and was not that of the total population serving as school board members in the United States.

2. A follow-up survey could not be conducted in an effort to improve the response rate because The American School Board Journal required anonymity.

3. The responses to the questionnaire were assumed to be the true attitude of the respondents based on personal observation, experience, or preference.

4. Responses to items on the questionnaire regarding school board characteristics may reflect multiple responses about a particular school board because it was not possible to limit the sample to only one member of a given board.

Organization of the Study

This study of the recruitment and selection of school board members is divided into five chapters.

Chapter 1 contains introduction, statement of need, statement of the problem, research questions, definitions, and limitations of the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature relevant to the recruitment and selection of school board members and to their roles and issues of concern as they relate to the selection process.

Chapter 3 includes a description of research methodology, selection of the sample, instrumentation, collection of data, and method of analysis.

Chapter 4 describes the data and the findings of the survey and provides an analysis of data concerning the research questions.

Chapter 5 contains the conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature relevant to salient factors in the recruitment and selection of school board members and how these factors may be related to modes of representativeness and the method by which school board members are selected. This chapter is divided into sections which include historical perspectives; selection of school board members; factors related to recruitment and selection; demographic, personal, and school board characteristics; modes of representation; and a summary.

The sources reviewed included books, periodicals, journals, and dissertations.

Historical Perspectives

School boards are policymaking bodies by tradition and legal interpretation. Educational policymaking is a political activity conducted within complex political environments. It is essential to understand the history of school boards, the origins of boards of education, and their responsibilities, in order to comprehend the unique political contexts within which the members are

selected and perform their public service as well as to project and recommend future refinements and improvements in educational governance (Campbell et al., 1985).

School boards of the United States trace their historical roots to the Massachusetts School Ordinance of 1642 which delegated specific responsibility for education to the "townsmen," persons who also had other local governmental responsibilities (Dexter, 1922). In 1647, the government of Massachusetts Bay Colony passed a law requiring all towns of a certain size to establish and maintain schools. Control and responsibility for education was made a function of town government and was not separated from other local regulatory and service functions. Townsmen were both legislative and administrative officials; policies and administrative matters were determined at town meetings or by the selectmen of the town (Callahan in Cistone, 1975; Reeves, 1954).

As the demand for education increased and public interest in schools grew, and as the non-education problems of local government multiplied, temporary committees were appointed by the selectmen (Boston, 1721) to handle educational affairs resulting in the appointment of the first permanent school visiting committee separate from other local governing bodies (Reeves, 1954). In

1789, the Massachusetts legislature passed the first comprehensive state school law that required every town to support an elementary school, larger ones to provide grammar schools, and towns to certify teachers as well as authorizing towns to employ a special committee to attend to the schools. Boston, in the same year, passed its own school law which provided for the creation of a separate school committee (twelve members, one from each ward) to be elected by the people. Thus, the term "school committee" arose and has been applied to the body which locally controls education, although today local school governing bodies are known by many titles (e.g., school board, school trustees, board of school directors). Secondly, eventually, virtually all states, cities, and towns adopted the pattern of school governance established in Massachusetts and Boston (Callahan, 1975).

State authority over public schools began in Massachusetts in 1647, soon after the settlement of the colony (Reeves, 1954). Today, the statutes of each of the 50 states provide the framework and boundaries within which school boards function. Prescribed are methods for selecting members as well as matters such as the size of the board, length of term of members, procedures for filling vacancies, place and time of regular and special meetings, and the duties and responsibilities of

board members. The power to establish local policies governing a local school system is delegated to the school board by the state; school board members are, in effect, agents of the state. At the same time, board members are either elected or appointed locally and are responsive to their constituencies (Campbell et al., 1985).

In the history of school boards, Callahan (1975) considers that there have been two periods in which significant change occurred. Early school boards performed executive or administrative as well as legislative functions. The first significant change identified by Callahan occurred in the 1840s when, in Boston, the office of superintendent of schools was created and school boards began to delegate some of their administrative functions to that person. The second period of significant change peaked in the 1890s and occurred at a national level. The issue was whether public schools should be controlled by locally elected officials or by professional experts in the offices of the superintendency.

Beginning in 1872, superintendents (including John Philbrick, Thomas Bicknell, Emerson White, Andrew Draper, William Maxwell, and Nicholas Murray Butler) began discussion that had as the objective changes which would give the superintendents the power, prestige, salary, and

security they thought they needed and deserved. These superintendents felt that an essential step in the improvement of the quality of education was to empower themselves as "educational experts" to assure that the best educational programs were provided by the schools and to eliminate the corrupt politicians who, as they saw it, were using the schools for their personal political or economic benefit. This view of school boards was crystallized in a document written by John D. Philbrick in 1885. Philbrick wrote "as is your school board, so are your schools" . . . "The school boards are probably few and far between among whose members there are not some persons unjustified for a trust of such importance" (Callahan, 1975, p. 26). Philbrick reported that the office was frequently used by politicians as stepping-stones to other political offices and he urged that unscrupulous politicians be eliminated from school boards and that intelligent, honest, dedicated people be elected who would have the sense to turn over the supervision of the schools to professional experts.

Callahan (1975) contends that open battle emerged in 1895 and was significantly influenced by the writing of Joseph Mayer Rice. The debate was over "Who would run the schools?" and in the end, there was a compromise settlement: superintendents had made significant gains but not a clear-cut victory. The superintendents' positions were

incorporated in a report drafted by Andrew S. Draper to the National Education Association in 1895 and addressed the following questions:

Should there be a board of education, or a commissioner with an advisory council?

If a commissioner, should he be elected by the people, or appointed by the mayor, or selected in some other way?

What should be his powers and duties?

If a board of education, of how many members should it consist?

Should the members be elected or appointed? From the city at large or to represent districts?

By what authority should the superintendent of schools be elected or appointed? and what term?

Should the city superintendent owe his appointment directly or indirectly to the state educational authorities, and be responsible to them rather than to the local authorities?

In whom should be vested the power to appoint teachers?

In whom the power to discharge teachers?

By whom should the course of study be made?

By whom should promotions be made? (Callahan, 1975, p. 29)

The report did not recommend elimination of school boards but did recommend virtually turning the schools over to the superintendents. The report antagonized school board members and one member from Milwaukee and a journalist, William George Bruce, emerged to lead the fight against the superintendents. He labeled the intent of the Draper Report as "The 'Czar' Movement" and accused superintendents of wanting to eliminate school boards.

The significance of debate was continued as superintendents and board members discussed the questions of the appropriate role and responsibilities to be assumed by each. The evidence, however, suggests that since 1895 schools were largely removed from partisan politics; school boards were reduced in size; and superintendents were given the power to hire teachers, select textbooks, and control the education program generally. As the school board, however, retained the power of appointment and dismissal of the superintendent, the major outcome was that "the American tradition of having its public schools controlled by elected officials was maintained and, in a most basic sense, strengthened" (Callahan, 1975, p. 34).

In 1916, Edward P. Cubberly published a textbook on school administration in which he made recommendations regarding the selection and organization of school boards. Although his ideas were the syntheses of many, Callahan (1975) cites Cubberly's book as being the most influential and that "at least until 1960, the vast majority of local school boards in America have been selected and organized, and have functioned, along the lines that he advocated" (p. 37).

Cubberly recommended that school boards should be small (five to seven members), should be elected at

large and not from wards (ward representation led to political evils and social-class bias), members should serve without pay, and be derived from men who were successful in the handling of large business undertakings (manufacturers, merchants, bankers, contractors, and professional men) and not the inexperienced, unsuccessful, uneducated, or retired men or women. Other recommendations made by Cubberly included that school boards be elected and not appointed and terms of office for three to five years, that school boards be independent of municipal government, and that they act as committees of the whole (no standing committees) in order to act as a legislative body (determine policies, select experts, decide on expenditures and tax levies, etc.), and turn the executive function--the operation of the schools--over to the superintendent and staff (Callahan, 1975).

In 1938, the question of whether local boards of education should be abolished or reduced in power was settled by the issuance of the Educational Policies Commission report written by George Strayer. Callahan (1975) calls the report, The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy, "the most influential statement ever published on the subject" (p. 41). Strayer stated that "faith in the local administration is part of the democratic tradition" (Callahan, 1975, p. 41) and while he believed the board should rely on the advice of experts,

he concluded, "The final authority must rest with the lay board. The schools belong to the people" (p. 41).

The American school board historical perspective reflected that it is the product of over 200 years of evolution, changing little in terms of legal responsibilities in the past 75 years (IEL, 1986). In the beginning and today, school boards are the governing agency of the public schools. Challenged by superintendents, educators, and communities, the role and responsibilities have been defined by state and federal laws, court decisions, and local rules and regulations reflecting long-standing tensions between governance and management; federal, state, and local control; and the distribution of power and influence within the community itself. Again, in 1987, school boards are being challenged to address the national agenda of education reform. Begun in 1983 with the publication of The Nation at Risk and mostly resulting in state-level activities to raise educational standards for students, the second wave of the reform movement has focused on the need for the improvement of teachers. Local school boards have been criticized for abdicating leadership and resisting change; local boards have responded with concern over costs and control. It is, again, a time of challenge and study to determine the strength and direction of grassroots leadership of American public education.

Selection of School Board Members

School board members are either appointed or elected. The vast majority, however, are elected. Indeed, according to information in the 1982 Census of Governments and the 1977 survey by the National Center for Education Statistics, 95.6% (15,142) school boards in the United States are elected, leaving a scant 4.1% (642) appointed. As indicated on Table 1, all school boards are elected in 31 states; 15 states have a preference for elected boards but have made some provisions for school board appointment (e.g., municipalities, joint or regional systems, or special purpose school districts); general laws provide for appointed boards in three states (Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey), but special provisions allow elected boards; and one state (Virginia) only permits appointed school boards. In general, studies have shown that appointive systems are more common in the South than in the Northeast, North Central, and West regions (Underwood et al., 1981) and among the nation's larger school districts (National School Boards Association, 1975).

Theoretical arguments over whether it is preferable to elect or appoint school board members in order to realize effective school boards has been presented in the literature. Reeves (1954) provides the following case for elective boards:

Table 1

Elected Versus Appointed School Boards by States

States With Only Elected School Board Members	States With Appointed and Elected School Board Members	States With Only Appointed School Board Members
Alaska	<u>Preference for Elected</u>	Virginia
Arizona		
Arkansas		
Colorado	Alabama	
Connecticut	California	
Florida	Georgia	
Hawaii	Illinois	
Idaho	Indiana	
Iowa	Michigan	
Kansas	Mississippi	
Kentucky	New Hampshire	
Louisiana	New York	
Maine	North Carolina	
Massachusetts	Pennsylvania	
Minnesota	Rhode Island	
Missouri	South Carolina	
Montana	Tennessee	
Nebraska	Wisconsin	
Nevada		
New Mexico		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma	<u>Preference for Appointed</u>	
Oregon		
South Dakota		
Texas	Delaware	
Utah	Maryland	
Vermont	New Jersey	
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wyoming		

1. People take more interest in their schools and in local educational issues when the issues are popularized as the result of an election campaign.

2. Election of school board members is more democratic than appointment.

3. School boards consisting of elective members are more free to act independently for what they deem to be the best interests of the schools.

4. An elective board is more responsive to the will of the people.

5. Election, more often than appointment, protects the schools from local politics.

6. Elective boards may be more free to act on the professional advice of the superintendent and staff.

7. The elective method is preferred and is the most commonly used.

Reeves (1954) also posits the case for appointed boards as follows:

1. It is often possible to secure better school board members by appointment than by election.

2. The appointing authority can be held fully responsible to the people for the actions of the school board.

3. Appointment for only, overlapping terms of persons deeply interested in the schools will secure less politically inclined persons.

4. Appointive methods result in greater average lengths of service on the board which is desirable.

5. Appointed school board members may feel less pressure to "make good" on issues that are not related to sound educational theory or practice.

In an article, "What Works Best: An Elected or an Appointed School Board," Hurwitz (1972) points out that voters in local school districts do not direct the decision but, rather, it is the state legislature that most often prescribes the method of selection. Reviewing the basic rationales, Hurwitz summarizes the case for each:

Simply stated, an elected board is more responsive to the will of the people than is an appointed board because its members are elected to represent the people in determining school policies. An elected board therefore can be held accountable by the public for its actions, while an appointed board is only indirectly responsible to the people of the school district (through the mayor or other official or body).

Leading citizens in many cities and towns will accept the position of school board members if they're appointed to it whereas they (won't submit) to the harassments inherent in the free election process. . . . Many people who possess the potential for becoming first-rate board members are unaccustomed to public defeat. Team this fact with an understandable reluctance to spend personal time and money it takes to enter any type of standard election and you have a situation where qualified people will rarely sit on boards of education. (Hurwitz, 1972, p. 21-22)

The argument for and against elected or appointed school boards rotates on the issues of accountability versus competence. And, as Hurwitz states "neither way guarantees 'good' boards."

A National School Boards Association report (1975) found no evidence of a correlation between effective governance of a school system and the method of selecting school board members. There was, however, a correlation between a good board and the community climate as measured by interest, responsiveness, enthusiasm, and pride. Another National School Boards Association study (1975) confirmed a pattern that suggests that the public is more aware of the work of elected school boards than those appointed.

Zeigler and Jennings (1974) in a definitive work Governing American Schools asked "Who governs American education to what end?" They conclude that the early educational reformers, those who wanted to keep politics and education separate, succeeded all too well. The consequences, they state, of an avowedly apolitical approach to education include failure to measure up to the standards of democratic leadership selection marked by the non-existence of controversy, desire for change, and the restlessness with the status quo which they believe is the heart of the electoral process. Specifically, Zeigler and Jennings found in their study that although most board members are elected, 21% of this sample of elective board members originally obtained their seats by appointment; that 3 in every 10 board members

gained office as appointees. Further, examining the relationship of the electoral process to measures of school board member responsiveness, their study found a "good deal of mythology about the responsiveness of appointed versus elected officials in public life" (p. 85) and that there is tenuous support for the common view that elected officials are more responsive because they know they can be sanctioned by defeat at the polls. Zeigler and Jennings found that compared with appointed boards, the elected ones are somewhat less responsive to group pressures but somewhat more responsive to individuals and, conversely, appointed boards are more responsive to group interests, although, overall appointed boards are more responsive in general. Appointed boards, they suggest, may tend to "overcompensate in responsiveness in the absence of being officially 'the people's choice'" (p. 87). They, too, as the National School Boards Association study showed, noted that whether the board of education is elected or appointed is either unknown or irrelevant to the constituents. Their findings cast doubt on the assumption that the form of election produces the substance of representation and that "the question is not encouraging for those placing their bets on elected boards as being more responsive" (Zeigler and Jennings, 1974, p. 87).

This monumental study by Ziegler and Jennings (1974) concluded that school boards, whether elected or appointed, generally fail to govern and recommended that boards become more political in order that schools can be more responsive to their constituents.

Factors Related to Recruitment and Selection

Whether elected or appointed, the researcher identified ten factors related to the recruitment and selection of school board members. These were:

1. Prior service to the community. Recruitment, the process by which persons are selected to become school board members, is, according to Cistone (1975), "a selective flow of individuals that entails both eligibility for elite status and subsequent selection and assignment to specific elite positions" (p. 48). Eligibility is viewed as an outcome of a person's status in the structure of political opportunity and, therefore, it is possible to determine effective political opportunity from the prior experiences of those subsequently nominated and/or elected. One factor identified by Cistone is that derived through apprenticeship. He defines apprenticeship as the "cumulative political learning and experience that goes on in organizations and associations as a training for political roles. It serves to channel ambition and to mobilize talent and resources toward public office" (p. 54).

In research reported by Cistone (1974) and by Zeigler and Jennings (1974), school board members were found actively involved in the organizational and associational life of the community. Cistone found that 97% of his sample of school board members had been active in some civic, educational, or occupational organization prior to standing for election. Zeigler and Jennings found that most board members (87%) served apprenticeships in public affairs as a step toward board membership. Their study found that although no one arena--civic/business, political/governmental, or educational--predominated as a pathway to the board, of all the steps, more board members participated and to a greater degree in the civic/business domain than the political/governmental and educational domains which were closely matched. Their study also found that nearly half of their sample of board members had not participated in educational affairs; but that of the half that did, 42% had participated in the PTA, 21% on some form of a citizens advisory committee, and many mentioned civic/service organizations whose primary focus is not education but who devote some time to education. Appointees to school boards were found not to be appreciably different in their pattern of pre-board apprenticeship from their elected counterparts although more of them had been active in an education-

related committee or group. Since appointees were found to so closely resemble the initially elected in terms of pre-board experiences, Zeigler and Jennings conclude that the composition of appointed and elected boards are not appreciably different.

2. Source(s) of encouragement/nomination. A second factor identified as part of the recruitment and selection process was that of the role of sponsors and selectors. Few people, studies of recruitment have found (Cistone, 1975; Crain, 1968; Cronin, 1973; Minar, 1966; Zeigler & Jennings, 1974), enter public office without the encouragement and/or screening/sponsorship of others. Although Zeigler and Jennings found 23% of their sample claimed no encouragement from others, those that did most frequently (29%) cited school board members. Both Cistone and Zeigler and Jennings suggested that this indicates a strategy to self-perpetuate style and politics. "Continuity of policy and practice is most effectively maintained if control can be exercised in the selection of successive recruits" (Cistone, 1975, p. 55).

Other active sources of encouragement by Zeigler and Jennings (1974) were formal citizen groups (21%), friends and neighbors (21%), professional school personnel (14%), and governmental and political figures (13%). This study concluded that (a) systematic

recruitment mechanisms are not that common, (b) at least 40% (combining board members and professional school personnel) of board members were inspired by representatives of the school system, and (c) that there are residues of partisan influences in school politics.

A second part of the "how" of the recruitment process is the screening or nomination of candidates. Reeves (1954) identified at least five methods used to nominate candidates: (a) petition, (b) primary election, (c) announcement, (d) caucus, or (e) open meeting or by more than one of these methods. He stated that the most common and probably the best method is nomination by petition. Campbell et al. (1985) discuss these methods, observing that the process of pre-sorting prior to the actual vote has become highly developed in some districts and less so in others. The caucus committee, defined as a body of school district volunteers who canvass, screen, and nominate the best available candidate--whether to be elected or appointed--has been advocated by some as a way to involve the community, achieve competent and dedicated members, and increase interest in school board membership and activity (Campbell et al., 1985; Hurwitz, 1972).

Encouragement, sponsorship, or selective nomination has been questioned as to whether such pre-sorting of candidates denied a democratic selection process. Martin

(1969) suggested that contrary to the apparent open door to candidacy for the school board, that committees, influential citizens, and other mechanisms deny the right to access, a basic democratic feature. Thus, Martin, instead of extolling the caucus committee as used in New York and Chicago and other cities, questioned the domination of such persons and the effect they have had on access.

Nomination for appointed boards were found to have various schemes. Campbell (1985) and Reeves (1954) listed several including those used for elective boards. The act of appointment has been found to be by the city council or similar legislative body, the mayor, county boards, judges, the governor, state legislator, or the county superintendent.

3. Reason for membership. Persons who are asked or nominate themselves have reasons for wanting to be board members (Campbell et al., 1985). McCarty (1959), investigating the motives of school board members in seven mid-western communities, found 54% expressed self-oriented motives (personal goals or special interest groups) and 46% had community-oriented motives (advancement of objectives of the school system to benefit the community generally). McCarty (1959) and Gross (1958) studied the relation of motives to the operation of boards. Both found that the higher proportion of board members motivated by civic duty, the less friction or more agreement on the board,

while the higher proportion motivated by self-interest or special interest groups, the more friction or less consensus on the board.

Reeves (1954) believes that school board membership is usually accepted as an opportunity to render service to one's community and that membership on a school board is sought because persons secure personal satisfaction from rendering service and deem it a personal honor to be elected to its membership. Although Reeves acknowledges some may be motivated by unworthy ideas, he concludes that most school board members have a firm belief in the importance of public education for the children of the school district.

4. Electoral Structure. One of the principal outcomes of the reform movement at the turn of the century was to replace neighborhood election districts (wards) with at-large elections (Reeves, 1954). By 1946, an American Association of School Administrators (AASA) study found that 85.7% of elective school boards were elected at-large. Indeed, Reeves (1954) states that "selection of school board members as representatives of precincts, wards, magisterial districts, or other subdivisions of the school district, is generally condemned as a method of selecting members of school boards" (p. 94).

Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found that although at-large elections was one of the two central pillars of the

reform movement (the other being nonpartisanship), 73% of the districts they studied had pure at-large elections.

Appointed boards, as discussed in Campbell et al. (1985), also have moved toward large regional representation although a number of cities or larger school districts have been found to have various kinds of appointment schemes.

Campbell et al. (1985) discussed specific structural modifications in the selection and representation of school board members across the United States from 1969 to 1982. Both the method (appointed or elected) and representation (at-large or area representation) have been studied by citizens in New York, Kansas City, Seattle, Oklahoma City, Milwaukee, Boston, Detroit, and San Francisco. While there was no overall trend, most structural modifications were changes to decrease the size and permit some regional representation.

5. Relationship to Partisan Politics. A key element of the reform movement was to eliminate party politics from education. Reeves (1954) states, "The schools have their own peculiar problems which are not in any sense related to the issues defined as Republican or Democratic. Political considerations should have no weight in the selection of members of school boards. . . . The nonpartisan ticket is to be preferred" (p. 92-93).

Previous studies have found the large majority (82-86%) of school board members are selected through nonpartisan elections (National Education Association, 1950).

Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found 59% of their sample of board members to have neither party or slate competition. They suggest, and Martin (1962) agreed, that the elimination of party politics, however, has not eliminated politics from education and that the old machines have been displaced by the politics of "good government" organizations and the educational bureaucracy. Their study, however, concluded that both at-large elections and nonpartisanship elections affected both the quantity and quality of competition for school board membership.

6. Format/Competition. The actual format of the selection process is related to the electoral structure (whether candidates are selected from a field at-large or whether selected for a specific seat) and to the presence of competition. It is extensively stated in school board literature that the actual selection of school board members reflects few candidates and low voter turnout (Lecos & Barham, 1975). Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found that in 24% of the school districts studied, there was no competition for school board seats and that 19% of all board members elected to office did not face

competition in their first election. This means that the overall majority of elected school board members (81%) did face competition. Minar (1966) found in a study of suburban elementary districts that the competition for school board seats varied inversely with the status of the districts; that is, the higher the socioeconomic status of the district, the less competition for school board seats. Data collected by the New Jersey School Boards Association from 1980 to 1985 showed a range of 1.6 to 1.25 candidates to available school board seats over the six-year period.

Closely associated to the factor of the formats and competition present in school board elections is the element in the selection process of winning or losing and whether winning involved defeating an incumbent. Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found that two-thirds of elective board members who faced competition, faced an incumbent and that, overall, 54% of school board candidates faced both opposition and an incumbent. Conversely, 43% of the school districts, their study found, had not experienced defeat of an incumbent. Zeigler and Jennings use this data to argue that there is little conflict and little opposition to the status quo, resulting in little exercise of the democratic selection process in the selection of school board members.

7. The campaign process. A series of elements were identified as constituting a factor of the campaign process itself in the selection of school board members. The research is lean on such elements as whether there was, in fact, a campaign, the development of issues or a platform, whether opposing candidates had ideas that were different, and whether the public was actively involved through organized support for the candidate. Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found that 58% of their sample replied that they had ideas about schools that differed from other candidates. These differences were about board rules (38%), educational program and personnel (33%), physical and fiscal problems (27%), and civil rights and liberties (22%). Further, the study found that approximately one-half (48%) of those receiving encouragement to run (as opposed to self-starters) indicated that they received some organized public support. These findings, suggest Zeigler and Jennings (1974), that "the early educational reformers, those who wanted to keep politics and education separate, succeeded all too well."

Campbell et al. (1985), without citing specific studies, suggested otherwise. They stated:

Board members have been cajoled, threatened, harassed, and sometimes applauded for their stances on emotion-laden issues. Public sentiment has often been strong enough to threaten recall elections,

mobilize opposition slates, or otherwise affect the outcome of school board elections. Busing, the neighborhood school, prayer in the school, reading methods, and pupil safety are some of the issues capable of arousing widespread interest in who school board members are and how they have been chosen. (p. 174)

8. Selection. The actual selection of school board members is characterized by the event of an election or appointment at a fixed time. According to Lecos (1972), voter turnout for school board elections has been poor and the percent voting has been less than those participating in other local, state, and federal elections. In its recent study, IEL (1986) found that there "appears to be deep public apathy and indifference, as reflected in the difficulty of attracting quality candidates. . . . and in the abysmally low voter turnout for board elections" (p. 10).

Data provided by the New Jersey School Boards Association indicated that from 1979 to 1985 there had been a range in voter turnout in annual school elections from an average high of 15.2% in 1982 to an average low of 7.34% in 1985 across the 549 school districts that conducted elections.

Opinion (Reeves, 1954) is divided as to whether it is more desirable to hold school board elections jointly with or separately from general elections. Reeves concluded that, generally, it is better to hold elections jointly due to expense and the desirability of encouraging

voter turnout. The results of special school elections, stated Reeves, are often determined by a small group of people who may not represent community opinion. Martin (1962) acknowledged that separate school elections permit concentration of energies and resources on education and emphasize the independence of schools but he observed consequences rendered the electoral process more subject to control than if played on a larger stage and resulted in lack of public interest and small voter turnout.

9. Recall. One of the indices of competition in the selection of school board members is the use of recall procedures or the forcing of turnover in a seat. Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found only 3% of school districts studied had experienced a forced turnover affecting 1-10% of the members. Recall may be the ultimate way in which a community exercises its sanctions against what it views to be an unresponsive public official, but data would suggest that it is infrequently used when it comes to school boards.

10. Intentions. Those opposed to partisan and elected school boards often cite the "stepping-stone" phenomena of board members seeking higher office as one of the undesirable outcomes. Their argument is that such ambition or use of school board office attracts corrupt politicians who are not truly interested in education and the schools but

merely of using membership for further personal advancement. Zeigler and Jennings (1974) posit an opposing argument which suggests that ambition for office and aspiration for higher office are requisites for meaningful elections and an accountable political process. Their study found, however, relatively low ambitions and aspirations. When asked if board members desired another term, Zeigler and Jennings found 32% said "yes," 37% "not sure," and 31% said "no." Asked whether they had any interest in other offices, 81% said, flatly, "no," 12% said "yes," and 7% said "maybe." Further, 44% of those saying "yes" aspired to another local or county position, and 42% aspired to state or national office. Zeigler and Jennings assess such responses as indicative of the low public responsiveness to be expected from school boards and the passive electoral climate of school board elections.

Demographic, Personal, and School Board
Characteristics Related to the
Recruitment and Selection
of School Board Members

Demographic Characteristics

Region, size, and type of school district have been variables related to certain aspects of school board functioning, particularly in a series of studies undertaken by The American School Board Journal and Virginia Tech (ASBJ-VT). Examining the profile of school board members

region to region, these studies have painted national and regional profiles of school board members that yield subtle differences (ASBJ-VT studies, 1978 to 1986).

These same studies have found that the majority of school board members (49%) serve in districts with student enrollments of less than 5,000 located in small towns or rural areas. In IEL's 1986 study, their sample found 74% of school districts to have student enrollments less than 5,000 and 54% were located in suburban areas.

Although most school boards are elected, these studies have found variance in methodology with appointive systems more common in the South and in larger urban areas or cities (Campbell et al., 1985).

Personal Characteristics

Of all areas of research on school board members, those with the longest history and most productivity have been studies which related personal or social characteristics of school board members to their selection and performance (see Underwood, McCluskey, & Umberger, 1981, for an extensive summary). Beginning with the seminal work of Counts (1927) and verified by the subsequent ASBJ-VT studies, school board members have been found to be predominantly male, white, middle-aged, management or professionals, and college-educated. Studies within this

50-year period have noted shifts and movement from Counts' original findings such that it is reported:

- There has been an increase in women serving on school boards. In 1927 Counts found 10.2% of all board members to be female. In 1987, Luckett found 31.6% were women.
- There is modest diversity in ethnic and racial representation on school boards although they remain predominantly white as Counts found in 1927. In 1987, the ASBJ-VT survey found the distribution of membership by race to be 2.4% black, 95.2% white, 1.1% Hispanic, .9% American Indian, and .1% Oriental. Indeed, there has been a trend reflecting declines in representation of blacks, Hispanics, and Orientals since 1980 when the annual survey revealed slightly higher percent representation.
- While still predominantly middle-aged (41-50 years of age), school board representation has shown shifts toward increasing in older membership, particularly from that group over 60.
- In 1927, farmers were more highly represented on school boards than any other occupational class. By 1957 (White, 1962), farmers were found to be in third place and in 1987 they no longer constituted a category by themselves. Managers and professionals have consistently

for the 50 years been represented as the largest number of school board members. In 1987, 66.5% of the men and 36.4% of the women reported working in professional or managerial careers.

- Over the 50 years, school board members have demonstrated higher levels of educational attainment. In 1927, Counts reported 61% of members of school boards surveyed had education beyond high school. In 1987, 65.3% had earned a four-year college degree or advanced degree.

These studies, as Zeigler and Jennings (1974) have emphasized, continue to demonstrate the high and predictable relationship between personal characteristics and recruitment and selection to the school board. Zeigler and Jennings argue that continuance of "middle-class" bias has politically isolated school boards from other political systems. Others (Charters, 1955) have observed that these studies have produced interesting descriptive data on the characteristics of board members but contributed little to understanding how boards reach decisions. Other studies (e.g., Gross, 1958; Wirth, 1979) have suggested that the characteristics of school board members are not representative of the population they serve. Studies directed at the impact of the phenomena of the 1960s--the civil rights movement and interest created in community control of schools (and school boards)--found

demographically more representative boards but no difference in their responsiveness (Carver, 1968; Gittell & Hollander, 1968). The 1986 IEL study found the demographic characteristics of school boards and board members consistent with the ASBJ-VT findings. Commenting on the fact that board members are solidly middle-class, IEL concludes:

There are reasons for concern about the continuing underrepresentation of women and minorities on boards, particularly as the minority school population continues to burgeon. National data can be misleading because the minority population is concentrated so heavily in a limited number of states and in larger urban districts. Despite these caveats . . . , there is reason for legitimate concern that the socioeconomic composition of school boards, when aggregated nationally, inordinately reflects a majority middle and upper middle class orientation for local governance of education. (p. 6)

School Board Characteristics

Four characteristics of school boards have been, more than others, studied, particularly in relation to the influence they had to board operation. Size of school board, tenure of members (both in terms of length of service and length of term), coterminousness with other governmental units, and fiscal independence or dependence have been objects of school board surveys and studies.

Size of school boards. One of the principal concerns of the 20th century reform movement was the relatively large size of school boards. From 1849, when Boston had 214 members, to 1950, when the prevailing size of school

boards (National Education Association, 1950) was found to be between 5 and 9 members, there has been a dramatic reduction in the size of school boards. Reeves (1954) recommends that the most advantageous size for boards is between 5 and 7 members and that 3-member boards are to be avoided. IEL (1986) found 94% of boards to be between 5 and 9 members, leaving few to be less or more than the desired size. Noteworthy, however, is the absence of studies relating the size of school boards to factors in the recruitment and selection of the board members themselves.

Tenure of board members. One of the recommendations of the 20th century reform movement was to increase the length of school board members' terms. Originally, members were appointed for one or two years. Reeves (1954) recommends that school board terms be relatively long and members frequently re-elected while Zeigler and Jennings (1974) argue that long terms and incumbency are the hallmarks of a static political system. Zeigler and Jennings' study did find, however, that term of office was the sole legal variable that related to responsiveness of boards to their constituents (i.e., the longer the term, the more responsive board). Kimbrough (1964) in a study of community power structures and educational policy found tenure of board members and superintendents to be shorter in high fiscal effort and competitive districts.

Concern has been expressed that boards are turning over more rapidly, particularly in urban and large school districts leading toward instability and lack of continuity in board decisions and policymaking. Counts (1927) found the average tenure of board members to be approximately four years, while the IEL study (1986) found 82% of board members to have served between four and eight years with an additional 8% serving more than eight years. Length of tenure could be a significant factor related to the recruitment and selection of board members.

School district government. School districts have evolved differently across the United States (Reeves, 1954) as they were formed into governing units. In 1982, the United States Bureau of the Census reported that 76% of school districts were not coterminous with the area of any other local government. Thus, the vast majority of all school districts in the United States constitute general units of government independent of any county, city, or town. This fact has significant implications for the recruitment and selection of school board members and board operation. Zeigler and Jennings (1974) argued that structural properties built into the selection (and election) process would have viable and meaningful outcomes for school district governance. Their study found that when local, state, and federal elections were held

coterminously with school board elections, there was board-public concordance on financial issues and not others. The 1986 IEL study noted that school boards too often are isolated from general government "which allows municipal government to distance itself from the school system and problems of the board, isolated the board from political power structures, and creates frustrations among community leaders about a lack of coherent community planning. . . ." (p. 25-26).

Fiscal relationship. According to the United States Bureau of the Census (1982), 14,847 of the nation's 16,384 school systems, or 90.6%, were independent districts. The primary criterion used by the Census Bureau is fiscal control: "Independent" school districts have the power to set the school budget, to levy taxes, and usually to borrow. In 1982, independent school districts were found in 33 states; 12 states had a mix of independent and dependent systems, with dependent systems predominant in 5 (Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, and Tennessee); and 5 states had all dependent systems (Alaska, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia). While dependence and coterminous boundaries are highly related (83% of dependent systems do cover the same jurisdiction as a county, city, or town), independence and coterminous boundaries are highly unrelated (82% of independent districts are not coterminous with any political jurisdiction).

Inasmuch as the typical school board is elected and has independent fiscal control, this factor could have significance on those factors relating to the recruitment and selection of school board members. Surprisingly, studies exploring this relationship have not been found. Even Zeigler and Jennings (1974) did not relate their findings regarding board-community congruence on financial matters to the presence or absence of fiscal control. Indeed, it is argued (Hurwitz, 1972) that one of the main reasons advocated for elected school boards is the direct responsibility members have to the taxpayers and the ability to be held accountable.

Modes of Representation

School board members are selected to represent and act on behalf of the larger adult population in matters related to education. How this representation is manifest has been the subject of some study and speculation.

Identified as one aspect of the reform movement of the 1890s and 1900s, board members were encouraged to act as the guardians, the trustees, of the public interest, rather than delegates or representatives of community interests (Reeves, 1954). The IEL study (1986) identified these as two ideological tensions appearing within school boards. In the IEL interviews of board members, some saw themselves as general trustees of the public interest,

relying on school administrators to run the district. The IEL study (1986) concluded that "Board members increasingly are perceived as representing special interests, and the trusteeship notion of service in which board members represent the entire community has been less prominent in recent years" (p. 10). This was identified as a major factor affecting board effectiveness and community perceptions.

Bell (1986), on the other hand, found in a study of school board members in Maryland, 82%, whether elected or appointed, expressed a preference for a trustee role in which they use their own judgment regardless of what others want them to do. Kerr (1969) indirectly identified board members' preference for a trustee role when he related the relative absence of clear-cut constituencies and the finding that the motive of "civic duty" for running for the school board were both highly related to board members' reflecting views in high conformity with incumbent board members and the superintendent. Thus, Kerr argued that the chief contribution of school boards is the legitimation of school policies rather than representation of the community.

Zeigler and Jennings (1974), in a treatment of this classic dichotomy (Should the representatives represent the interest or the will of the represented?), stated that

although "academics and theorists may wish it away or write it away, . . . the public and public officials live with choice (or blending of choices) constantly" (p. 121). Their study found that constituents barely leaned toward the trustee model (48%), while board members generally chose the trustee orientation (68%) and superintendents, as might be expected, overwhelmingly preferred the trustee mode for board members. Zeigler and Jennings found this to be true whether boards were elected or appointed, partisan or nonpartisan, and even when board members acknowledged that they thought their constituents preferred a delegate role.

Summary

This review of the literature explored the history; method; related factors; importance of demographic, personal, and school board characteristics; and mode of representation to the recruitment and selection of school board members, particularly in the 20th century. Citing studies, particularly those descriptive of school board members, emphasis was also placed on relating the interaction of variables as well as their significance for those operations of school boards reflective of the selection process. Although, as Cistone (1975) observed, the research is lean, there is evidence to support not only the need for further study but the importance for

examining the selection process in order to find ways to increase and improve school boards' grassroots leadership role.

In the reform movement of the 1980s, local school boards are being asked to participate, once again, in the restructuring of the public schools. Local school board members are being called upon to support a top-down call to action from governors, state legislators, and state departments of education to exert a bottoms-up response. It is, therefore, appropriate to examine in 1987 whether this reform movement has had any effect on the recruitment or selection of school board members or whether the general findings of the past 50 years, reflective of the effects of the first reform movement, hold sway today.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology of this study, explain the sampling technique, describe the data collection 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. The purpose of descriptive or survey research is to collect data from a selected sample in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions regarding the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelation of variables identified for study (Wiersma, 1980).

No category of educational research is more widely used than the type variously known as the survey, the narrative 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. (Mouly, 1970, p. 234)

Babbie (1973) described the characteristics of survey research as being logical, permitting the rigorous step-by-step development and testing of logical explanations;

deterministic, assisting the explanation for and sources of observed events, characteristics and correlations (documenting causal processes); and, in general, leading to an understanding of the larger population from which the sample was selected (developing generalized propositions) and permitting replication such that the generalizability of findings can be retested.

Survey research refers to a particular type of empirical social research. While there is great variety in the purposes of survey research, Babbie has identified three general objectives:

1. Description. The ability to make descriptive assertions about the distribution of traits among a carefully selected sample of respondents and to infer a comparable description of the larger population.

2. Explanation. The ability to make explanatory assertions about the population.

3. Exploration. The ability to search for additional possibilities.

This study surveyed a nationwide stratified sample by means of a mailed questionnaire (Appendix A). The study was sponsored by The American School Board Journal published by the National School Boards Association, the national professional organization for school board members in the United States.

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. (Mouly, 1970, p. 242)

A survey, according to Fink and Kosecoff (1985), is "a method of collecting information from people about their ideas, feelings, plans, beliefs, and social, educational, and financial background" (p. 13). A survey in the form of a questionnaire has distinct advantages for gathering such data as each respondent receives the same set of questions phrased in exactly the same way and is assumed to yield more comparable data than interviews (Sax, 1979).

Descriptive survey procedures utilizing a questionnaire were selected for this study in order to determine information, attitudes, and opinions of school board members about factors (methods, processes, and procedures) extant in recruitment and selection and to study the relationship among these and selected demographic, personal, and school board variables.

Sample

A nationwide sample of school board members was identified from the list of subscribers of The American

School Board Journal. A technique of stratified random sampling was utilized based on regions of the United States, as identified by The American School Board Journal (Table 2). Stratified random sampling was utilized 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" (Gay, 1976, p. 71). The function of stratification is to organize the population into homogeneous subsets and select an appropriate sample from each in order to obtain a greater degree of representativeness and reduce sample error (Babbie, 1973). Specifically, Babbie explains that stratification by geographical location usually increases representativeness.

The stratified random sample (Table 3) 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 an 18% random sample of the population. This is relatively the same sample size as that chosen by Dodge in his 1981 study (Dodge, 1981)

Table 2

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

Region	Membership	States	
Northeast	5,644	Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Maine Maryland Massachusetts New Hampshire	New Jersey New York Pennsylvania Rhode Island Vermont Virgin Is.
Central	8,483	Illinois Indiana Iowa Kentucky Michigan	Minnesota Missouri Ohio Wisconsin
Southern	4,389	Alabama Arkansas Florida Georgia Louisiana Mississippi North Carolina South Carolina	Tennessee Texas Virginia West Virginia
Western	3,256	Colorado Kansas Montana Nebraska New Mexico	North Dakota Oklahoma South Dakota Wyoming
Pacific	3,189	Alaska Arizona California Hawaii Idaho	Nevada Oregon Utah Washington

Note. N = 24,961

Table 3

Population and Sample by Region

Region	School Board Member Subscribers	18% Sample
Northeast	5,644	1,016
Central	8,483	1,527
Southern	4,389	790
Western	3,256	586
Pacific	<u>3,189</u>	<u>574</u>
Total	24,961	4,493

and Meyer in his 1982 study (Meyer, 1982). The slight increase in sample size was intended to increase the number of respondents and realize a larger sample of the population of school board members.

Instrumentation

The survey form in this study was designed to accomplish two purposes (see Appendix A). One purpose was to collect selected demographic, personal, and attitudinal information about the school board members surveyed in this study. The survey form also collected data requested by The American School Board Journal but not utilized in this study.

The survey instrument was divided into five parts. Part I (Questions 1-5) gathered demographic information about the school board member's school district. Part II (Questions 1-10) provided personal information about school board member subscribers to The American School Board Journal. Part III (Questions 1-13) sought information about the school board on which the members serve. Part IV gathered data relative to factors descriptive of the recruitment and selection process of school board members and asked respondents to reply in accordance with the method by which they had most recently been selected to serve on the school board, i.e., elected (Questions 1-18) and appointed (Questions 1-16). Part V of the survey form

sought information in reference to attitudes of school board members regarding current concerns and their mode of representation as board members.

Specifically, Part IV and Part V of the survey were devised to obtain information to determine the most salient factors which describe the selection process of school board members (Research Question 1) and to determine school board members' preference for a trustee versus delegate role relationship to the community from which they were selected (Research Question 6).

The factors selected for study (Part IV) were derived from a review of the literature and discussions with the chairman and editors of The American School Board Journal. Ten factors were identified as necessary to describe the recruitment and selection process. These were:

1. Prior service to community
2. Sources of encouragement/nomination
3. Reason(s) for seeking membership
4. Representative structure
5. Political status
6. Format/competition
7. Campaign process
8. Selection
9. Recall provisions
10. Intentions

The questions designed to provide information regarding these factors (Table 4) were adapted to reflect factors relevant to either an elective or appointive process. Indeed, questions for both groups were identical except for questions regarding the campaign process (Question 10) and selection information (Elected, Questions 13 and 15).

Part V of the survey elicited attitudes and opinions regarding current concerns and roles and responsibilities of school board members. Question two of this section was designed to measure the disposition of each board member toward a trustee versus delegate role. Response choices were adapted from the work of Zeigler and Jennings (1974) and most recently Bell (1986). Question three of this section was designed to identify the sector of the community to which school board members felt the most responsibility to represent.

Following the development of the questionnaire, the committee and chairmen, members of the editorial staff of The American School Board Journal, and selected school board members, not represented in the study sample, were asked to review the questionnaire for the following:

1. Were the directions of the questionnaire stated and explained clearly?

Table 4

Relationship of Study Factors to Questionnaire Items

Factor	Question	
	Elected	Appointed
1. Prior service	1	1
2. Source(s) of encouragement/nomination	3, 5	3, 5
3. Reason for membership	2a, 2b	2, 2b
4. Representative structure	4	4
5. Political status	6	6
6. Format/competition	7, 14	7, 13
7. Campaign process	8, 9, 10a, 10b, 11	8, 9, 10, 11
8. Selection	12, 13 15	12
9. Recall provisions	16	14
10. Intentions	17, 18	15, 16

2. Were the questions of sufficient interest and appeal to ensure the respondent would be inclined to respond and complete the questionnaire?

3. Were the questions relevant to current educational concerns so as to elicit an accurate and realistic response?

4. Were the questions asked in a way that would avoid embarrassment to respondents?

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 philosophic questions of the survey?

Responses of these reviewing groups were analyzed for possible misinterpretation of any items and appropriate revisions were made. Particular emphasis was given to clarity of question items and appropriateness of response alternatives to facilitate item analysis.

Collection of Data

A total of 4,493 local school board members within the United States was identified and requested to participate in this study. A postcard (Appendix B) was sent two weeks prior to the mailing of the questionnaire to notify selected respondents that they had been selected for participation in the survey and to solicit their

cooperation in completing and returning the survey. Questionnaires were mailed to each school board member selected for the sample on February 11, 1987. They were accompanied by a cover letter and self-addressed postage-paid return envelope. The first set of returns was received on March 12, 1987, and the final set on April 10, 1987.

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

It is generally accepted that responses to mail questionnaires is poor (Fink & Kosecoff, 1985). Previous national studies of school board members reported returns ranging from 23% to 40%. In this study, a return of 34.7% was achieved.

Method of Analysis

The returned questionnaires were examined for correctness and completeness. Any questionnaires with one or more parts substantially incomplete were discarded. A total of 1,569 questionnaires was received with 12 being discarded. The total sample, therefore, was 1,557 surveys.

All data were coded and entered on a computer terminal. The data were analyzed through use of the Statistical

Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) packaged computer routines. All questions from the survey instrument were analyzed using frequency distributions. Responses to questions from Part IV and Part V were analyzed according to cross-tabulation procedures with the chi-square statistic for significance. Responses to questions from Part IV, 1, 2a, 9, 10b, and 15 for elected and Part IV, 1, 2a, and 9 for appointed, and Part V, 1 were analyzed according to multi-response techniques.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methodology of this study, the development of the instrument, the data collection procedures, and the statistical methods used in analyzing the data.

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 characteristics of the respondents to the survey. The second section presents the findings with respect to each research question. The third section presents a summary of the chapter.

Description of the Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 4,493 local school board members within the United States who were sent a survey. After eight weeks, 1,557 or 34.7% of the surveys were returned.

Demographic Data Relative to the Respondents

Region. The distribution of returned surveys from the sample group by region is reported in Table 5 in relation to data indicating the national distribution of local school districts for the same geographic regions. The responses by region were within .5 to 7.4% of the national data. The greatest differences occurred in

Table 5

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Region and in Relation to National Distribution of School Districts

Region	Surveys				School Districts ^a	
	Mailed	Returned		Total	No.	%
	No.	No.	%	%		
Northeast	1,016	343	33.8	22.0	3,023	18.9
Central	1,527	559	36.6	35.9	4,671	29.2
Southern	790	267	33.8	17.2	2,615	16.4
Western	586	210	35.8	13.5	3,582	22.4
Pacific	574	178	31.0	11.4	2,085	13.1
Total	4,493	1,557	34.7	100.0	15,976	100.0

^aNumber of local basic administrative units were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics 1983-84, p. 57 (Verified by telephone April 24, 1987, most current data available).

Central regions where the responses were 6.1% greater than the national data and in the Western region where the responses were 7.4% less than the national data. The other three regions varied between .5% and 3% in the difference between the responses and the actual distribution of school districts in terms of percent by region.

Enrollment. The distribution of returned surveys by school system enrollment size is reported in Table 6 and in relation to data indicating the national distribution of local school districts for the same enrollment size groupings. The enrollment sizes reported by the school board members vary from the national data by a range of 4.1 to 35.2% and in inverse relationship to the size of the district. That is, as the size of the district increased, the amount of difference decreased such that the percent of variance between percent of respondents to the survey and the percent of school districts is highest (35.2%) in the less-than-1,000 category and the smallest (4.1%) in the 25,000-or-more category. In addition, the direction of the difference is such that there is a greater percent of respondents than percent of school districts for each category of enrollment size exceeding 1,000 and fewer percent respondents than percent school districts in the enrollment size category of less than 1,000.

Table 6

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Enrollment Size and in Relation to National
Distribution of School Districts

Enrollment Size	Surveys		School Districts ^a	
	No. Returned	% Total	No.	%
Less than 1,000	296	19.0	8,652	54.9
1,000 - 4,999	789	50.7	5,503	35.0
5,000 - 9,999	251	16.1	970	6.2
10,000 - 24,999	135	8.7	456	2.9
25,000 or more	79	5.1	161	1.0
No response	7	.4	-	-
Total	1,557	100.0	15,747	100.0

^aNumber of local basic administrative units by size of school system obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics 1983-84, p. 62 (Verified by telephone April 24, 1987, most current data available).

Community description. The number and percent of responses by community description are reported in Table 7. The largest percent of respondents indicated that their community was best categorized as Small Town with 28.6% of the total. The next largest group of respondents indicated Suburban (27.6%) and Rural (25.9%) as characterizing their community.

Personal Data Relative to Respondents

The distribution of respondents by their reported various personal characteristics is presented in Table 8.

Sex of respondents. The number and percent of respondents by sex, as indicated, was 950 or 61.0% male and 605 or 38.9% female.

Ethnic designation of respondents. The number and percent of respondents by ethnic designation, as shown, indicate that the majority, 1,468 or 94.3%, were White and 56 or 3.6% were Black. The next largest category was Hispanic with 24 or 1.5% of the total number of respondents.

Age of respondents. The data indicated that the largest group of respondents were between 41 and 50 years of age, 651 respondents or 41.8% of the total. The second and third largest groups were between 51 and 60 years of age (325 or 20.9%) and between 36 and 40 years of age (302 or 19.4%). Thus, 1,278 or 82% of the

Table 7

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Community Description

Community Description	Surveys Returned	
	No.	%
Urban	171	11.0
Suburban	430	27.6
Rural	403	25.9
Small town	446	28.6
Other	94	6.0
No response	13	.8
Total	1,557	100.0

Table 8

Personal Characteristics of Respondents by Number and Percent (Sex, Ethnic Designation, Age, Educational Level, and Occupation)

Characteristic	Respondents		Characteristic	Respondents	
	No.	%		No.	%
1. Sex			4. Educational Level		
Male	950	61.0	Less than high school	11	.7
Female	605	38.9	High school graduate	199	12.8
No response	2	.1	Post-high school training	319	20.5
Total	1,557	100.0	Four-year college degree	511	32.8
2. Ethnic Designation			Advanced college degree	512	32.8
White	1,468	94.3	No response	5	.4
Black	56	3.6	Total	1,557	100.0
Hispanic	24	1.5	5. Occupation		
American Indian	1	.1	Professional	506	32.5
Oriental	3	.2	Managerial	239	15.4
Other	3	.2	Business owner	216	13.9
No response	2	.1	Clerical	41	2.6
Total	1,557	100.0	Sales	48	3.1
3. Age			Service	23	1.5
Under 25	2	.1	Trades	40	2.6
26 - 35	107	6.9	Semi-skilled	10	.6
36 - 40	302	19.4	Laborer	7	.4
41 - 50	651	41.8	Retired	125	8.0
51 - 60	325	20.9	Homemaker	186	11.9
Over 60	170	10.9	Other	112	7.2
Total	1,557	100.0	No response	4	.3
			Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

responding school board members are between the ages of 35 and 60 years of age.

Education level of respondents. As shown on Table 8, the number and percent of respondents by level of education indicated that 1,342 or 86.2% had completed some education beyond high school with 1,023 or 65.7% of the respondents indicating completion of college or an advanced degree.

Occupation of respondents. The number and percent of respondents by occupation is reported in classification derived from the Gallop Poll. The largest category of respondents, 506 or 32.5%, reported working in professional fields while the fewest respondents reported working in semi-skilled (10 or .6%) or laborer (7 or .4%) areas. The three categories of professional (506 or 32.5%), managerial (239 or 15.4%), and business owner (216 or 13.9%) accounted for 61.7% of all respondents while another almost 20% were retired (125 or 8.0%) or a homemaker (186 or 11.9%). Respondents indicating "other" (112 or 7.2%) were most characterized by occupations such as farming, ranching, or teaching.

School Board Characteristics Relative to Respondents

Length of board service by respondents. As shown on Table 9, school board members responded that they had served on the board from less than 1 year to 42 years.

Table 9

Distribution of Respondents by Length of Board Service

Length of Service ^a	Respondents	
	No.	%
1 to 5 years	890	57.2
6 to 10 years	448	28.8
11 to 15 years	133	8.5
16 to 20 years	44	2.8
Over 20 years	29	1.9
No response	13	.8
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. n = 1,557

^aRange = 1 - 42 years

Mean = 5.9 years

SD = 4.9 years

Most respondents, 890 or 57.2% indicated that they had five or less years of service on the board while the mean number of years of service was 5.9 years.

Size of school board served on by respondents. The size of school boards, as determined by the number of members, ranged from 3 to 22, as shown on Table 10. The largest group of school boards were 7 or 8 members (659 or 42.3%) with the second largest group reported as being 5 or 6 members (607 or 39.0%). Thus, 1,266 or 81.3% of school boards represented by the respondents were between 5 and 8 members with a mean size of 6.7 members.

Coterminous boundaries of school districts reported by respondents. As shown on Table 11, the majority of school districts (1,053 or 67.6%) represented by the respondents were not coterminous with other governmental units. This figure is slightly less than the 76% of school districts reported by the United States Bureau of the Census in 1982.

Fiscal relationship of school districts in states of school boards served on by respondents. The fiscal relationship of school districts, as defined by the states, and reported by the respondents is reflected on Table 12. These data indicate that 1,025 or 68.5% of the school districts represented by the respondents are in states providing for fiscally independent school districts; that 72 or 4.8% are in states requiring fiscally dependent school districts; and

Table 10

Size of School Boards Served On by Respondents

Size of Board ^a (Number of Members)	Respondents	
	No.	%
3 - 4	9	.6
5 - 6	607	39.0
7 - 8	659	42.3
9 - 10	235	15.1
11 ⁺	34	2.2
No response	13	.8
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. n = 1,557

^aRange = 3 - 22

Mean = 6.7

SD = 1.6

Table 11

Coterminous Boundaries of School Districts with Other
Governmental Units of School Boards Served on by Respondents

Coterminous Boundaries	Respondents	
	No.	%
Yes	489	31.4
No	1,053	67.6
No response	15	1.0
Total	1,557	100.0

Table 12

Fiscal Relationship of School Districts in States of
School Boards Served On by Respondents

Fiscal Relationship	State of School District of Respondents	
	No.	%
Independent	1,061	68.1
Dependent	73	4.7
Both	423	27.2
Total	1,557	100.0

Fiscal Relationship of School Districts as Reported by
Respondents

Fiscal Relationship	Respondents	
	No.	%
Independent	1,042	66.9
Dependent	455	29.2
No response	60	3.9
Total	1,557	100.0

400 or 26% of the respondents are in school districts in states providing for both relationships. As shown, 1,042 or 66.9% of the school districts were reported by the respondents to be fiscally independent and 455 or 29.2% to be fiscally dependent.

Method of selection of school board members. As indicated on Table 13, the majority of school boards (1,476 or 94.8%) represented by the respondents select their members by election, leaving 81 or 5.2% as appointed school boards.

Table 14 provides an indication of how the respondents were actually selected to serve on the school board at the time of the survey. As shown, 1,438 or 92.4% of the respondents were elected to serve and 119 or 7.6% were appointed to membership. Of those appointed to membership, 81 or 68.1% were appointed to serve on an appointed board and 38 or 31.9% of appointees were appointed to complete an elected term.

Findings for Each Research Question

Research Question 1. What are the most salient factors which describe the selection process of school board members?

Item responses to survey questions Part IV, 1-18 were utilized to provide respondents' perceptions and grouped to derive information regarding 10 factors identified to describe the recruitment and selection process. Table 4

Table 13

Method of Selection of the School Board in School
Districts of Respondents

Method	Respondents	
	No.	%
Elected	1,476	94.8
Appointed	81	5.2
Total	1,557	100.0

Table 14

Method of Selection to the School Board by Respondents

Method	Respondents			
	No.	%	No.	%
Elected			1,438	92.4
Appointed			119	7.6
Appointed/appointed board	81	68.1		
Appointed/elected board	38	31.9		
Total			1,557	100.0

presented those factors and identified which questions related to each factor. Each question was analyzed using frequency distributions.

Prior Service to the Community

As shown in Table 15, school board member respondents indicated that they had been actively involved in the educational, civic, or political-governmental life of the community prior to becoming a school board member. A majority of the respondents, 1,478 or 94.9%, reported that they had served the community in at least one capacity and 1,035 or 66.5% reported to have been involved in three or more community organizations or activities. The respondents reported a prodigious range of activities, from 0-10, for an overall average of 3.4 activities per school board member.

The largest percent of response of prior service was in educational activities with 1,314 or 84.4% reporting one or more areas of involvement. Involvement in civic or business organizations was the second largest sector of reported prior service with 1,178 or 65.7% reporting one or more activities. The sector with least reported involvement was that of the political-government sector in which 674 or 43.3% reported prior service in this area. This pattern of involvement in the three sectors--education, civic-business, and political-government--was reflected

Table 15

Amount of Service Prior to Board Membership by Sector and Combinations of Sectors as Reported by Respondents

No. of Contributions	Educational		Civic/Business		Political/Govt		Educational Civic/Business		Educational Political/Govt		Civic/Business Political/Govt		Educational Civic/Business Political/Govt	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	243	15.6	379	34.3	883	56.7	93	6.0	173	11.1	290	18.6	79	5.1
1	588	37.8	615	39.5	475	30.5	236	15.2	358	23.0	407	26.1	170	10.9
2	432	27.7	376	24.1	165	10.6	374	24.0	477	30.6	418	26.8	273	17.5
3	238	15.3	168	10.8	28	1.8	368	23.6	314	20.2	243	15.6	351	22.5
4	53	3.4	19	1.2	6	.4	265	17.0	156	10.0	130	8.3	289	18.6
5	3	.2	-	-	-	-	143	9.2	53	3.4	50	3.2	197	12.7
6	-	-	-	-	-	-	69	4.4	19	1.2	15	1.0	100	6.4
7	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	.6	7	.4	4	.3	55	3.5
8 ⁺	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	2.8
Total	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0
Range	0-5		0-4		0-4		0-7		0-7		0-7		0-10	
Mean	1.5		1.3		.6		2.8		2.1		1.8		3.4	
SD	1.0		.9		.8		1.5		1.4		1.4		1.9	

Note. N = 1,557

in the number and percent of respondents reporting service in more than one sector. As shown on Table 15, only 93 or 6.0% reported no activity in either the educational or civic-business sector while 173 or 11.1% reported no activity in either the educational or political-government sector, and 290 or 18.6% reported no prior activity in the civic-business or political-government sector.

Table 16 indicates the nature of the prior service of school board members in each sector. Only one area of prior service was reported by a majority of respondents. As shown, the majority of respondents, 812 or 52.2%, reported that they had been a member of a parent-teacher organization. No other specific area of activity was reported by a majority of the respondents in any sector.

Other areas in the education sector with reported high involvement were participation on a citizen advisory committee (548 or 35.2%) and being a school volunteer (574 or 36.9%). A number (260) of respondents provided specific examples of prior service in the educational sector. These included references to specific committees, participation on other boards (state, parochial, private, and university), involvement in booster clubs or advocacy groups (e.g., gifted/talented, band, or athletics), board-watching, and employment in education. If the thirty-five respondents indicating prior (or present) employment

Table 16

Service Prior to Board Membership by Sector as Reported by Respondents

Sector	Respondents	
	No.	% ^a
1. Educational		
PTA/PTO	812	52.2
Citizen advisory committee	548	35.2
School volunteer	574	36.9
Employee of school district	199	12.8
Other	260	16.7
2. Civic/Business		
Chamber of Commerce	296	19.0
Service club/civic organization	680	43.7
Charitable organization	604	38.8
Other	367	23.6
3. Political/Government		
Successful candidate	137	8.8
Unsuccessful candidate	86	5.5
Democratic Party	224	14.4
Republican Party	229	14.7
Local political parties	128	8.2
Other	109	7.0

Note. N = 1,557

^aPercentages total more than 100 because of multiple responses.

in education are added to the 199 respondents reporting that they were an employee of a school district, 234, or 15%, of the respondents were employed in education.

As indicated on Table 16, the area of highest involvement in the civic-business sector was participation in a service club or civic organization (680 or 43.7%) or charitable organization (604 or 38.8%). The activities specified by the 360 respondents reporting "other" activities in this sector included many church or religious activities (e.g., boards, organizations, etc.); youth activities (e.g., scouts, little league, soccer, and clubs); women's organizations (e.g., League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women [AAUW], Junior League, etc.); farm or rural organizations (e.g., 4-H, Extension Services, Farm Bureau, Fair Board); fire, rescue, and ambulance service; cultural activities (e.g., library board, art, and historical); and others (e.g., neighborhood associations, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], Jaycees, fraternal organizations).

Although no one activity in the political-government sector was reported by more than 15% of the respondents, a combined 453 or 29.1% reported some involvement with the major political parties. A majority of respondents specifying activities in this sector reported some form

of involvement in local government activities (planning commission, zoning board, court, housing, parks and recreation, etc.).

Source(s) of Encouragement/Nomination

As shown on Table 17, 1,440 or 92.4% reported that they had received encouragement from others to seek school board membership. The respondents reported that the most frequent source of encouragement was that of friends and neighbors (474 or 30.4%) and that the second most frequent source of encouragement came from school board members (372 or 23.9%). If the third most frequently reported source of encouragement, family (307 or 19.7%), is added to that of friends and neighbors, 781 or 50.1% report non-organized or more personal sources of encouragement to seek board membership than formal, professional, or school-related sources of encouragement.

The majority of respondents, 1,069 or 68.7%, as shown on Table 18, reported that they had been nominated for candidacy for school board membership by signing-up/ supported by a petition. An additional 171 respondents reported that the "other" form of nomination describing this experience was filing (e.g., no petition, paid a fee, or filed) or signing-up, registering, or applying. If these are added to those reporting a signing-up process requiring a petition, 1,240 or 79.1% achieved nomination

Table 17

Source(s) of Encouragement to Seek Board Membership as
Reported by Respondents

Source	Respondents	
	No.	%
Board members	372	23.9
Family	307	19.7
Formal citizens' groups	90	5.8
Friends and neighbors	474	30.4
Professional school personnel	93	6.0
Teachers union/organization	20	1.3
Government/political figures	47	3.0
No one	99	6.4
Other	37	2.4
No response	18	1.2
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

Table 18

Form of Nomination of Candidates for School BoardMembership as Reported by Respondents

Form	Respondents	
	No.	%
Sign-up (Petition)	1,069	68.7
Caucus	34	2.2
Party nominee	65	4.2
Other	354	22.7
No response	35	2.2
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

by some form of sign-up. The remaining respondents reported a diversity of methods with no one predominating. Respondents elected to membership reported the use of caucuses, primary elections, nomination at town or school board meetings, write-ins, and volunteering. Respondents appointed to membership reported nomination/appointment to be by a governing body (e.g., city council, county commission, or board of supervisors), the school board itself, or by a governor, mayor, or judge/jury.

Reason for Membership

As shown on Table 19, the vast majority of respondents, 1,260 or 80.9%, reported 2 or more reasons for seeking membership on the school board. The number of reasons ranged from 0 (17 or 1.1%) to as many as 10 (7 or .4%) with the mean number of reasons 3.3 per school board member respondent. Most respondents indicated 1 to 5 reasons for seeking membership.

Table 20 reports the nature of the reasons that the respondents sought school board membership. Only 2 reasons of the 15 alternatives provided--"exercise civic duty" and "increase academic standards"--were reported by a majority of respondents (1,027 or 66% and 832 or 53.4%) as a reason for seeking board membership. Other reasons cited by more than a quarter of the respondents were "improve own child's education" (627 or 40.3%),

Table 19

Number of Reasons for Membership on the School Board as
Reported by Respondents

Number of Reasons ^a	Respondents		
	No.	%	Cumulative %
0	17	1.1	1.1
1	280	18.0	19.1
2	292	18.8	37.9
3	323	20.7	58.6
4	259	16.6	75.2
5	179	11.5	86.7
6	106	6.8	93.5
7	59	3.8	97.3
8	24	1.5	98.8
9	11	.7	99.5
10	7	.4	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

^aRange - 0-10

Mean = 3.3

SD = 1.9

Table 20

Reason for Membership on the School Board as Reported by
Respondents

Reason	Respondents	
	No.	%
Improve own child's education	627	40.3
Represent a specific group	109	7.0
Make schools more accountable	618	39.7
Make schools fiscally sound	493	31.7
Revise curriculum	393	25.2
Gain political visibility	41	2.6
Revise boundaries	24	1.5
Remove the superintendent	51	3.3
Streamline central staff	75	4.8
Ensure support for athletics	85	5.5
Increase school discipline	284	18.2
Increase academic standards	832	53.4
Remove drugs from schools	181	11.6
Exercise civic duty	1,027	66.0
Other	334	21.5

Note. N = 1,557

"make schools more accountable" (618 or 39.7%), "make schools fiscally sound" (493 or 31.7%), and "revise curriculum" (393 or 25.2%). A small segment, or less than 10%, reported that they represented a specific interest group (109 or 7.0%), wanted to gain political visibility (41 or 2.6%), wanted to revise boundaries (24 or 1.5%), or remove the superintendent (51 or 3.3%). The majority of respondents indicating "other" reasons for seeking board membership cited general and specific educational program interest or concerns (e.g., general interest in education, improve educational program, maintain excellent programs, improve communication, or interest in gifted/talented, handicapped, or other specific program). The remaining respondents indicating "other" cited reasons including need for community service, support for staff, personal goals or growth, removal or opposition to a board member or policy, or that they were asked.

When asked to identify the single most important reason for seeking membership on the school board, respondents reported a wide diversity of reasons. As shown on Table 21, the majority of respondents (342 or 22%) cited a civic duty, desire to serve the community, or make a contribution as the single most important reason. The second most frequently cited reason (327 or 21%) was an interest in educational programs, quality of education,

Table 21

The Single Most Important Reason for Seeking Membership on the School Board as Reported by Respondents

Reason	Respondents		
	No.	Total No.	%
Educational programs		327	21.0
General interest	174		
Improve education	100		
Maintain standards	53		
Specific issue		125	8.0
Change "X"	67		
Prevent/resolve "Y"	58		
Improve communication		16	1.0
Make school accountable		93	6.0
Responsibility		342	22.0
Civic	242		
To children	100		
Role of board		141	9.1
Representation	64		
Board role	77		
Involvement		86	5.5
General	55		
Learn how school works	31		
Superintendent		9	.6
Was asked		41	2.6
No response		377	24.2
Total		1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

desire to support the schools, or to improve or maintain academic standards. If reasons for educational programs are added to those expressing concern about a specific issue or program or a sense of responsibility to the community or children, the majority of respondents (794 or 50.9%) expressed the advancement of the objectives of the school system to benefit the community as their most important reason for seeking board membership. These findings are similar to those reported in Table 20.

Representative Structure

As shown on Table 22, the majority of respondents, 1,123 or 72.1%, reported that they had been selected to represent the school district on the school board at-large. The vast majority of the remaining respondents (368 or 23.6%) reported that they were selected to represent a specific area. Almost half of those respondents indicating "other" (50 or 3.2%) indicated that either they were selected for a specific seat or a "place" on the board which was not related to a geographic area.

Political Status

The majority of respondents, 1,242 or 79.8%, as shown on Table 23, reported that they had been a "non-partisan" candidate for school board membership. A smaller number, 123 or 7.9%, indicated that they had

Table 22

Representative Structure for the Selection of School Board
Members as Reported by Respondents

Representative Structure	Respondents	
	No.	%
At-large	1,123	72.2
Specific area	368	23.6
Other	50	3.2
No response	16	1.0
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

Table 23

Political Status of School Board Members at Time of
Selection as Reported by Respondents

Political Status	Respondents	
	No.	%
Nonpartisan	1,242	79.8
Member/Democratic Party	73	4.7
Member/Republican Party	50	3.2
Member/other political party	-	-
Member/slate of candidates	107	6.9
Other	68	4.4
No response	17	1.0
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

been affiliated with one of the major political parties. This figure is slightly increased if 26 of the 68 respondents indicating "other" are added on the basis of their response of "cross-filing." Thus, 149 or 9.6% of respondents were candidates with some partisan affiliation.

Format/Competition

Table 24 reports information describing the selection format as to whether the respondents were selected among a number to be selected out of a field of candidates or whether they were selected from a field of candidates for the same seat. As indicated, the majority of respondents (873 or 56.1%) reported that they had been selected from a field of candidates for the same seat while 648 or 41.6% reported that a certain number were to be selected from a field of candidates.

Of those reporting that they were among a number to be selected, 609 or 93.9% reported that the number to be selected was between 1 and 9 with 2.9 seats available, on the average. These same respondents reported that the number of candidates for these seats ranged from 1 to 26 with 5.9 candidates competing, on the average, for each seat. In general, when a number of school board members were selected out of a field of candidates, 2 to 4 seats were filled (mean $\pm$ 1 SD) at the same time and the number

Table 24

Format and Competition in the Selection Process for Board Membership as Reported by Respondents

Format	Competition																	
	Respondents				Characteristics													
	Total				Number										Range	Mean	SD	Mode
	No.	%	No.	%	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 ⁺				
Field of candidates			648	41.6														
No. to be selected	609	93.9			23	237	218	91	28	4	4	1	3	-	1-9	2.9	1.1	2.0
No. of candidates	591	91.2			4	16	85	86	117	95	75	48	14	51	1-26	5.9	3.0	5.0
Specific seat			873	56.1														
Opposed--no. cand.	488	55.9																
No. candidates	(358)	(74.0)			174	89	36	22	17	9	5	2	2	2	1-18	2.2	1.8	1.0
Unopposed--no. cand.	385	44.1																
No response			36	2.3														
Total			1,557	100.0														

Note. N = 1,557

of candidates ranged from 3 to 9 (mean $\pm$ 1 SD). As reported, the most typical selections involved filling 2 school board vacancies from a field of 5 candidates for a 1:2.5 seat-to-candidate ratio.

A majority of the respondents reporting that they were selected from a field of candidates for the same seat indicated that they were opposed by at least 1 candidate (488 or 55.9%) while 385 or 44.1% reported that they had been unopposed. The average number of candidates competing for the same seat was reported to be 2.2 and ranged from 1 to 18. The typical experience of these board members, as reported, involved opposition by 1 other candidate. Thus, in general, a majority of school board member respondents were selected from a field of candidates for their seat and faced competition (1,136 or 72.9%).

As shown on Table 25, a majority of school board member respondents (1,008 or 64.7%) reported that they had not unseated an incumbent at the time they had been first selected to serve on the school board. If the number of respondents reporting that they were unopposed (Table 24, N = 385) is subtracted, 623 of the 1,136 respondents facing competition, or 54.8%, did not compete against an incumbent.

Table 25

Incumbents Unseated by Selection of Board Member as
Reported by Respondents

Incumbent Unseated	Respondents	
	No.	%
Yes	507	32.6
No	1,008	64.7
No response	45	2.7
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

The Campaign Process

Table 26 reports information relative to a series of elements descriptive of the campaign process.

Campaign issue/platform. A slight majority (760 or 51.1%) of respondents providing a response indicated that they did not have a campaign issue or platform at the time of their selection. As shown on Table 26, the issue most descriptive of those who did have a campaign platform (728 or 48.9%) was to "improve educational programs" (reported by 55% of the respondents). The second most frequently cited issue (22%) was to "strengthen the role of the board." Respondents indicating "other" campaign issues (18.4%) most frequently cited educational programs, their past experience or record, taxes or accountability, and issues of representation (change, prevent, or replace).

Issue differences. A majority of those responding ($N = 1,088$) that they had been opposed for candidacy indicated that they had ideas different from those of other candidates (647 or 59.4%). The most frequently cited difference of opinion related to the "role of the board" (63.2%) while "educational programs" (46.9%), "physical and fiscal problems" (36.3%), and the "superintendent" (26.4%) were cited as the other areas most descriptive of issue differences in descending frequency. The most frequently cited "other" issue differences related

Table 26

Presence of Elements of the Campaign Process: Platform, Issue Differences, Formal Campaign, and Public Support as Reported by Respondents

Elements											
1. Campaign Issue/Platform			2. Issue Differences			3. Formal Campaign			4. Public Support		
No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%	
Yes	728	46.8	Yes	647	41.6	Yes	732	47.0	Yes	439	28.2
No	760	48.8	No	441	28.3	No	788	50.6	No	1,073	68.9
No response	69	4.4	No response	469	30.1	No response	37	2.4	No response	50	2.9
Total	1,557	100.0	Total	1,557	100.0	Total	1,557	100.0	Total	1,557	100.0

Campaign Platform (N = 728)			Areas of Difference (N = 647)			Elected (N = 687)			Source of Support (N = 439)		
Issue			Area						Group		
● Role of board	22.0		● Role of board	63.2		1. Fund--Yes	416	60.5	● PTAs	25.9	
● Superintendent	1.7		● Superintendent	26.4		● Raised money	399	58.1	● Political party	14.7	
● Educational programs	55.2		● Educational programs	46.9		Range, \$8-\$20,000			● Religious group	4.6	
● Moral/character education	1.5		● Educational personnel	19.3		Mean, \$2,430			● Civic/business group	15.8	
● Specific personnel changes	.1		● Physical/fiscal	36.3		SD, Mode, \$500			● Union/employee organization	23.4	
● School facilities	4.3		● Civil rights/liberties	8.5		● Spent money	510	74.2	● Other	20.9	
● School attendance boundaries	.7		● Other	14.1		Range, \$1-\$24,000					
● Financial base	5.4					Mean, \$1,406					
● Civil rights/liberties	1.1					SD, \$2,651					
● Other	18.4					Mode, \$500					
						2. Methods (N = 887)					
						● Radio	17.8				
						● TV	3.0				
						● Posters	47.1				
						● Newspapers	69.8				
						● Campaign literature	49.4				
						● Telephone	46.3				
						● Door-to-door	44.3				
						● Meet-the-candidate	63.8				
						● Leafletting	28.5				
						● Mailout	30.1				
						● Other	8.8				
						Appointed (N = 41)					
						Forum Used					
						● Town meeting	1.7				
						● Public debate	12.2				
						● Roundtable	14.6				
						● Other	75.6				

to taxes, conservative point of view, and religious concerns. Thus, while a majority of those opposed in their selection had issue differences with the other candidates, the majority of differences related to the role of the board while educational program issues were most frequently cited as most descriptive of campaign platforms.

Formal campaign. As shown on Table 26, a slight majority of respondents (788 or 50.6%) indicated that there was not a formal, public and/or organized process for expressing one's candidacy prior to selection. Of those responding that there was a formal process (732 or 47%), a majority were elected (687 or 93.8%). Of this group of elected respondents, 416 or 61% reported that they did have a campaign fund; a slightly smaller group (399 or 58.1%) provided information regarding how much they had raised. Of those elected school board members responding, \$2,430 was raised, on the average, although the reported range varied from \$8 to \$20,000. The typical amount of money raised was reported to be \$500, among the respondents. A slightly larger number of elected respondents reported that they had spent money during the campaign. The average expenditure reported was \$1,406 with the reported range varying from \$1 to \$24,000. The typical amount of money reported as being spent was \$500.

The difference between those respondents raising and spending money can be attributed to the fact that a number reported that they spent their own money as opposed to establishing a campaign fund through contributions.

A vast majority (97.4%) of those elected and responding that there was an organized campaign ($N = 687$) indicated that they had used at least one method of communicating their candidacy. Additionally, 218 or 30.4% of those who had indicated that there was no organized formal campaign reported that they had used at least one of the listed methods. Therefore, a total of 887 or 61.7% of all elected respondents reported using some form of communication regarding their candidacy. By far the most frequently used medium was the newspapers (69.8%), while meet-the-candidate sessions (63.8%), campaign literature (49.4%), posters (47.1%), telephone (46.3%), and door-to-door campaigning (44.3%) were reportedly used by over 40% of these respondents. Least frequently used was TV (3.0%) and radio (17.8%). Among the "other" methods specified were cards, yard signs, bumper stickers, buttons, and coffees.

Respondents who had been appointed to their seat and indicated that there had been an organized process for them to express their interest and ideas ($N = 45$ or 37.8% of those appointed) 41 reported that an interview process,

public hearing, open meeting of the school board, or caucuses or panel had been used as alternatives to the methods listed: town meeting, public debate, or roundtable.

Public support. The majority of school board member respondents (1,073 or 68.9%) reported that they were not publicly supported by any organized group at their most recent election or appointment. As shown on Table 26, those reporting organized public support (439 or 28.2%) indicated that they had received support from PTAs (25.9%), union/employee organizations (23.4%), and civic or business groups (15.8%). Those indicating "other" sources of public support cited teacher associations, AAUW, concerned parents, citizen groups, newspaper, advocacy groups (e.g., gifted/talented, learning disabilities, special education), and friends.

Selection

As shown on Table 27, respondents reported that the selection of school board members occurred virtually during every month of the year. The majority, however, reported that selections were made in November (467 or 30%) with the next largest groups reporting April (315 or 20.2%), May (258 or 16.6%), or June (150 or 9.6%). In general, school board members reported that they were either selected in the spring (March-June, 823 or 52.5%) or in the fall (September-November, 541 or 34.8%).

Table 27

Month in which School Board Selection Completed as Reported
by Respondents

Month	Respondents	
	No.	%
January	33	2.1
February	12	.8
March	100	6.4
April	315	20.2
May	258	16.6
June	150	9.6
July	20	1.3
August	22	1.4
September	68	4.4
October	6	.4
November	467	30.0
December	6	.4
No response	100	6.4
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

The most typical single month for selection was reported to be November.

As shown on Table 28, those respondents reporting that they had been elected to serve on the school board ($N = 1,438$), a majority (835 or 58.1%) indicated that there were other issues on the ballot at the same time as their election. The most frequently reported to be on the ballot at the same time were other local elections (68.9%) followed by state elections (41.1%), the school board budget (18.9%), and national elections (18.8%). Among the "other" issues specified were millage and levies or other local funding issues.

Table 29 provides information, as reported by respondents, regarding the number of people voting, the percent this represents of registered voters, and the percentage of the vote obtained by the school board member. As indicated, for each question, only 68.8% to 61.2% or about two-thirds of those elected responded to the question. Many wrote that they did not know, had forgotten, or would have to refer to records in order to answer the question. Those responding reported that, on the average, 3,720 people voted with the range varying from 8 to 150,000. The typical number of voters reported was 1,000. This turn-out represented, as reported by the respondents, between 1% to 95% of those registered

Table 28

Presence of Other Issue(s) on the Ballot at Time of
Election as Reported by Respondents

	Respondents	
	No.	%
<u>Presence of Other Issue(s)</u>		
Yes	835	58.1
No	518	36.0
No response	85	5.9
Total	1,438	100.0
<u>Other Issues (<u>N</u> = 835)</u>		
School board budget	158	18.9
Bond referendum	105	12.6
Local elections	575	68.9
State elections	343	41.1
National elections	157	18.8
Other	96	11.5

Note. N = 1,438

Table 29

Voter Participation in Most Recent Election as Reported by Respondents

	No. Voted (<u>N</u> = 999)	Percentage of Registered Voters Voting (<u>N</u> = 890)	Percent of Vote Received by Respondent (<u>N</u> = 947)
Range	8 - 150,000	1% - 95%	3% - 99%
Mean	3,720	31.9%	65.9%
SD	8,683	20.1%	21.0%
Mode	1,000	25.0%	60.0%
Median	1,322	29.5%	65.9%

Note. N = 1,438

to vote with the average percentage reported to be 31.9% and the typical turnout reported to be 25%. Respondents reported that they had received from 3% to 99% of the vote with the average percent received reported as 65.9% and the typical percent of the vote received reported to be 60%. (A check of those respondents reporting less than 10% of the vote suggested that they had responded with respect to the percent of voters registered rather than the percent of the vote received based on the actual number voting.) Thus, in those school districts electing school board members, typically, respondents report that they had received over 60% of the vote and more than 25% of those registered to vote had participated.

Recall Provisions

A majority of respondents, 886 or 56.9%, reported, as shown on Table 30, that there is a process for recalling or removing school board members. A number of respondents (198 or 12.7%) did not respond, some writing that they did not know. When asked if the process had ever been used, the overwhelming majority, 707 or 79.8%, indicated that they had not been used. A small number, 24 or 2.7%, of those respondents reporting the presence of recall provisions, reported that they had been the target of removal while a small but slightly larger number, 62 or 7.0%, reported that other current members on their school board had been the target of removal.

Table 30

Recall Provisions as Reported by Respondents

Provision	Respondents			
	No.	%	No.	%
Recall <u>NOT</u> provided			473	30.4
Recall provided			886	56.9
Used	149	16.8		
Not used	707	79.8		
No response	30	3.4		
<u>Target of recall</u>				
1. Respondent				
Yes	24	2.7		
No	833	94.0		
No response	29	3.3		
2. Other current members				
Yes	62	7.0		
No	789	89.0		
No response	35	4.0		
No response			198	12.7
Total			1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

Intentions

Table 31 provides information regarding the respondents' intentions to serve another term on the school board and to seek election to another public office. As shown, the largest group (689 or 44.3%) of respondents said "yes," they did desire to serve another term on the school board, and the next largest group (522 or 33.5%) said "maybe." Many (819 or 52.6%) provided an explanation of their response. Of those responding "yes," many said:

After X years' experience, I feel I have more to offer than ever before.

The job is not finished.

I've just begun.

The work I started isn't complete.

I enjoy it.

Great personal satisfaction and feeling of contributing.

Still more to give.

Has taken (1, 2, 3, 4) years to learn how it works.

I fear I've lost a lot of my marbles but I'm running again.

Among the comments of those responding "maybe" were:

Much more work involved than I ever thought possible.

Too soon to tell.

Some days I'm sure I will, others I'm sure I won't.

It depends--on health, how the board is doing, who the other candidates are, whether I can afford to serve (time and money).

Table 31

Intention to Serve Another Term on the School Board or to Seek Another Public Office
as Reported by Respondents

Intention	To Serve Another Term		To Seek Another Public Office	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	689	44.3	128	8.2
No	305	19.6	1,010	64.9
Maybe	522	33.5	383	24.6
No response	41	2.6	36	2.3
Total	1,557	100.0	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

After (8, 9, 10, X) years, it may be long enough.

My children will be out of school.

Those responding "no" (305 or 19.6%) said:

Been there long enough, time for someone younger or who have children in school.

Tired-out.

No time.

I need the time for (family, business, or career).

I served my time.

Time for someone else.

As shown on Table 31, a majority of the respondents, 1,010 or 64.9%, reported that they were not intending to seek election to another public office. Only 128 or 8.2% said "yes" and 383 or 24.6% said "maybe." Of those responding that they were not intending to seek another office, some wrote:

My only interest is education.

School board politics isn't fun, but local politics looks like no fun.

No other political interest.

I like where I am.

Those saying "maybe" or "yes" (representing one-third of the respondents combined) often provided the position or post they might consider. The majority of those listed were a local government office such as county commission, city or town council, mayor, or village trustee. Others

listed were state offices--most frequently state representative--and one or two listed the governorship or the United States Senate.

Research Question 2. Do these factors differ significantly as a function of the method of selection of the school board?

The previous research question addressed 10 factors descriptive of the recruitment and selection process of school board members analyzed according to the total sample group. This research question asked how the responses of elected and appointed school board members compare regarding demographic, personal, and school board characteristics on each of the 10 factors. Responses to survey questions Part IV (Recruitment and Selection Information) were used to classify the respondent by the method of selection, elected or appointed, including those appointed to serve an elected term ($N = 38$ or 31.9% of those 119 or 7.6% appointed). Cross-tabulation procedures with the calculation of chi-square values and level of significance were used to analyze each of the 10 factors descriptive of the selection process according to method of selection. Any cross-tabulations with more than 20.0% of the cells evidencing an expected cell frequency less than 5.0 were considered indeterminate and treated as not significant.

Table 32 showed information concerning the significance of the cross-tabulation between elected and appointed

Table 32

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Demographic, Personal, and
School Board Characteristics for Elected and Appointed
School Board Members as Reported by Respondents

Variable	Significance	χ^2	S
Demographic			
Region	S	145.615	0.000
Size	S	43.902	0.000
Type	S	10.404	0.034
Personal			
Sex	N.S.		
Ethnic	S	16.689	0.000
Age	N.S.		
Education	S	28.980	0.000
School board characteristic			
Length of service	S	11.030	0.011
Number of terms	S	16.529	0.002
Size of board	S	11.657	0.019
Boundaries	S	76.768	0.000
Fiscal relationship	S	92.252	0.000

Note. S = Level of significance; N.S. = Not significant
at $p = 0.05$.

school board members' responses (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) regarding demographic, personal, and school board characteristics. As shown, elected and appointed school board members were found to differ significantly in 10 out of 12 measures of demographic, personal, and school board characteristics. Only 2 personal characteristics--sex and age--did not vary significantly among school board members according to the two methods of selection.

With respect to demographic variables, cross-tabulation of elected and appointed school board members by region ($\chi^2 = 145.615$ with 4 df and significance = 0.000), size of school district ($\chi^2 = 43.902$ with 4 df and significance = 0.000), and type of school district ($\chi^2 = 10.404$ with 4 df and significance = 0.034) found that proportionately more than expected school board members were appointed in the South (25.1%) while slightly more than expected were elected in the West (98.1%), Pacific (97.8%), and Central (96.4%) regions; more than expected are appointed in school districts between 5,000 and 9,999 (12.0%) and over 25,000 (22.8%) enrolled students while slightly more than expected were elected in school districts with less than 1,000 enrollment (97.3%); and more than expected were appointed in urban (11.7%) and "other" (12.8%) (e.g., mixed-type, regional), and

slightly more than expected were elected in rural (94.5%) school districts.

Cross-tabulation of elected and appointed school board members according to personal characteristics found two--ethnic designation ($\chi^2 = 16.689$ 5 df and significance = 0.000) and education ($\chi^2 = 28.980$ with 5 df and significance = 0.000)--as having statistical significance at the .05 level. As reported by respondents, appointed members demonstrated more than expected levels of representation by minorities (14.3%) while elected members demonstrated more than expected White (95.1%) representation. More appointed school board member respondents than expected reported that they had completed college (36.4%) or received advanced degrees (43.2%) while more than expected of elected school board members reported completing high school (13.7%).

An analysis of cross-tabulations for school board characteristics by method of selection found that responses for these two groups varied significantly according to length of service ($\chi^2 = 11.030$ with 4 df and significance = 0.011), number of terms ($\chi^2 = 16.529$ with 4 df and significance = .002), size of board ($\chi^2 = 11.657$ with 4 df and significance = 0.019), coterminousness of boundaries ($\chi^2 = 76.768$ with 1 df and significance = 0.000), and fiscal relationship ($\chi^2 = 92.252$ with 1 df and significance = 0.000). More

than expected appointed school board members reported that they had 1 to 5 years of service (71.9% of all those appointed as compared to 57.6% of all respondents), were in their first term (45.7% as compared to 33.0% of all respondents), and were serving on a 3- to 6- or 11⁺-member board (44.1% of appointees as compared to 39.9% of all respondents). On the other hand, slightly more than expected elected school board members reported more than 6 years of service, that they were in their third or more term, and that they were elected to serve on 7- to 8-member boards (43.5% of all elected school board members). Further, appointed respondents reported that more than two-thirds of their school districts (68.4% as opposed to 31.7% of all respondents) were coterminous with the boundaries of other governmental units and fiscally dependent (70.8% as compared to 30.4% of all respondents). Elected school board member respondents reported that over two-thirds of their school districts were not coterminous with any other governmental unit (71.3% as compared to 68.3% of all respondents) and fiscally independent (72.0% as compared to 69.6% of all respondents).

Table 33 showed information concerning the significance of the cross-tabulation between elected and appointed school board members' responses regarding 10 factors descriptive of the selection process. As indicated, elected and appointed school board members'

Table 33

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members for Elected and Appointed Respondents, as Reported

Factor	Significance	χ^2 / S	χ^2 / S
1. <u>Prior service</u>			
Amount	N.S.		
Sector	S ($n = 2$)	5.642 / 0.017	7.876 / 0.005
2. <u>Source of encouragement</u>			
Source	S	121.963 / 0.000	
Form of nomination	S	246.146 / 0.000	
3. <u>Reason for membership</u>			
Number of reasons	S	25.572 / 0.004	
Reason	S ($n = 2$)	7.168 / 0.007	4.357 / 0.036
4. <u>Representative structure</u>	N.S.		
5. <u>Political status</u>	S	53.967 / 0.000	
6. <u>Format/competition</u>			
Format	S	32.071 / 0.000	
Competition			
No. to be selected	N.S.		
No candidates	N.S.		
Same seat (OP v. UNOP)	S	13.902 / 0.000	
Incumbent	S	25.774 / 0.000	
7. <u>Campaign process</u>			
Issue/platform	S	29.357 / 0.000	
Issue differences	S	4.608 / 0.031	
Formal campaign	S	3.679 / 0.055	
Public support	S	5.915 / 0.015	
8. <u>Selection (Month)</u>	S	169.013 / 0.000	
9. <u>Recall provisions</u>			
Provision	S	10.090 / 0.000	
Use	N.S.		
Target: Respondent	N.S.		
Others	N.S.		
10. <u>Intentions</u>			
Board	S	15.710 / 0.000	
Other office	S	7.388 / 0.024	

Note. N = 1,557. S = Level of significance; N.S. = Not significant at $p = 0.05$; OP = Opposed; UNOP = Unopposed.

responses regarding recruitment and selection were found to differ significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) in some way in 9 of the 10 factors. Only 1, representative structure (at-large representation as opposed to representing a specific seat), is shown as not having significance at the .05 level.

As indicated on Table 33, while appointed and elected school board members did not vary significantly in the amount of Prior Service (Factor 1) they reported, they did vary significantly in two areas of service--parent-teacher organization ($\chi^2 = 5.642$ with 1 df and significance = 0.017) and charitable organizations ($\chi^2 = 7.876$ with 1 df and significance = 0.005). Appointed respondents reported a higher than expected level of participation in a parent-teacher organization (63.0% as compared to 51.3% of elected respondents) and charitable organizations (51.3% as compared to 37.8% of elected respondents). In all other respects, appointed and elected school board members appeared similar in their participation and involvement in the educational, civic-business, and political-government sectors of their communities.

With respect to Factor 2 (Source of Encouragement), elected and appointed school board members' responses were found to vary significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) with respect to the source of encouragement ($\chi^2 = 121.963$ with 8 df and significance = 0.000) and form of nomination ($\chi^2 = 246.146$ with 3 df with significance = 0.000).

Appointed members, as compared to elected members, reported higher than expected encouragement from government and political figures (19.1% as compared to 1.8%) and less encouragement from school board members (17.4% as compared to 24.7%) and friends and neighbors (17.4% as compared to 31.9%). Elected respondents indicated more frequent use of the "sign-up (petition)" form of nomination (75.1% as compared to 9.7% for appointed) while appointed respondents reported more frequent use of "other" forms (e.g., file or register without petition) than elected respondents (81.4% as compared to 18.6%).

As shown on Table 33, Factor 3 (Reason for Membership) both the number of reasons ($\chi^2 = 25.572$ with 10 df and significance = 0.004) and selected stated reasons for membership, specifically, those of "make schools more accountable" ($\chi^2 = 7.168$ with 1 df and significance = 0.004) and "make schools fiscally sound" ($\chi^2 = 4.357$ with 1 df and significance = 0.036) were found to differ significantly between elected and appointed respondents.

Elected respondents as compared to appointed reported more reasons than expected (13.7% reported more than 6 as compared to 7.6% and only 37.1% reported 2 or fewer as compared to 47.8%) and more frequently cited "make schools more accountable" (40.7% as compared to 27.7%) and "make schools fiscally sound" (32.4% as compared to 22.7%) as reasons for seeking board membership.

Factor 5 (Political Status) as shown on Table 33 was found to vary significantly ($\chi^2 = 53.967$ with 2 df and significance = 0.000) between elected and appointed respondents with elected respondents more frequently reporting that they had been a "non-partisan" candidate (82.0% as compared to 63.5%) and appointed candidates more frequently reporting "other" (19.1% as compared to 3.2%) which included reference more related to their qualities and experiences than to political status.

As indicated on Table 33, Factor 6 (Format/Competition) was found to differ significantly between elected and appointed respondents with respect to format ($\chi^2 = 32.071$ with 1 df and significance = 0.000), whether those selected from a field of candidates for the same seat were opposed or unopposed ($\chi^2 = 13.902$ with 1 df and significance = 0.000) and whether their selection resulted in unseating an incumbent ($\chi^2 = 25.774$ with 1 df and significance = 0.000). With respect to format, appointed respondents more frequently than expected reported that they had been

selected from a field of candidates for a single seat than elected respondents (83.2% as compared to 55.3%) and more elected respondents than appointed run in a field of candidates for a specified number of seats (44.7% as compared to 16.8%). Indicative of differences between elected and appointed school board members with respect to competition, more appointed respondents reported facing opposition for their seat than elected (74.5% as compared to 53.7%) and more elected respondents reported that they had defeated an incumbent (35.3% as compared to 11.9%).

As shown on Table 33, all four elements comprising Factor 7 (Campaign Process) were found to vary significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) between elected and appointed respondents: campaign/platform ($\chi^2 = 29.357$ with 1 df and significance = 0.000), issue differences ($\chi^2 = 4.608$ with 1 df and significance = 0.031), formal campaign ($\chi^2 = 3.679$ with 1 df and significance = 0.055), and public support ($\chi^2 = 5.915$ with 1 df and significance = 0.015). More elected than appointed respondents reported that they had a campaign issue or platform (51.0% versus 24.6%) and issue differences with the other candidates (60.4% versus 47.5%) while more appointed than elected respondents did not participate in a formal, public and/or organized campaign (60.9% versus 51.1%) and did not

receive public support from an organized group (81.2% versus 70.1%).

Factor 8 (Selection) was found to differ significantly between elected and appointed respondents in the only area capable of comparison, month of selection ($\chi^2 = 169.013$ with 4 df and significance = 0.000) such that more elected than appointed members reported being selected in April (22.4% versus 9.4%), May (18.2% versus 9.4%), and November (34.0% versus 1.2%) while more appointed than elected respondents reported being selected in June (31.8% versus 9.0%) and July (21.1% versus .1%).

As indicated on Table 33, Factor 9 (Recall Provisions) was reported to vary significantly ($\chi^2 = 10.090$ with 1 df and significance = 0.001) in those jurisdictions represented by elected respondents as compared to appointed respondents (66.5% versus 50.9%) but the use and target of recall provisions was not reported to be significantly different by these two groups of respondents.

Intentions represented by Factor 10 were found to differ significantly between elected and appointed respondents both with respect to whether they desired another school board term ($\chi^2 = 15.710$ with 2 df and significance = 0.000) or whether they intended to run for another elective public office ($\chi^2 = 7.388$ with 2 df and significance = 0.024). More elected than appointed

respondents reported that they did not desire another school board term (21.1% versus 6.9%) but that they might consider running for another office (25.9% versus 17.1%) while more appointed than elected respondents indicated that they did desire another school board term (58.6% versus 44.5%) but did not intend to run for another office (77.8% versus 65.5%).

Research Question 3. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of (a) size of school district, (b) type or location of school district, or (c) region of the country?

Responses to survey questions Part I, 1, 2, and 3 (Demographic Information) were utilized to identify each respondent according to the variables of region, size of school district, and type of school district. Cross-tabulation procedures with the calculation of chi-square values and level of significance were used on elements of 10 factors descriptive of the selection process by each of the three demographic variables.

Table 34 reported a summary of the significance of the cross-tabulations. As shown, 7 of the 10 factors were found to be significantly different in some respects by region, 5 were found to vary significantly by size of the school district, and 6 were found to differ significantly by type of school district. An effort was made to determine whether there was any relationship between

Table 34

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of 10 Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by Demographic Variables (Region, Size, and Type) of School District as Reported by Respondents

Factor	Region				Size				Type			
	S	χ^2	/	S	S	χ^2	/	S	S	χ^2	/	S
1. <u>Prior service</u>												
Amount	S	(n = 3)			S	(n = 2)			S	(n = 2)		
Sector	S	(n = 9)			S	(n = 8)			S	(n = 10)		
2. <u>Source of encouragement</u>												
Source	N.S.				N.S.				S	69.984	/ .001	
Form of nomination	S	214.347	/ .000		N.S.				S	36.112	/ .000	
3. <u>Reason for membership</u>												
Number of reasons	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
Reason	S	(n = 5)			S	(n = 6)			S	(n = 7)		
4. <u>Representative structure</u>	S	81.538	/ .000		S	27.108	/ .000		S	95.850	/ .000	
5. <u>Political status</u>	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
6. <u>Format/competition</u>	-											
Format	S	86.327	/ .000		S	18.775	/ .000		S	15.610	/ .003	
Competition												
No. to be selected	S	77.658	/ .000		N.S.				S	19.866	/ .010	
No. candidates	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
Same seat (OP v. UNOP)	S	20.766	/ .000		S	16.221	/ .002		N.S.			
Incumbent	S	11.560	/ .020		N.S.				N.S.			
7. <u>Campaign process</u>												
Issue/platform	S	19.442	/ .000		S	71.936	/ .000		S	57.307	/ .000	
Issue differences	N.S.				S	11.304	/ .023		S	12.497	/ .014	
Formal campaign	S	20.615	/ .000		S	134.231	/ .000		S	117.920	/ .000	
Public support	S	31.915	/ .000		S	176.014	/ .000		S	134.527	/ .000	
8. <u>Selection (Month)</u>	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
9. <u>Recall provisions</u>												
Provision	S	120.022	/ .000		N.S.				N.S.			
Use	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
Target: Respondent	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
Others	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
10. <u>Intentions</u>												
Board	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			
Other office	N.S.				N.S.				N.S.			

Note. N = 1,557. S = Level of significance; N.S. = Not significant at p = 0.05; OP = Opposed; UNOP = Unopposed.

size and type of school district. A cross-tabulation of these variables found that the type of school district did vary significantly according to size ($\chi^2 = 591.190$ with 16 df and significance = 0.000). Respondents from urban school districts reported student enrollments of 725,000⁺ (26.5%), 10,000-24,999 (27.6%), and 5,000-9,999 (26.5%); respondents from suburban school districts reported enrollments of 5,000-9,999 (26.7%) and 1,000-4,999 (49.6%); rural school districts reported enrollments of 1,000-4,999 (52.1%) and < 1,000 (37.2%); and small town school district enrollments were reported to be 1,000-4,999 (65.8%) and < 1,000 (23.6%).

As shown on Table 34, Factor 1 (Prior Service) was found to vary significantly both in the amount and nature of the service according to each of the three demographic variables. The amount of prior service in the educational, civic-business, and political-government sectors varied significantly such that school board member respondents in the Pacific and South regions reported more prior service in education than those in the West or East (34.8% and 35.2% versus 23.3% and 23.6% reported 2 activities and more in the West [20.5%] and East [29.7%] reported none). Southern region respondents, those living in school districts 25,000⁺ and urban districts reported more civic-business activity than those in the East, in school districts less than 1,000, or in rural areas (33.3%, 34.2%, or 31.0% versus 18.7%, 19.3%, or 20.6%). Respondents from

the Pacific and Southern regions, urban school districts, and those from districts larger than 10,000 students reported more activities in the combined education and civic/business sectors than did those living in the East, rural areas, and in school districts less than 1,000 (25.3%, 21.7%, 24.6%, or 26.6% versus 8.7%, 13.2%, or 9.5%).

The nature of prior service was found to vary significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) by region, size, and type of school district. In general, in the educational sector, more respondents from the Pacific and Southern regions than the West (60.7% and 65.2% versus 39.5%), school districts of 5,000-25,000⁺ students than those less than 1,000 (62.2%, 63.0%, and 69.6% versus 30.4%) reported membership in a parent-teacher organization; more respondents from the Pacific than the West, South, or East (44.4% versus 31.0%, 30.3%, or 31.8%), from school districts between 5,000-24,999 students than those less than 1,000 (44.2% and 44.4% versus 30.4%), and in suburban rather than rural or small town districts (45.3% versus 30.5% or 29.1%) reported serving on a citizens' advisory committee; more respondents from the Pacific and Central regions than the East (46.1% and 41.3% versus 28.6%), from school districts between 5,000-24,999 students than those less than 1,000 (41.0% and 42.2% versus 25.0%), and in suburban than rural or urban districts (44.2% versus 30.3%

or 33.3%) reported volunteering in the school; and more respondents in 25,000⁺ student districts than those 1,000 or less (22.8% versus 9.5%) and in urban rather than suburban or rural districts (18.1% versus 9.5% or 11.4%) reported being an employee of a school district.

In the civic-business sector, more respondents in the South and West than the East (36.3% and 25.2% versus 7.3%) and in small town or urban rather than suburban or rural school districts (27.1% or 21.1% versus 14.4% or 14.1%) reported membership in the Chamber of Commerce; more respondents in the South or West than the East (55.8% or 48.6% versus 33.2%), in districts larger than 10,000 than less than 1,000 (55.7% and 50.4% versus 39.2%), and in urban or small town rather than suburban districts (52.0% or 49.3% versus 35.6%) reported service club activity; and more respondents in the South than any other region (50.2% versus 35.4%, 36.7%, 37.2%, or 35.6%), in districts larger than 10,000 as compared to less than 1,000 (57.0% and 50.4% versus 26.7%), and in urban or small town rather than rural districts (49.1% and 41.9% versus 31.0%) reported activities related to charitable organizations.

In the political-government sector, more respondents in the South than West (14.6% versus 5.2%) reported they had been a successful candidate; more respondents in the South than the Central or Pacific regions (22.5% versus

10.2% or 12.4%), in 10,000-24,999 student districts than those less than 1,000 (24.4% versus 8.8%) and in urban rather than rural districts (24.6% versus 12.3%) reported activity in the Democratic party organization; and more respondents in districts of 10,000-24,999 students than those less than 1,000 (13.3% versus 4.1%) and in urban rather than rural districts (12.9% versus 6.0%) reported activity in a local political organization.

Factor 2 (Source of Encouragement), as shown on Table 34, varied by source according to the type of school district and form of nomination varied by region and type of school district. In general, urban respondents reported more encouragement from family (24.8%) and citizens groups (12.1%) than rural or small town respondents (18.8% and 4.0%), rural respondents reported more support from school board members (29.1%) and school personnel (7.1%) than urban respondents (18.8% and 4.7%), and small town respondents reported more encouragement from friends and neighbors (36.3%) than urban or suburban members (29.3%). Form of nomination was found to differ significantly such that more respondents from the Central than the Southern region (86.1% versus 58.6%) and rural more than urban school districts (79.8% versus 70.0%) reported being nominated by "sign-up (petition)"; more respondents from the East than any other region (14.4% versus 0.0%) and

urban rather than rural school districts (7.3% versus 1.9%) reported being a "party nominee"; and more respondents from the Pacific (32.9%), South (30.9%), and West (28.5%) than from the East (9.6%) and urban districts rather than suburban districts (22.0% versus 15.8%) reported "other" as the form of nomination (e.g., file or register without petition).

Factor 3 (Reason for Membership), as shown on Table 34, was found to vary significantly by selected individual reasons according to region, size, and type of school district but did not show significant differences by the number of reasons. In all, 8 of the 15 stated reasons varied by one or more of the demographic variables. In general, more respondents from the Pacific and West rather than the East reported as a reason "improve own child's education" (47.8% or 46.7% versus 36.4%). Southern respondents reported more frequently than those from the East or Central regions "increase academic standards" (62.5% versus 49.3% or 51.5%) and "remove drugs from schools" (17.6% versus 9.0% or 10.2%). Generally, more respondents from 4,999 or less (45.9% and 43.6%) and rural (48.9%) than those from large (25,000⁺) (32.6%) and urban (28.1%) school districts reported "improve own child's education" and respondents from large (25,000⁺) than small (< 1,000-4,999) (55.9% versus 38.2%) and urban than rural (49.1%

versus 35.5%) school districts reported "make schools more accountable" as reasons for seeking school board membership.

As indicated on Table 34, Factor 4 (Representative Structure) was found to vary significantly according to all three demographic variables. More respondents in the Central (81.7%) and East (74.8%), in school districts between 5,000 (81.4%) and 10,000 (78.2%) students, and in suburban (82.6%), small town (79.1%), and urban (78.1%) school districts reported representation on the school board as an "at-large" member than did those in the West (62.1%), 25,000⁺ student districts (51.7%), and rural (58.8%) school districts. Representation from a specific area was more frequently reported by those in the West (36.4%), 25,000⁺ student districts (43.3%), and rural (38.5%) school districts than respondents from the Central (17.6%) and East (17.8%), 5,000-9,999 student districts (16.4%) and in suburban districts (12.1%).

Format/Competition (Factor 6) was found to significantly vary by all 3 of the demographic variables, as reported on Table 34. Respondents more frequently reported being selected from a field of candidates in the Central region (55.1%) than the South (22.3%), in school districts from 5,000-9,999 students (50.8%) than 25,000⁺ students (23.7%), and in suburban (48.7%) than rural (35.2%). Selection for a specific seat was reported

more frequently by respondents from the South (77.7%), in 25,000⁺ student districts (76.3%), and rural school districts (64.8%).

Competition, in terms of the number to be selected, was found to vary significantly by region and type of school district. In general, fewer (1-2) candidates were selected in the Central (51.4%) and Southern (47.5%) regions and in rural (52.6%) and small town (46.5%) school districts, while more seats were filled (3-4) in the West (58.2%) and Pacific (57.4%) regions and in urban (54.8%) and suburban (54.2%) school districts. Competition for a specific seat was found to differ significantly by region and size of school district. Generally, more respondents in the South (64.4%) and West (63.9%) than in the East (43.5%) and in large (25,000⁺) (74.1%) as compared to small (< 1,000) (49.4%) school districts reported being opposed by one or more candidates for the same seat.

Another indicator of competition was whether respondents unseated an incumbent. As shown on Table 34, significant differences were found by region. More school board member respondents in the Central region (38.6%) than in the South (27.8%) reported unseating an incumbent.

Factor 7 (Campaign Process) was found to vary significantly by region, size, and type of school district. In general, more respondents in the Pacific (54.9%),

South (53.0%), and East (53.9%) reported that they had a campaign issue/platform; respondents in the Pacific (54.1%) and East (52.6%) more frequently reported that there was a formal, organized campaign or process; and that they had (Pacific, 33.0% and East, 38.4%) greater public support than respondents in the West with regard to all 3 elements (37.3%, 34.8%, and 16.7%, respectively). Also, respondents from school districts larger than 10,000 students and in urban and suburban school districts more frequently reported that they had a campaign issue/platform (71.3%, 67.1%, 69.9%, 55.8%), ideas different from other candidates (66.0%, 65.6%, 64.1%, 65.0%), participated in a formal, organized process (72.7%, 66.2%, 70.7%, 62.4%) and received public support (56.9%, 64.0%, 52.4%, 42.3%) than did those from school districts (< 1,000) (33.0%, 50.5%, 25.0%, 9.9%) and in rural or small town (39.5%, 53.2%, 34.4%, 16.4%) school districts.

Factor 9 (Recall Provisions) was found to differ significantly by region with respect to whether provisions were permitted. Respondents from the Pacific (94.8%) and West (76.4%) more frequently reported that recall was provided for than did those from the East (48.8%) or South (57.8%).

Research Question 4. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of the (a) sex, (b) ethnic designation, (c) age, (d) education, or (e) occupation of school board members?

Responses to survey questions Part II (Personal Information), 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were utilized to classify each respondent according to their sex, ethnic designation, age, education, and occupation. Cross-tabulation procedures with the calculation of chi-square values and levels of significance were used to analyze each of 10 factors descriptive of the recruitment and selection process by each of the 5 personal variables. Any cross-tabulations with more than 20.0% of the cells demonstrating an expected cell frequency less than 5.0 were considered indeterminate and treated as not significant.

Table 35 showed a summary of information concerning the significance of the cross-tabulation between 10 factors descriptive of the selection process and 5 personal variables. Only 1 variable, ethnic designation, did not evidence having significance on any of the 10 factors at the .05 level. Respondents were found to significantly vary by personal characteristics on 7 of the 10 factors such that 5 factors significantly varied by sex, 3 by age, 4 by education, and 4 by occupation. Two factors, Factor 1 (Prior Service) and Factor 3 (Reason for Membership), were found to vary significantly by all 4 variables and Factor 7 (Campaign Process) was found to vary by 3 of the factors.

Table 35

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by Personal Variables (Sex, Ethnic, Age, Education, and Occupation) of Respondents as Reported by Respondents

Factor	Sex		Ethnic		Age		Education		Occupation	
	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S
<u>1. Prior service</u>										
Amount	S ($\underline{n} = 4$)		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Sector	S ($\underline{n} = 11$)		N.S.		S ($\underline{n} = 6$)		S ($\underline{n} = 4$)		S ($\underline{n} = 8$)	
<u>2. Source of encouragement</u>										
Source	S	27.189/0.000	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Form of nomination	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
<u>3. Reason for membership</u>										
Number of reasons	S	20.664/0.023	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Reason	S ($\underline{n} = 6$)		N.S.		S ($\underline{n} = 1$)		S ($\underline{n} = 5$)		S ($\underline{n} = 3$)	
<u>4. Representative structure</u>	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		S	23.798/0.002	N.S.	
<u>5. Political status</u>	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
<u>6. Format/competition</u>										
Format	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Competition										
No. to be selected	S	12.731/0.001	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
No. candidates	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Same seat (OP v. UNOP)	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Incumbent	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		S	17.767/0.001	N.S.	
<u>7. Campaign process</u>										
Issue/platform	S	5.594/0.018	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		S	19.771/0.048
Issue differences	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		S	10.620/0.031	S	23.053/0.017
Formal campaign	S	10.717/0.001	N.S.		N.S.		S	18.189/0.001	S	22.455/0.021
Public support	S	5.321/0.021	N.S.		N.S.		S	11.540/0.021	S	24.706/0.010

Table 35 (continued)

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by Personal Variables (Sex, Ethnic, Age, Education, and Occupation) of Respondents as Reported by Respondents

Factor	Sex		Ethnic		Age		Education		Occupation	
	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S
8. <u>Selection</u> (Month)	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
9. <u>Recall provisions</u>										
Provision	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Use										
Target: Respondent	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Others	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
10. <u>Intentions</u>										
Board	N.S.		N.S.		S	45.213/0.000	N.S.		S	51.268/0.000
Other office	N.S.		N.S.		S	40.101/0.000	N.S.		N.S.	

Note. N = 1,557. S = Level of significance; N.S. = Not significant at $p = 0.05$; OP = Opposed; UNOP = Unopposed.

As shown on Table 35, Factor 1 (Prior Service) was found to vary significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) according to the sector of the activity by the respondents' sex, age, education, and occupation, and by the amount of prior service only according to their sex. With respect to the amount of prior service, more women reported 2 to 4 activities (33.9% - 7.1%) in education than did men (23.8% - 1.0%) and fewer reported 1 activity (23.8% versus 46.4%), more educational service in combination with civic-business activities (26.4% - 6.1% of women reported 2 to 6 activities as compared to 21.7% - 3.4% of the men) and more men reported no activity (8.6% versus 1.8%) or 1 activity (18.6% versus 9.8%), and more educational service in combination with political-government activity (28.6% - 21.0% of the women reported 3 to 6 activities as compared to 14.7% - 2.1% of the men).

Sectors of service prior to school board membership were found to vary significantly more by sex (11 out of 15 stated activities), than by education (4 out of 15 stated activities), or occupation (8 out of 15 stated activities), as indicated on Table 35. Four of the 5 activities in the education sector were found to vary significantly by all 4 personal variables. In general, more women (71.6%) respondents aged 41-50 (58.5%), those with educational achievement at the post-high school level

(56.7%), and homemakers (80.6%) reported participation in a parent-teacher organization than did men (39.8%), respondents less than 35 years of age (24.3%) or over 60 (40.6%), high school graduates (44.2%), and retired (38.4%). More women than men (45.0% versus 29.1%), respondents aged 41-50 than less than 35 or over 60 (40.6% versus 23.4% and 27.6%), post-high school or college graduate than high school (39.5% and 38.0% versus 27.6%), and homemakers than sales personnel (50.5% versus 20.8%) reported serving on a community advisory committee. More women than men (60.5% versus 21.8%), respondents aged 41-50 than less than 35 or over 60 (40.6% versus 27.1% and 18.8%), post- high school or college than earning advanced degrees (44.5% and 39.9% versus 28.7%), and homemakers than retired (50.5% versus 17.6%) reported service as a school volunteer. More women than men (19.5% versus 8.5%), respondents over age 60 than any other age group (32.9% versus 6.5% - 12.0%), advanced degree than high school graduates (18.4% versus 5.5%) and retired than any other occupational group (42.4% versus 0% - 18.8%) reported having been an employee of a school district. More women than men (18.5% versus 13.7%) reported additional "other" activities.

The civic-business sector was found to vary significantly with respect to involvement with the Chamber of Commerce (more men than women [23.2% versus 12.6%], and more professionals, managers, and business owners than homemakers [21.3%, 27.6%, and 27.3% versus 5.9%]), service clubs (more men than women [47.6% versus 23.2%], respondents over 51 than less than 35 [42.2% and 48.8% versus 32.7%], and managers, business owners, and sales than homemakers, service personnel, or clerks [51.0%, 50.0%, and 47.7% versus 37.1%, 34.8%, and 31.7%]), charity (more men than women [23.2% versus 12.6%, respondents over 51 than less than 35 [42.2% and 48.8% versus 36.4%], and retired or homemaker than sales personnel [54.5% and 50.0% versus 27.1%]), and "other" civic activities (more women than men [27.3% versus 21.2%] and homemakers than clerks and trades persons [31.2% versus 17.1% and 15.0%]). In the political-government sector, more men than women (10.0% versus 6.8%) reported having been a successful candidate and more women than men (10.4% versus 6.7%) reported they belonged to a local political party.

As indicated on Table 35, Factor 2 (Source of Encouragement) was found to vary significantly as to the source of encouragement according to the sex of the respondents but not to any other personal characteristic

and was not found to vary significantly with respect to the form of nomination according to personal characteristics of the respondents. In general, more men than women reported encouragement from school board members (26.7% versus 21.7%) or that they were "self-starters" (8.0% versus 3.5%) and more women than men reported encouragement from family (23.5% versus 17.0%) and formal citizens' groups (7.7% versus 5.5%).

Factor 3 (Reason for Membership), as shown on Table 35, was found to differ significantly with respect to the specifically stated reasons by the respondents' sex, age, education, and occupation, and with regard to number of reasons only according to sex. With respect to the number of reasons for seeking board membership, more women than men reported 2 reasons (21.7% versus 16.9%) and more men than women reported 1 reason (20.4% versus 14.0%). In general, 10 of the 15 stated reasons were found to vary by 1 or more of the 4 personal characteristics (6 by sex, 1 by age, 5 by education, and 3 by occupation) and no one reason by all personal characteristics. More respondents less than 50 years of age than over 51 (42.5% - 51.4% versus 29.2% - 20.0%) and sales, service, or trades persons or homemakers than clerks or retired (52.1% and 47.8% versus 29.3% and 13.6%) reported "improve own child's education" as a reason for seeking board

membership. More women than men reported "representing a specific group" (8.8% versus 5.9%) and "increasing academic standards" (58.7% versus 50.2%), and more men than women (36.2% versus 24.5%) reported "make schools fiscally sound" as a reason. More women than men (31.7% versus 21.2%) and homemakers than managers and business owners (35.5% versus 21.8% and 19.0%) reported "revise curriculum" as a reason. More men than women (6.8% versus 3.3%) and high school graduates than college graduates (9.0% versus 3.5%) reported "ensure support for athletics" and more high school graduates than post-high school and college graduates responded "increase school discipline" (28.6% versus 23.8% and 14.3%) and "remove drugs from schools" (18.6% versus 16.6% and 7.2%) as reasons for board membership. "Other" reasons were more frequently provided by women than men (28.3% and 17.1%), advanced degree recipients than high school graduates (23.8% versus 13.6%) and homemakers than managers or sales persons (32.3% versus 15.9% and 5.0%).

Factor 4 (Representative Structure) was found to differ significantly by the educational level of the respondents. More advanced degree and college graduates than high school graduates and less (77.1% and 75.4% versus 65.5% and 54.5%) reported representing their school

district as an "at-large" member whereas more high school graduates than advanced degree recipients represented a specific area within the district (32.0% versus 18.3%).

As shown on Table 35, Factor 6 (Format/Competition) was found not to vary as to format (field of candidate versus specific seat) by any of the personal characteristics although more men than women (48.4% versus 33.7%) reported competing in the selection of 1 or 2 seats and women more than men (58.4% versus 45.9%) reported competing in the selection of 3 or 4 seats. With respect to the unseating of an incumbent as an indicator of competition, more high school than college graduates (41.7% versus 29.1%) reported unseating an incumbent at the time of their selection.

Each element of the campaign process (Factor 7) was found to vary significantly by 2 or 3 of the personal characteristics. As shown on Table 35, elements varied according to occupation and 3 of the 4 varied according to sex and/or education. In general, more women than men (52.9% versus 46.4%) and more homemakers and retired than clerks and service personnel (51.1% and 52.7% versus 35.9% and 22.7%) reported having a campaign issue or platform. More advanced degree and post-high school graduates than high school graduates (63.7% and 62.6% versus 49.0%) and sales persons, retired, and managers

than homemakers and business owners (75.0%, 64.7%, and 64.2% versus 38.8% and 47.9%) reported being opposed for their seat and had ideas different from the other candidates. More women than men (53.7% versus 44.9%), advanced degree than high school graduates (54.7% versus 40.6%) and homemakers and sales personnel than business owners, retired, or clerks (57.8% and 56.3% versus 39.7%, 42.2%, and 41.0%) reported that there was a formal organized process for board membership selection. More women than men (32.5% versus 26.9%), advanced degree versus high school graduates (34.4% versus 23.5%) and retired and sales personnel than business owners and homemakers (39.3% and 39.6% versus 23.3% and 34.4%) reported receipt of public support by any organized group.

Factor 10 (Intentions) was found to vary significantly with respect to desires to serve another term on the school board by age and occupation and to intentions to run for another public office by occupation of the respondents. In general, more respondents less than 40 than over 60 (51.9% and 53.3% versus 38.0%) and professional than retired (48.6% versus 31.4%) reported "yes" rather than "no" to desiring another school board term and more less than 35 than over 60 (36.4% versus 26.4%) and business owners than clerks or sales personnel (40.7% versus 20.0%) said "maybe."

With respect to seeking another office, more respondents less than 35 than between 41 - 50 (17.9% versus 7.2%) reported "yes"; more over 60 than less than 35 (76.1% versus 52.8%) reported "no"; and more less than 35 than over 60 (29.2% versus 4.1%) reported "maybe."

Research Question 5. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of (a) length of membership, (b) size of school board, (c) relationship of the school board to other local governmental units, or (d) type of fiscal control?

Responses to survey questions Part III, 1, 5, 7, and 8 were utilized to classify each respondent regarding the number of years they had served on the school board, the size of the board (achieved by adding the reported number of men and women members), whether the boundaries of the school district in which they served were coterminous with any other governmental unit, and whether the school board on which they served was fiscally dependent or independent. Cross-tabulation procedures with the calculation of chi-square values and level of significance were used to analyze the responses. Cross-tabulations resulting in more than 20% of the cells evidencing an expected cell frequency less than 5.0 were considered indeterminate and treated as not significant for purposes of analysis.

Table 36 showed summary information concerning the significance of the cross-tabulation between 10 factors descriptive of the selection process and 4 variables regarding school board characteristics: length of service, size of board, coterminous boundary, and fiscal relationship. As shown, 1 or more of these 4 characteristics were found to significantly vary with respect to some aspect of 9 of the 10 factors descriptive of the selection process. All 4 of the school board characteristics were found to differ significantly with elements of 2 of the 10 factors, prior service and format/competition. Five of the factors were found to differ significantly according to length of service; 5 factors varied significantly by size of the board; 6 factors varied significantly according to the nature of the school district boundary; and 5 factors differed significantly with regard to fiscal relationship.

As shown on Table 36, Factor 1 (Prior Service) was found to differ significantly in the amount of service according to only 1 of the 4 school board characteristics and in only one aspect. More respondents in fiscally dependent school districts than independent districts reported 2 or more activities in the combined civic-business and political-government sectors (47.8% versus 40.4%).

Table 36

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by School Board Variables (Length of Service, Size of Board, Coterminous Boundaries, and Fiscal Relationship) as Reported by Respondents

Factor	Length of Service		Size of Board		Coterminous Boundary		Fiscal Relationship	
	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S
<u>1. Prior service</u>								
Amount	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		S ($\underline{n} = 1$)	
Sector	S ($\underline{n} = 2$)		S ($\underline{n} = 2$)		S ($\underline{n} = 5$)		S ($\underline{n} = 2$)	
<u>2. Source of encouragement</u>								
Source	N.S.		N.S.		S 22.196 / 0.004		N.S.	
Form of nomination	N.S.		S 90.080 / 0.000		S 73.988 / 0.000		S 27.467 / 0.000	
<u>3. Reason for membership</u>								
Number of reasons	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Reason	S ($\underline{n} = 2$)		N.S.		S ($\underline{n} = 2$)		N.S.	
<u>4. Representative structure</u>	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		S 8.809 / 0.012	
<u>5. Political status</u>	N.S.		N.S.		S 85.002 / 0.000		S 26.054 / 0.000	
<u>6. Format/competition</u>								
Format	N.S.		S 21.950 / 0.000		N.S.		S 2.829 / 0.092	
Competition								
No. to be selected	N.S.		N.S.		S 22.307 / 0.000		N.S.	
No. candidates	N.S.		N.S.		S 14.547 / 0.005		N.S.	
Same seat (OP v. UNOP)	S 22.957 / 0.000		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Incumbent	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
<u>7. Campaign process</u>								
Issue/platform	S 9.818 / 0.043		N.S.		S 16.037 / 0.000		N.S.	
Issue differences	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Formal campaign	S 30.274 / 0.000		S 11.059 / 0.025		S 12.625 / 0.000		N.S.	

Table 36 (continued)

Summary of Cross-Tabulations of Factors Descriptive of the Selection of School Board Members by School Board Variables (Length of Service, Size of Board, Coterminous Boundaries, and Fiscal Relationship) as Reported by Respondents

Factor	Length of Service		Size of Board		Coterminous Boundary		Fiscal Relationship	
	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S	S	χ^2/S
8. <u>Selection</u> (Month)	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
9. <u>Recall provisions</u>								
Provision	N.S.		S	22.283 / 0.000	N.S.		N.S.	
Use	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Target: Respondent	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Others	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
10. <u>Intentions</u>								
Board	S	72.971 / 0.000	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	
Other office	N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.	

Note. N = 1,557. S = Level of significance; N.S. = Not significant at $p = 0.05$; OP = Opposed; UNOP = Unopposed.

With respect to the nature of the prior service, selected areas of each sector did vary significantly by each of the 4 characteristics. In the educational sector, only 1 area of service "school volunteer" was found to vary significantly and only according to the size of the board such that respondents serving on 5- to 6-member boards reported more volunteering than those serving on 9- to 10-member boards (41.7% versus 29.8%). In the civic-business sector, membership in the Chamber of Commerce was reported to differ significantly by size of board and nature of the school districts' boundary such that more respondents serving on 5- to 6-member boards than 9- to 10-member boards (22.4% versus 10.6%) and respondents in school districts without coterminous boundaries rather than with (20.4% versus 16.6%) reported Chamber of Commerce activity. Also in the civic-business sector, more respondents with 11 - 20 years of service than 1 - 5 years of service (56.8% and 55.6% versus 41.7%) and reported service club or civic organization activity and more respondents serving in school districts with coterminous boundaries than without (43.8% versus 36.5%) reported activity in charitable organizations. In the political-government sector, more respondents from school districts with coterminous boundaries than without reported that they were both a successful candidate

(11.9% versus 7.3%) and an unsuccessful candidate (7.8% versus 4.6%); more respondents from school districts with coterminous boundaries than without (19.0% versus 12.3%), from fiscally dependent districts than independent (18.7% versus 12.5%) and with more than 16 years of service than less (22.7% and 24.1% versus 11.3%, 17.4%, and 12.7%) reported activity in the Democratic Party organization; and more respondents from fiscally independent than dependent school districts (16.2% versus 11.0%) reported activity in the Republican Party organization.

Factor 2 (Source of Encouragement) was found to differ significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) with respect to source by only 1 school board characteristic, school district boundary. More respondents from school districts without coterminous boundaries than with reported receiving encouragement from school board members (26.5% versus 20.2%) and more from districts with than without coterminous boundaries reported receiving encouragement from formal citizens' groups (8.7% versus 5.0%), professional school personnel (7.2% versus 5.6%), and government and political figures (3.5% versus 1.1%).

With regard to form of nomination, more respondents reported "sign-up (petition)" who were from independent than dependent (78.3% versus 65.0%) and not coterminous

boundaried (78.0% versus 67.7%) school districts and who served on 7- to 8-member boards than boards of 11 or more members (78.3% versus 54.2%). The caucus form of nomination was reported more frequently by respondents from coterminous and dependent than non-coterminous and independent school districts (2.5% and 2.7% versus 1.7% and 1.7%). The form of "party nominees" was reported more frequently in coterminous school districts and by respondents serving on 9- to 10-member boards than by those in non-coterminous school districts and on 5- to 6-member boards (11.6% and 14.2% versus 1.4% and 2.0%). "Other" form of nomination (e.g., file or register without petition) was more frequently reported by respondents serving on boards of over 11 members and in dependent school districts than those serving on 9- to 10-member boards and independent school districts (33.3% and 24.1% versus 10.9% and 16.9%).

Factor 3 (Reason for Membership) was found to not vary significantly in the number of reasons respondents indicated for seeking school board membership by any 1 of the 4 school board characteristics. Selected specific reasons were found to differ significantly according to years of service and school district boundary. More respondents from school districts with coterminous boundaries than without indicated "increase school

discipline" as a reason (22.7% versus 16.3%); more respondents with 6-10 years than 10-15 years' service (57.4% versus 40.6%) indicated "increase academic standards" as a reason; and more respondents from non-coterminous boundaried school districts and either 6-10 or more than 21 years' service than from coterminous school districts and 15-20 years' service (67.3% versus 64.0% and 69.9% and 69.0% versus 57.9%) cited "civic duty" as a reason for seeking school board membership.

As shown on Table 36, Factor 4 (Representative Structure) was found to vary significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) by size of board and fiscal relationship. More respondents serving on 9- to 10-member boards than on those of over 11 members or in independent than dependent school districts (66.8% versus 33.3%, 74.4% and 71.2%) serve as an "at-large" member. More respondents on boards of more than 11 members than 7- to 8-members (59.3% versus 21.0%) and in dependent than independent (27.5% and 21.9%) serve as a member representing a specific area.

Factor 5 (Political Status), as shown on Table 36, was found to vary significantly according to the respondents' school districts' boundary and fiscal relationship. More respondents in school districts without coterminous boundaries than with (86.5% versus 71.0%) and fiscally independent than dependent (83.3%

versus 79.8%) were selected as a "non-partisan" candidate. More respondents in school districts with coterminous boundaries than without or fiscally dependent than independent were selected as a member of either the Democratic (11.7% versus 2.3%, 8.9% versus 3.5%) or Republican (6.9% versus 1.9%, 4.3% versus 2.9%) political party.

As indicated on Table 36, Factor 6 (Format/Competition) was found to vary significantly in format according to the size of the board and fiscal relationship, and in some competitive aspects by years of service and boundary relationships. With respect to format, more respondents serving on 9- to 10-member boards than those on boards of more than 11 (53.0% versus 20.6%) or in independent than dependent school districts (44.4% versus 39.6%) were selected from a field of candidates while more respondents from boards of over 11 members than 9-10 members (79.4% versus 47.0%) or in dependent than independent (60.4% versus 55.6%) were selected for a specific seat.

With respect to competition, more respondents from school districts with coterminous boundaries than without reported 3-4 and 5-9 seats were selected than 1-2 seats (55.4% versus 49.3%, 13.1% versus 4.0%, and 31.5% versus 46.7%) and 9-26 candidates (18.2% versus 7.6%) than any fewer candidates. More respondents with 1-5 years of

service than more than 21 years (62.0% versus 26.7%) reported that they were opposed for their specific seat and those with 21 or more than 1-5 years of service (73.3% versus 38.0%) reported that they ran unopposed.

Factor 7 (Campaign Process) was found to vary significantly on 3 of the 4 elements by 2 or 3 of the school board characteristics. More respondents with 1-5 years of service than more than 11-15 or over 21 (51.3% versus 38.9% and 34.6%) and in school districts with coterminous boundaries than without (56.6% versus 45.2%) reported they had a campaign issue or platform. More respondents with 1-5 years than 11-15 or more than 20 (53.6% versus 28.6% or 33.8%) or serving on 9- to 10-member than 5- to 6- or 11⁺-member boards (53.9% versus 43.5% or 41.2%), or in school districts with coterminous than non-coterminous boundaries (55.1% versus 45.1%) reported participating in a formal, organized process for selection. More respondents on 9- to 10-member than 5- to 6-member boards (42.3% versus 22.5%) and in school districts with coterminous than non-coterminous boundaries (35.3% versus 26.0%) reported being publicly supported at the time of their selection.

As indicated on Table 36, Factor 9 (Recall) was found to differ significantly in only one aspect and by only 1 characteristic: size of board. More respondents

from 5- to 6-member than 9- to 10-member boards (69.3% versus 50.5%) reported the presence of recall provisions.

Factor 10 (Intentions) was found to differ significantly (chi-square, $p < 0.05$) with respect to whether respondents desired to serve another term on the school board according to years of service. More respondents with 1-5 years of service than 16-20, 11-15, or 6-10 (50.6% versus 33.3%, 34.1%, or 40.3%) indicated "yes" they desired to serve another term; more respondents with 11-15 than 1-5 years of service (35.7% versus 13.0%) indicated "no"; and more respondents with 16-20 or 21⁺ than 6-10 or 11-15 years of service (38.1% or 44.4% versus 30.8% or 30.2%) indicated "maybe."

Research Question 6. Do school board members differ in their preference for a trustee versus delegate mode of representativeness as a function of their method of selection to the school board or to demographic and personal characteristics?

Responses to survey question Part V, 2 were utilized to classify each respondent according to their preferred mode of representativeness. Respondents who indicated "I should do what the public wants me to do even if it isn't my own personal preference" were classified as preferring the "delegate" mode. Respondents who selected the response "I should use my own judgment regardless of what others want me to do" were classified as preferring the "trustee" mode. As shown on Table 37, a majority,

Table 37

Preference for Mode of Representation as Reported by
Respondents

Mode of Representation	Respondents	
	No.	%
Delegate	395	25.4
Trustee	1,064	68.3
No response	98	6.3
Total	1,557	100.0

Note. N = 1,557

1,064 or 68.3%, of the respondents indicated a preference for the trustee mode of representativeness and 395 or 25.4% indicated the delegate mode. Many of the 98 or 6.3% of those who did not respond indicated either a choice of both modes or that neither adequately described their preferred mode.

The cross-tabulation procedure with the calculation of chi-square and level of significance was used to determine whether school board member respondents differed in their preference for a trustee versus delegate role by their method of selection or according to demographic or personal characteristics. A summary of the significance of the cross-tabulations according to these variables was shown on Table 38. As indicated, respondents did not vary significantly in their preferred mode by method of selection. Respondents were found to vary significantly (chi-square value, $p < 0.05$) according to all 3 demographic variables (region, size of district, and type of district) and 1 personal characteristic (education).

As shown on Table 39, the majority of respondents, according to each variable, preferred the trustee mode of representativeness. More respondents from the Pacific or West regions than the East or South (32.5% or 31.4% versus 21.1% or 22.5%), in school districts of less than 1,000 students than those of more than 25,000 (35.6%

Table 38

Summary of Significance of Cross-Tabulations Regarding
Preferred Mode of Representation by Method of Selection
and Demographic and Personal Characteristics

Variable	Significance	χ^2/S
Method of selection	N.S.	
Demographic		
Region	S	14.420 / 0.006
Size of district	S	20.241 / 0.000
Type of district	S	13.272 / 0.010
Personal		
Sex	N.S.	
Ethnic designation	N.S.	
Age	N.S.	
Education	S	10.699 / 0.030
Occupation	N.S.	

Note. S = Level of significance; N.S. = Not significant
at $p = 0.05$.

Table 39

Percent of Respondents According to Preference for Delegate Versus
Trustee Mode of Representativeness by Region, Size of School District,
Type of School District, and Educational Level

Variable	Delegate	Trustee
	%	%
Region		
Pacific	32.5	67.5
West	31.4	68.6
Central	29.5	70.5
South	22.5	77.5
East	21.1	78.9
Size of district		
Less than 1,000	35.6	64.4
1,000 - 4,999	27.3	72.7
5,000 - 9,999	18.6	81.4
10,000 - 24,999	26.2	73.8
25,000 ⁺	20.8	79.2
Type of district		
Urban	20.5	79.5
Suburban	24.2	75.8
Rural	32.8	67.2
Small town	28.3	71.7
Education level		
Less than high school	22.2	77.8
High school graduate	30.8	69.2
Post-high school	32.6	67.4
College graduate	26.8	73.2
Advanced college degree	22.7	77.2

versus 20.8%), in rural than urban (32.8% versus 20.5%) or with post-high school training than an advanced degree (32.6% versus 22.7%) indicated a preference for the delegate mode of representativeness while the trustee mode was preferred by more respondents from the East or South, in school districts of over 25,000, in urban school districts, and with advanced degrees.

Summary

This chapter presented a description of demographic, personal, and school board characteristics of the respondents. Demographic characteristics included the region and size of the school district of the respondents, comparing those descriptions to recorded national distributions, and the type of school district. Respondents were described by the personal characteristics of sex, ethnic designation, age, educational level, and occupation. Description of the respondents according to the school board characteristics of length of service, size of board, coterminousness of boundary, and fiscal relationship. The findings of this study with respect to each of six research questions was presented. The method of analysis and results were presented for each research question.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter provides a summary of the study conducted. The summary includes a review of the study's purpose, a restatement of the research questions, a summary of related literature, the research methodology employed, and findings and conclusions derived from data analysis. Recommendations for further research are made, as well.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

In the United States, lay control of public institutions, especially schools, has had a profound impact on society and the nation. Lay governance of education has been credited as a critical feature of American education since the early colonial period and has been viewed as essential to the establishment of universal free public education (Cremin, 1970). Understanding and examining the process of lay control of education can form the basis for predicting future changes in the governance of education.

It is important to not only acknowledge but to understand the linkage between politics and power in

education. If political processes ascribe values and allocate resources, then the distribution and exercise of power determine who gets what, when, and how. Politics and power are critical in the governance of public education through educational decision-making. The real decision-makers in the government of education are those who are successful in resolving school issues and school policies in accord with their own values, judgments, and perceptions (Rosenthal, 1969).

The school board, like other governing bodies, comprises only a fraction of the total population; that is, very few govern very many (Prewitt, 1970). Selecting the few who will occupy the governing positions in a community is a political process. The process of leadership selection is completed once the community chooses among candidates (Cistone, 1975).

It is important, as we approach education in the 21st century, to assess the recruitment and selection process by which local school board members become empowered to act on behalf of their constituents to shape public school policy. The recruitment and selection of school board members reflects the political process and the shifts and changes of the American public which exist at this time. Changing demographics may mean that education will not be able to rely on the "good will" of an electorate of which the majority does not have children in school. Information

is important to understand, project, and shape the influences, processes, and factors that relate to selecting school board members.

This study was intended to provide current data on the recruitment and selection of school board members, their modes of decision-making, and indicate how these processes varied among school board members and school districts across the United States. The major purpose of this study was to determine the salient factors in the recruitment and selection of school board members, board members' preference for a trustee versus delegate mode of representativeness, and how these factors related to selected demographic, personal, and school board variables and/or to the method by which school board members are selected.

Research Questions Restated

1. What are the most salient factors which describe the selection process of school board members?
2. Do these factors differ significantly as a function of the method of selection of the school board?
3. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of (a) size of school districts, (b) type of location of school district, or (c) region of the country?

4. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of the (a) sex, (b) ethnic designation, (c) age, (d) education, or (e) occupation of school board members?

5. Do these factors differ significantly as a consequence of (a) length of membership, (b) size of the school board, (c) relationship of the school board to other local governmental units, or (d) type of fiscal control?

6. Do school board members differ in their preference for a trustee versus delegate role model of representativeness as a function of their method of selection to the school board or demographic and personal characteristics?

Summary of Related Literature

The author has presented a historical perspective on the structural evolution of school boards, particularly with respect to selection of their membership and organization. The American school board historical perspective reflected that although it is the product of over 200 years of evolution, it has changed little in the past 75 years (IEL, 1986). Local school boards have been criticized for abdicating leadership and resisting change. In light of another reform movement, it is appropriate to determine the strength and direction of the grassroots leadership of American public education.

Information that more than 95% of the school boards in the United States are elected was juxtaposed to theoretical arguments over whether it was preferable to elect or appoint school board members to realize effective school boards. Arguments for and against elected or appointed school boards center on the issues of accountability (responsiveness to the will of the people) versus competence (personal qualities of school board members). Studies of elected and appointed school boards have found no differences in governance of schools or responsiveness to the community although Zeigler and Jennings (1974) state that the effort to keep politics and education separate has succeeded all too well. They argue that an apolitical approach to education has, as its consequence, failure of the school board selection process to measure up to the standards of democratic leadership selection. They further recommend that boards become more political in order that schools might become more responsive to their constituents.

Ten factors were identified through a review of the literature to describe the recruitment and selection process of school board members, whether elected or appointed. These include:

- Prior service to the community as an indicator of pre-board apprenticeship and defining effective political opportunity or eligibility for selection and assignment.

- Source of encouragement/nomination as indicators of the role of sponsors and selectors and the process of nominations in the "pre-sorting" of candidates.
- Reason for membership as an indicator of the motives for seeking school board membership.
- Representative structure as defining the structural approach to membership as either serving "at-large" or representing a specific geographic area.
- Political status as an indicator of the presence or absence of partisan politics in the selection process.
- Format/competition as factors reflective of the amount and kind of political activity engaged in by aspirants to school board membership.
- Campaign process as defined by a series of elements descriptive of the selection of school board members once they are candidates including the presence/absence of issues; a formal, organized campaign, and public support.
- Selection as a factor defining when and by whom selection to school board membership occurs.
- Recall provisions as an indicator of competition in the selection of school board members.
- Intentions as an indicator of whether school board members see school board service as a "stepping-stone" and/or whether they seek short or extended school board service.

From previous studies, selected demographic, personal, and school board variables were related to the selection of school board members. Twelve variables were reviewed in light of over 50 years of research, particularly research on the personal and social characteristics of school board members. The significance of these factors in the recruiting and selecting school board members was one of the purposes of this study. Demographic variables such as region, size, and type of school district have been found to relate to the method of selection, but few studies have been done exploring the relationship of these various factors in the selection process. Studies of personal characteristics of school board members have noted shifts and movement over the past 50 years although the profile of the typical school board member has changed little except with respect to occupation and education: the average member is still male, white, and middle-aged. School board characteristics--such as tenure of members, size of the board, coterminousness with other governmental units and fiscal relationships--while objects of survey and study were not found to be studied in relation to factors in the selection of school board members.

School board members are selected to represent and act on behalf of others in matters related to education. The nature of representation was identified as a classic dichotomy: Should representatives represent the interest

or the will of the represented? The literature review examined this ideological tension within school boards. Currently (IEL, 1986), there is concern that school board members increasingly represent special interests and serve as delegates, and that the trusteeship notion of service in which the interests of the entire community are represented is less prominent. There is disagreement as to which mode best serves the public and the educational interest.

The review of the literature concluded with an assessment of the reform movement of the 1980s in which local school boards were being called upon to support a top-down call to action with a bottoms-up response. It is timely and appropriate in 1987 to examine the recruitment and selection of school board members and whether the general findings of the past 50 years, reflecting the effects of the first reform movement, hold sway today.

Research Methodology

This study utilized descriptive research methodology and survey technique to gather data from school board members about their recruitment and selection to board membership. Descriptive survey procedures utilizing a questionnaire were selected for this study. Information, attitudes, and opinions of school board members about factors (methods, processes, and procedures) bearing on

recruitment and selection were solicited in order to study the relationship among these and selected demographic, personal, and school board variables.

The sample for the study was drawn from the population of subscribers to The American School Board Journal. It contained 4,493 members, representing 18% of the population. The respondent sample comprised 1,557 members; the return rate was 34.7% of those surveyed.

The survey instrument used to collect the data was divided into five parts. Part I gathered demographic information about the school board member's district. Part II collected personal information about the school board member. Part III sought information about the board on which the respondent served. Part IV collected data relative to 10 factors descriptive of the recruitment and selection process of school board members and asked respondents to reply in accordance with the method by which they had most recently been selected. Part V collected data with reference to attitudes of school board members regarding current concerns and their preferred mode of representation.

The method of analysis and statistical treatments applied to the data were stated. All questions from the survey instrument were analyzed.

Results

Respondents were described by region of the United States, enrollment size, type of community, sex, ethnic representation, age, educational level, occupation, length of board service, size of school board, coterminousness of boundaries, and fiscal relationship of the school districts.

The data produced by the study were grouped into 10 factors descriptive of the recruitment and selection process of school board members. These data were analyzed to provide a descriptive summary and to determine differences in the selected factors according to method of selection (elected or appointed) and by 12 variables related to demographic, personal, and school board characteristics. Data regarding the respondents' preferred mode of representation, trustee or delegate, were also described and analyzed by these same variables.

School board member respondents reported extensive service in their communities prior to becoming a school board member. Almost 95% reported they had served the community in at least one capacity and two-thirds reported they were involved in three or more community organizations or activities. Educational activities were identified by the largest percent of respondents with more than 80% reporting at least one area of involvement and over half reporting membership in a parent-teacher organization. Involvement in civic-business organizations was the second

largest sector with over two-thirds of the respondents reporting one or more activities. Political-government activities were reported least frequently with 40% reporting one activity and one-third reporting involvement in one of the major political parties.

School board member respondents reported the most frequent source of encouragement to seek school board membership was that of friends and neighbors followed by other school board members. If the response "family" were included with "friends and neighbors," the majority of respondents reported non-organized or personal sources of encouragement more than formal, professional or political sources.

School board member respondents reported that the majority had been nominated for candidacy by signing-up supported by a petition. If signing-up were to include filing or registering without a petition, almost 80% achieved nomination by "sign-up."

School board member respondents reported an average of three reasons for seeking board membership with two-thirds indicating "exercise civic duty" and over half indicating "increase academic standards" as reasons. Four reasons cited by more than one-quarter of the respondents were: "improve own child's education," "make schools more accountable," "make schools fiscally sound," and "revise curriculum."

School board member respondents reported that almost three-quarters had been selected to represent the school district "at-large" with slightly fewer of the remaining one-quarter reporting they had been selected to represent a specific area of the school district.

School board member respondents reported that the vast majority, almost 80%, had been "non-partisan" candidates for board membership. Less than 10% indicated that they had been selected as a candidate of one of the major political parties.

School board member respondents reported that slightly over half had been selected from a field of candidates for the same seat with the remaining indicating they had been selected as one of a specified number to be selected from a field of candidates. Respondents who reported participating in a field of candidates for a number of seats typically reported that two to four seats were to be selected from three to nine candidates. As reported by these respondents, the most typical selection involved filling two school board seats from a field of five candidates for a 1:2.5 seat-to-candidate ratio. Respondents reporting that they had been selected from a field of candidates for the same seat indicated that the majority (56%) had been opposed and that the typical experience was to be opposed by one other candidate.

School board member respondents reported that two-thirds of them had not unseated an incumbent at the time they had been first selected to serve on the school board. Thus, although three-quarters of the respondents reported that they had faced competition for their seat on the school board, over one-half did not compete against an incumbent.

School board member respondents reported that a majority of them did not have a campaign issue or platform at the time of their selection, did not participate in a formal, public and/or organized process, and did not receive public support from any organized group. A majority of those responding that they had been opposed did report that their ideas had differed from those of other candidates. Respondents reporting that they had participated in a formal, organized process were, for the most part, elected to the school board. The majority of this group reported that they did have a campaign fund with, on the average, \$2,430 raised and \$1,406 spent. The modal amount both raised and spent was reported to be \$500. The majority of elected respondents reported using at least one method of communicating their candidacy with most reporting they had used the newspaper, meet-the-candidate sessions, and campaign literature; few reported using radio or TV.

School board member respondents reported that selection occurred virtually every month of the year. The majority

reported selections in November, April, May, or June. Over half of the respondents reported they had been selected in the spring and one-third reported selection in the fall.

Elected school board member respondents reported that, in a majority of cases, other issues had been on the ballot at the same time as their election. Local elections were reported most frequently, followed by state and, then, national elections. Local funding matters were reported to appear on the ballot with about the same frequency as national elections.

Elected respondents reported voter information which reflected a wide range of voter participation. Typically, in those school districts with elected school board members, 25% of those registered voted and the selected school board member had received 60% of the vote.

School board member respondents reported that over half of the school districts did provide for recall of a board member. The overwhelming majority of these respondents reported, however, that recall provisions had not been used and few reported that either they or other current members of the school board had been targets of recall.

School board member respondents reported that three-quarters of them either desired or would consider another term on the school board; less than 20% said "no." Almost two-thirds of the respondents reported they were not

intending to seek election to another public office; less than 10% said "yes."

Elected and appointed school board member respondents provided significantly different responses regarding 10 of 12 measures of demographic, personal, and school board characteristics; only 2 characteristics, sex and age, were not found to be significantly different. School board member respondents reported that appointed members, although only 5% of all school boards are appointed, are more often found in the South than other regions, in school districts between 5,000 and 10,000 or over 25,000 students, and in small town or urban districts. Appointed respondents reflected a higher percentage of minorities (Blacks) than elected respondents and more reported that they had completed college or received advanced degrees. A larger percent of appointed than elected respondents reported that they were in their first five years of service, serving their first term, and on a 3- to 6- or 11⁺-member board. Appointed respondents reported that more than two-thirds of their school districts were coterminous with boundaries of other governmental units and fiscally dependent.

Elected school board members reported with more than expected frequency from the Central, Western, and Pacific regions, school districts with less than 1,000 enrollment, and rural districts. Elected respondents reflected a higher percentage of majority (White) than appointed

respondents and of those completing high school. A larger percent of elected than appointed respondents reported more than six years of service, that they were in their third or more term, and that they were serving on 7- to 8-member boards. Elected respondents reported that more than two-thirds of their school districts did not have coterminous boundaries with other governmental units and were fiscally independent.

Elected and appointed school board member respondents also provided significantly different responses regarding 9 of 10 factors descriptive of the recruitment and selection process. Only Factor 4 (Representative Structure) was found not to vary significantly as a function of the school board members' method of selection.

Elected and appointed respondents did not differ in the amount of service prior to school board membership but did vary in the nature of that service such that more appointed respondents reported participation in a parent-teacher and charitable organization. Elected and appointed respondents reported different sources of encouragement to seek board membership with those appointed reporting more from government and political figures and elected reporting more from school board members and friends and neighbors. Elected respondents reported more frequent use of the "sign-up (petition)" form of nomination while those appointed

reported more use of "other" forms, such as filing without a petition. Elected respondents reported more reasons for seeking board membership and more cited "make schools more accountable" and "make schools fiscally sound" as reasons. Although a majority of both elected and appointed respondents reported that they had been a "non-partisan" candidate selected from a field of candidates for a single seat and faced opposition, proportionately more elected were non-partisan but proportionately more appointed were selected for a single seat and faced opposition. A majority of elected respondents reported they had a campaign issue and issue differences with other candidates while a larger percent of appointed respondents reported they did not participate in a formal, public or organized process and did not receive public support from an organized group. Elected respondents reported being selected in April, May, or November while the majority of appointed members reported being selected in June or July. Although recall provisions were reported by more elected respondents, their use and "targets" did not differ significantly. More elected than appointed respondents reported that they did not desire another term on the school board; more elected reported they might consider running for another office. Appointed respondents indicated they did desire another term but did not intend to run for another office.

The information received from school board member respondents provided a general description of the forces, influences, motivations, and processes by which they were recruited and selected to become members and were summarized by 10 factors. Aspects of 9 of these 10 factors were found to vary significantly according to 1 or more of 11 demographic, personal, and school board characteristics; no factor descriptive of the selection process was found to vary significantly by ethnic designation.

Of the 10 factors, 1 (Factor 1, Prior Service) was found to vary significantly by 11 characteristics either in terms of amount of service or the nature of the activity. Factor 3 (Reason for Membership), Factor 6 (Format/Competition), and Factor 7 (Campaign Process) were found to differ by 9 of 11 characteristics. Factor 2 (Source of Encouragement) differed by 6 characteristics, Factor 4 (Representative Structure) varied by 5 characteristics, and Factor 10 (Intentions) differed by 3: age, occupation, and length of service. Factor 5 (Political Status) and Factor 9 (Recall) varied by 2 characteristics, and only 1, Factor 8 (Selection) did not reveal any significant differences.

Seven of the 10 factors varied by region; 6 varied by type of district, size of board, and fiscal relationship; 5 varied by size of school district, sex of respondent, and coterminousness of boundaries; 4 varied by education and

occupation; and 3 by age of respondent. More of the 10 factors were found to vary by demographic variables followed by school board characteristics and least by personal variables.

Known limitations of the chi-square statistic and its distribution may result in the acceptance of false hypotheses as "true" because of their level of probability (so-called alpha errors) when, in practical fact, no "true" difference exists. Therefore, an analysis was undertaken for each research question to assess the magnitude as well as the meaningfulness of the results. Only those findings bearing on differences between elected versus appointed school board members were viewed as representing statistically significant as well as "true" phenomenological differences. This conclusion is supported by the number of observed statistically significant differences (10 of 12 independent variables and 9 of 10 descriptive factors varied significantly) and their pattern. An analysis of the findings regarding differences in the selection of school board members according to the 12 demographic, personal, and school board characteristics revealed that although there were some very low probability levels, no configuration emerged to support their significance as other than random effects. That is, they were artifacts of the statistical technique employed.

School board member respondents were asked to indicate their preferred mode of representativeness. The trustee mode in which respondents use their own judgment was preferred by over two-thirds of the respondents; the delegate mode in which respondents do what the public wants was preferred by one-quarter of the respondents. The preferred mode was not found to differ by method of selection (elected versus appointed) or by the sex, ethnic designation, age, or occupation of the respondents but was found to vary by region, size of district, type of district, and education of the respondents. Although a majority of respondents according to each demographic, personal, or school board characteristic reported a preference for the trustee mode, proportionately more from the Pacific and West, in school districts less than 1,000, in rural districts, or with post-high school training preferred the delegate mode while proportionately more from the East or South, in school districts of more than 25,000, in urban districts, or with advanced degrees preferred the trustee mode.

Conclusion

This study provided a national profile of the recruitment and selection process of school board members. It revealed a process still influenced in some respects by the structural changes brought by the reform movement of the turn of the 20th century and described by studies

conducted over 20 years ago. Differences were found to exist, however. These differences, as much of the history of education in the United States reveals, appeared to differ more by geographic and demographic aspects of the nation than by personal characteristics of school board members. The selection of school board members remains very much determined by a nation of states and local school districts.

School board members indicate that the vast majority have served an apprenticeship in their community, most likely in an educational or civic-business organization. There appears to be no less commitment to community service than previously, although the pattern for participation may have changed. Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found more board members participated and to a greater degree in the civic-business domain; this study found the educational domain to be predominant in the steps to board membership.

School board members indicate that the vast majority have received encouragement to seek membership from significant others. In comparison to previous studies, this study found even fewer "self-starters" than previously reported and even less formal or systematic recruitment mechanisms. Whereas Zeigler and Jennings (1974) found at least 40% of board members inspired by representatives of the school system, this study found over 50% reporting

family, friends, and neighbors as providing the most encouragement. It appears that personal rather than formal sources of encouragement inspire board membership.

School board members reported multiple reasons for seeking board membership. They are not, as one respondent wrote, "single issue" candidates. The majority of respondents in this study expressed the advancement of the objectives of the school system to benefit the community as motivation for membership. This finding, contrary to other studies, should be heartening to those recently expressing concern that school board members are increasingly motivated by the concerns of special interest groups.

Reflecting continuation of the two central pillars of the reform movement of the 20th century, school board members report that the majority were appointed to represent the district "at-large" and that they were "non-partisan" candidates. While almost 30% reported prior activity in the major political organizations, school board membership appears to remain separated from partisan politics. While some (Zeigler & Jennings, 1974) believe these structural forms have denied educational leadership to be determined by more democratic forms of representative government, others believe--and respondents' comments reflect--that education is better served by its removal from the partisan political arena. Education, it is argued, is no less

political, but merely subject to a different set of political forces.

School board members report that although the majority are selected to represent the district at-large, a slight majority compete in a field of candidates for the same seat. In comparison to Zeigler and Jennings (1974), this finding suggests that fewer districts than previously conduct pure at-large elections and may reflect, as described by Campbell et al. (1985), more of the structural modifications in the selection and representation reported to have occurred since 1969. The structural modifications reported, particularly in large cities and urban areas, have been designed to permit more regional representation. The findings of this study, in comparison to earlier studies, suggest that such change may have taken place.

School board members report that there is a level of competition for school board membership. While some members report being unopposed or even asked to serve because there was no other candidate, the majority report at least competing against one other candidate for the same seat and even more when a number of seats are being filled. While the reported voter turnout of 25% of this study is less than that reported for national elections, it is higher than some states have reported, suggesting national variations. School board membership remains, however, the result of relatively minimal conflict.

The majority of school board members report that they did not participate in a campaign process. Many did, however, including platforms, issue differences, a formal campaign replete with buttons and bumper stickers, and public endorsements from organized groups. These findings reflect the regional and local differences of the East and urban and suburban communities versus those of the West and rural areas. School board selection for most, however, appears to be more reflective of a personal than political campaign.

School board members report that they are elected in November, April, or May and appointed in June or July. This finding suggests that elected membership either occurs in concert with other elections or at the start of a fiscal year. Appointed membership would appear to be more related to a July fiscal year or to a board cycle that begins with the opening of school.

School board members report that a procedure for recall may exist but that it is seldom used. While a few respondents wrote that they were either involved in recall or that their membership was related to the recall of a previous board (or board member), this study suggests that these are uncommon occurrences and not a real threat to their tenure as board members.

School board members report that they enjoy serving and that, for the most part, they would consider another term and to a greater degree than school board members reported in earlier studies. They remain, as previous studies have found, relatively uninterested in higher office, although less so than reported by Zeigler and Jennings (1974).

School board members report that they prefer to make public, educational policy which serves the interest more than the will of the community. Other studies (IEL, 1986) have reported board members increasingly are perceived as representing special interests, that members with single constituencies or issues are affecting board affectiveness, and that the trusteeship notion of service is less prominent. The findings of this study, while unable to demonstrate shifts and changes, do not support the overriding influence of special interests or narrow representation. Rather, the findings of this study suggest that the majority of school board members sought, were selected, and are motivated to serve in a manner that represents their perception of the interests of their entire community.

In 1987, education in the United States is undergoing reform, particularly with respect to standards for students and teachers. Unlike the major reform of the 20th century, this reform movement has not identified specific structural

reform of school board or of the selection of school board members. There has been, however, an entreaty to school boards to strengthen their leadership by improving the communities' understanding of their role and by increasing the effectiveness of the board's functioning. Individual school districts have reported, over the past 20 years, efforts to examine the structure and selection of school boards and to make modifications which will better serve education. This study's findings regarding differences in the selection of elected and appointed members support the need to examine and reconsider the structural elements of school boards in support of strengthened leadership for education in the 21st century.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based on the results and conclusions of this study of the recruitment and selection of school board members, the following recommendations are made for further study.

This 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 sample who have subscribed to the Journal. A more comprehensive nationwide sample, particularly selected to more nearly reflect the demographic characteristics of

school districts in the United States, would result in more accurate information regarding the selection process.

No attempt in this study was made to assess and relate structural characteristics of school board membership selection to the actual functioning of school boards or to assess the effectiveness of school board functioning. While some community studies have been done, none have relied on a nationwide sample. A study of such magnitude and utilizing a research design which relies on quantitative data capable of being analyzed by parametric techniques which have more power could yield findings not only more subtle but more robust. At a time of major educational reform, such a study would appear to be appropriate.

No attempt was made in this study to compare the selection of school board members with that of the selection of other community or local officials. If questions about the results of the selection process are thought to be real, it would be instructive to compare the process and the results in a more direct way. Such studies would assist in determining whether the current structure of school boards and the selection process for membership achieve the ideals of identifying leadership for education in the United States for the next century.

References

- American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association. (1946). School boards in action. Twenty-fourth yearbook. Washington: National Education Association.
- Babbie, E. R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bell, J. S., Jr. (1986). A study of the relationship between community participation in educational governance and the socio-political environment of the school board. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Callahan, R. E. (1975). The American board of education, 1789-1960. In P. J. Cistone (Ed.), Understanding school boards (pp. 19-46). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O., & Usdan, M. D. (1985). The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Carver, F. (1968). Social class and school board role expectations. Urban Education, 3, 143-154.
- Charters, W. W., Jr. (1955). Beyond the survey in school board research. Educational Administration and Supervision, 41, 449-452.
- Cistone, P. J. (1974). The ecological basis of school board member recruitment. Education and Urban Society.
- Cistone, P. J. (Ed.). (1975). Understanding school boards. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Counts, G. P. (1927). The social composition of boards of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crain, R. L. (1968). The politics of school desegregation. Chicago: Aldine.

- Lutz, F. W., & Garnon, F. (1979). Citizen participation in educational decisions. Citizen Participation, 10, 108-117.
- Martin, R. C. (1969). School government. In A. Rosenthal (Ed.), Governing education: A reader on politics, power and public school policy (pp. 260-290). Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- McCarty, D. J. (1959). Motives for seeking school board membership. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Meyer, J. A. (1982). National survey of the attitude of school board members toward community participation - community control. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Minar, D. W. (1966). The community basis of conflict in school system politics. American Sociological Review, 31, 822-835.
- Mouly, G. J. (1970). The science of educational research. New York: Litton.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1986). Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84. Washington: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington: Department of Education.
- National Education Association, Research Division. (1950). Fiscal authority of city school boards. Research Bulletin, 28, 2.
- National School Boards Association. (1975). The people look at their school boards (Research Rep. 1975-1). Evanston, IL: Author.
- New Jersey School Boards Association. (1986). Facts and figures: 1986 annual school election. Trenton, NJ: Author.
- Prewitt, K. (1970). The recruitment of political leaders. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Reeves, C. E. (1954). School boards: Their status, functions and activities. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1970). American education: The colonial experience 1607-1783. New York: Harper & Row.

Cronin, J. M. (1973). The control of urban schools. New York: Free Press.

Dexter, E. G. (1922). A history of education in the United States. New York: Macmillan.

Dodge, H. (1981). A national study of the attitudes of school board members toward the reduction of programs and services. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1985). How to conduct surveys. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Gay, L. R. (1976). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gittell, M., & Hollander, T. E. (1968). Six urban school districts: A comparative study of instructional response. New York: Praeger.

Gross, N. G. (1958). Who runs our schools? New York: John Wiley.

Hurwitz, M. W. (1972). What works best in an elected or appointed school board? The American School Board Journal, 23, 21-23.

Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc. (1986). School boards. Washington: Author.

Kerr, N. D. (1969). The school board as an agency of legitimation. In A. Rosenthal (Ed.), Governing education (pp. 137-172). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Kimbrough, R. B. (1964). Informal county leadership structure and controls affecting educational policy-making. Cooperative Research Project No. 1324. Washington: Office of Education.

Lecos, M. A., & Burham, F. E. (1975). Selecting school board members: Is there a best method? Unknown.

Luckett, R., Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. C. (1987). Men and women make disceribly different contributions to their boards. The American School Board Journal, 21-27.

- Rosenthal, A. (Ed.). (1969). Governing education: On politics, power, and public school policy. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Sax, G. (1979). Foundations of educational research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Underwood, K. E., Thomas, W. P., & Pace, M. (1981). Your portrait: Who you are, region by region. The American School Board Journal, 168, 21.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1982). 1982 census of governments: Governmental organization, Vol. 1. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- White, A. L. (1962). Local school boards: Organization and practices. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Government Printing Office.
- Wiersma, W. (1980). Research methods in education. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Wirth, C. J. (1979). Social bias in political recruitment: Ascribed and achieved status of black and white school board members. Social Science Quarterly, 59, 758-766.
- Zeigler, L. H., & Jennings, M. K. (1974). Governing American schools: Political interaction in local school districts. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury.

APPENDIX

Dear Colleague: *We need your opinion!*

From among the 90,000 school board members in the United States, you have been selected to take part in a special annual survey that will advance local control of education and improve the quality of our schools.

You will soon receive a special questionnaire designed to reveal the attitudes and characteristics of school board members throughout the nation. Please fill it out and return it as soon as possible. Your response will be included in an upcoming issue of the Journal.

Thank you for your cooperation.

The Editors
The American School Board Journal

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD
JOURNAL

1680 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314 / (703) 838-6722

Dear Subscriber:

You have been selected to play a pivotal role in the Journal's, nationwide survey of U.S. school boards.

Our annual study of the characteristics and attitudes of school board members is the most comprehensive and widely quoted poll of its kind. It highlights the dynamic, evolving nature of school board leadership...it underscores the significance of local control in education.

And its success depends on you.

Won't you take a few minutes now to complete the enclosed questionnaire. We'll tabulate the results and report the significant findings in a major article in an upcoming issue of The American School Board Journal. A self-addressed, postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Cordially,

Gregg W. Downey
Editor and Assistant Publisher

1987 NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

PART I--DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please respond with the following information.

1. In which state is your school system located? _____
2. Describe the approximate size of your school district's enrollment by checking one of the following:
 _____ Fewer than 1,000 _____ 10,000 to 24,999
 _____ 1,000 to 4,999 _____ 25,000 or more
 _____ 5,000 to 9,999
3. Describe the community your school district serves by checking one of the following:
 _____ Urban _____ Small town
 _____ Suburban _____ Other (please specify _____)
 _____ Rural _____
4. Is your school district's enrollment currently
 _____ Increasing _____ Decreasing _____ Remaining Stable
5. In the next five years, do you project your school district's enrollment will
 _____ Increase _____ Decrease _____ Remain Stable

PART II--PERSONAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please respond with the following information.

1. Are you _____ male, _____ female?
2. Are you
 _____ Black _____ American Indian
 _____ White _____ Oriental
 _____ Hispanic _____ Other (please specify _____)
3. Age
 _____ Under 25 _____ 41 - 50
 _____ 26 - 35 _____ 51 - 60
 _____ 36 - 40 _____ Over 60
4. What is your highest educational attainment?
 _____ Less than high school graduate _____ Four-year college degree
 _____ High school graduate _____ Advanced college degree
 _____ Post-high school training
5. What is your current occupation?
 _____ Professional _____ Clerical _____ Skilled Trades _____ Retired
 _____ Managerial _____ Sales _____ Semi-Skilled _____ Housewife
 _____ Business Owner _____ Service _____ Laborer _____ Other (please specify _____)

PART II--Cont.

6. What is your family income?

_____ Less than \$20,000	_____ \$50,000 - \$59,999	_____ \$90,000 - \$99,999
_____ \$20,000 - \$29,999	_____ \$60,000 - \$69,999	_____ \$100,000 - \$149,999
_____ \$30,000 - \$39,999	_____ \$70,000 - \$79,999	_____ \$150,000 ⁺
_____ \$40,000 - \$49,999	_____ \$80,000 - \$89,999	

7. Are you married? _____ Yes _____ No

8. How many children do you have in public school (K-12) at this time? _____

9. How many years have you been a resident in your school district?

_____ 0 - 5	_____ 6 - 15	_____ 16 - 35	_____ 36 ⁺
-------------	--------------	---------------	-----------------------

10. Do you rent or own your own home? _____ Rent _____ Own

PART III--SCHOOL BOARD INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please respond with the following information.

1. How many years have you served on the school board? _____

2. Have you ever served on another school board? _____ Yes _____ No

3. How many terms have you served on the school board?

_____ Less than one term	_____ Two terms	_____ More than three terms
_____ One term	_____ Three terms	

4. What is the statutory length of a school board member's term in your district?

_____ One year	_____ Three years	_____ Five ⁺ years
_____ Two years	_____ Four years	

5. How many members of your school board are _____ men, _____ women?

6. How many members of your school board are _____ White, _____ Black, _____ Hispanic,
_____ American Indian, _____ Oriental, _____ Other (please specify _____)

7. Are the boundaries of your school district the same as those of any other local governmental unit (e.g., county, township, city, etc.)?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, please specify what other governmental unit _____

8. Is your school board fiscally dependent (budget control and taxing authority rests with local government) or independent (budget control and taxing authority rests with School Board)?

_____ Dependent _____ Independent

9. In what month does your school system's fiscal year begin? _____

10. In what month is a draft budget first submitted to your board? _____

11. In what month does your board vote to approve or disapprove the final budget? _____

12. Are members of your school board _____ elected, _____ appointed?

13. How were you first selected for membership on the school board?

_____ Elected _____ Appointed _____ Appointed to complete an elected term

PART IV--RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION INFORMATION	
DIRECTIONS: The following questions are about you specifically, not the board as a whole. If you were most recently elected, please respond to those questions under the heading ELECTED. If you were most recently appointed to the school board or were most recently appointed to complete the term of an elected member, please respond to those questions under the heading APPOINTED.	
ELECTED	APPOINTED
1. Prior to your membership on the school board, in what ways did you serve your community/school district? (Check all that pertain.) ● Educational ☐ Member of parent-teacher organization ☐ Citizen advisory committee ☐ School volunteer ☐ Employee of school district ☐ Other (please specify _____) ● Civic/Business ☐ Chamber of Commerce ☐ Service club or civic organization (e.g., Lions, Rotary, etc.) ☐ Charitable organization (e.g., United Way, Red Cross, etc.) ☐ Other (please specify _____) ● Political/Government ☐ Successful candidate for local, state, or national elected office ☐ Unsuccessful candidate for local, state, or national elected office ☐ Democratic party organization ☐ Republican party organization ☐ Local political parties ☐ Other (please specify _____) 2a. What was the reason(s) you sought membership on the school board? (Check all that apply.) ☐ Improve own child's education ☐ Represent a specific group ☐ Make schools more accountable ☐ Make schools fiscally sound ☐ Revise curriculum ☐ Gain political visibility ☐ Revise boundaries ☐ Remove the superintendent ☐ Streamline central staff ☐ Ensure support for athletics ☐ Increase school discipline ☐ Increase academic standards ☐ Remove drugs from schools ☐ Exercise civic duty ☐ Other (please specify _____)	1. Prior to your membership on the school board, in what ways did you serve your community/school district? (Check all that pertain.) ● Educational ☐ Member of parent-teacher organization ☐ Citizen advisory committee ☐ School volunteer ☐ Employee of school district ☐ Other (please specify _____) ● Civic/Business ☐ Chamber of Commerce ☐ Service club or civic organization (e.g., Lions, Rotary, etc.) ☐ Charitable organization (e.g., United Way, Red Cross, etc.) ☐ Other (please specify _____) ● Political/Government ☐ Successful candidate for local, state, or national elected office ☐ Unsuccessful candidate for local, state, or national elected office ☐ Democratic party organization ☐ Republican party organization ☐ Local political parties ☐ Other (please specify _____) 2a. What was the reason(s) you sought membership on the school board? (Check all that apply.) ☐ Improve own child's education ☐ Represent a specific group ☐ Make schools more accountable ☐ Make schools fiscally sound ☐ Revise curriculum ☐ Gain political visibility ☐ Revise boundaries ☐ Remove the superintendent ☐ Streamline central staff ☐ Ensure support for athletics ☐ Increase school discipline ☐ Increase academic standards ☐ Remove drugs from schools ☐ Exercise civic duty ☐ Other (please specify _____)

ELECTED	APPOINTED
2b. What was the single most important reason you sought membership on the school board? _____	2b. What was the single most important reason you sought membership on the school board? _____
3. Who gave you the most encouragement to run for the school board? (Check <u>one</u>.) _____ Board members _____ Family members _____ Formal citizens' groups _____ Friends and neighbors _____ Professional school personnel _____ Teacher union or organization _____ Government and political figures _____ No one _____ Other (please specify _____)	3. Who gave you the most encouragement to seek appointment? (Check <u>one</u>.) _____ Board members _____ Family members _____ Formal citizens' groups _____ Friends and neighbors _____ Professional school personnel _____ Teacher union or organization _____ Government and political figures _____ No one _____ Other (please specify _____)
4. At the time of your most recent election, did you run _____ At-large _____ Representing a specific area within the school district _____ Other (please specify _____)	4. Do you represent _____ The district at large _____ A specific area within the school district _____ Other (please specify _____)
5. At the time of your most recent election, how were you selected to run? _____ Sign-up (petition) _____ Caucus _____ Party nominee _____ Other (please specify _____)	5. At the time of your most recent appointment, how were you selected to serve? _____ Sign-up (petition) _____ Caucus _____ Party nominee _____ Other (please specify _____)
6. At the time of your most recent election, did you run as a _____ Nonpartisan _____ Member of Democratic party _____ Member of Republican party _____ Member of other political party _____ Member of a slate of candidates _____ Other (please specify _____)	6. On what basis were you most recently appointed? _____ Nonpartisan _____ Member of Democratic party _____ Member of Republican party _____ Member of other political party _____ Member of a slate of candidates _____ Other (please specify _____)
7. Which format best describes your most recent election? (Please check <u>one</u>.) _____ Voters were instructed to select a certain number out of a field of candidates If so, how many were to be selected? _____ (state number) out of how many candidates? _____ (state number) _____ I was opposed by one or more candidates for the same seat If so, how many other candidates? _____ (state number) _____ I ran unopposed	7. Which format best describes the process by which you were most recently appointed? (Please check <u>one</u>.) _____ A certain number of appointees were selected out of a field of candidates If so, how many were to be selected? _____ (state number) out of how many candidates? _____ (state number) _____ I was appointed from a field of one or more candidates for the same seat _____ I was the only candidate

ELECTED	APPOINTED
8. At the time of your election, did you have a campaign issue/platform? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, please check the <u>one</u> category most descriptive of your platform: _____ Strengthen role of the board _____ Remove the superintendent _____ Improve educational programs _____ Institute moral and character education _____ Make specific personnel changes _____ Improve school facilities _____ Address school attendance boundaries _____ Strengthen schools' financial base _____ Ensure civil rights/civil liberties _____ Other (please specify _____)	8. At the time of your appointment, did you have an issue which was related to your appointment? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, please check the <u>one</u> category most descriptive of your issue: _____ Strengthen role of the board _____ Remove the superintendent _____ Improve educational programs _____ Institute moral and character education _____ Make specific personnel changes _____ Improve school facilities _____ Address school attendance boundaries _____ Strengthen schools' financial base _____ Ensure civil rights/civil liberties _____ Other (please specify _____)
9. If you ran opposed, were your ideas about schools different from those of other candidates? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, in what areas were they different? (Check all that apply.) _____ Role of the board _____ Superintendent _____ Educational programs _____ Educational personnel _____ Physical and fiscal problems _____ Civil rights/civil liberties _____ Other (please specify _____)	9. If there were other candidates for appointment, were your ideas about schools different from those of other candidates? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, in what areas were they different? (Check all that apply.) _____ Role of the board _____ Superintendent _____ Educational programs _____ Educational personnel _____ Physical and fiscal problems _____ Civil rights/civil liberties _____ Other (please specify _____)
10. At the time of your most recent election, was there a formal, public, and/or organized campaign? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, a. Did you have a campaign fund? _____ Yes _____ No How much did you raise? _____ How much did you spend? _____ b. Did you use (check <u>all</u> that apply): _____ Radio _____ TV _____ Posters _____ Newspapers _____ Campaign literature _____ Telephone campaigning _____ Door-to-door campaigning _____ Meet-the-candidate sessions _____ Leafletting _____ Mail-out _____ Other (please specify _____)	10. Was there a formal, organized process for you to express your interest and ideas prior to your most recent appointment? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, what form did this take? (Check <u>all</u> that apply.) _____ Town meeting _____ Public debate _____ Roundtable _____ Other (please specify _____)

ELECTED	APPOINTED
11. At the time of your most recent election, were you publicly supported by any organized group? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, please check the <u>one</u> group which most actively supported your candidacy. _____ PTAs _____ Political party _____ Religious group _____ Civic/business group _____ Union/employee organization _____ Other (please specify _____)	11. At the time of your most recent appointment, were you publicly supported by any organized group? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, check the <u>one</u> group which most actively supported your appointment. _____ PTAs _____ Political party _____ Religious group _____ Civic/business group _____ Union/employee organization _____ Other (please specify _____)
12. In what month is the regular school board election held? _____	12. In what month are the regular school board appointments made? _____
13. At the time of your most recent election, a. how many people voted? _____ b. what percentage of registered voters does this represent? _____ c. what percentage of the vote did you receive? _____	
14. At the time of your first election, did you defeat an incumbent? _____ Yes _____ No	13. At the time of your first appointment, was an incumbent removed involuntarily from the seat? _____ Yes _____ No
15. Were there any other issues or offices on the ballot at the time of your most recent election? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, please check all that apply: _____ School board budget _____ Bond referendum _____ Local elections _____ State elections _____ National elections _____ Other (please specify _____)	14. In your jurisdiction, is there a process for removing appointed board members from office before their terms expire? _____ Yes _____ No a. If yes, what term best describes this process? _____ Petition _____ Impeachment _____ Forced resignation _____ Other (please specify _____) b. If yes, 1) has it ever been used? _____ Yes _____ No 2) have you been the target of removal? _____ Yes _____ No 3) have other current members of your school board been the target of removal? _____ Yes _____ No
16. Are recall elections permitted in your jurisdiction? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, a. have they ever been used? _____ Yes _____ No b. have you been the target of a recall election? _____ Yes _____ No c. have other current members of your school board been the target of a recall election? _____ Yes _____ No	
17. Do you desire to serve another term on the school board? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Maybe Please explain. _____ _____	15. Do you desire to serve another term? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Maybe Please explain. _____ _____

ELECTED	APPOINTED
18. Do you intend to run for another elective public office? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Maybe Please explain. _____ _____ _____	16. Do you intend to seek election to another public office? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Maybe Please explain. _____ _____ _____

Please provide any additional comments:

PART V--ROLES AND ISSUES

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the following.

1. From the following list, please rank the first three most pressing concerns in your school district. (Place 1 next to your most pressing concern; 2 next to your second most pressing concern; and 3 next to your third most pressing concern.)

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| _____ Integration/busing | _____ Large schools/overcrowding |
| _____ Use of drugs | _____ Pupils' lack of interest/truancy |
| _____ Declining enrollment | _____ Poor curriculum/poor standards |
| _____ Crime/vandalism | _____ Difficulty of getting good teachers |
| _____ Management/leadership | _____ Parents' lack of interest |
| _____ Facilities | _____ Lack of respect for other students/teachers |
| _____ Personnel relations | _____ Lack of proper financial support |
| _____ State mandates | _____ Collective bargaining |
| _____ Curriculum development | _____ Other (please specify _____) |

2. Check the one statement that best approximates the point of view from which you most often approach your job as a school board member.

- _____ As a board member, "I should do what the public wants me to do even if it is not my own personal preference."
- _____ As a board member, "I should use my own judgment regardless of what others want me to do."

3. As a school board member, I believe my first responsibility is to:
(Check the one most representative of your view)

- _____ Members of the public in the specific geographic area I represent
- _____ Members of the ethnic group I represent
- _____ Members of the special constituency group I represent
- _____ Members of the public of the entire school district

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

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