

A STUDY OF THE PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF TWO
CLASSES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

By

ERNEST FRANK REZABEK

Bachelor of Arts
Central State College
Edmond, Oklahoma
1949

Master of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1950

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1968

OCT 27 1968

A STUDY OF THE PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF TWO
CLASSES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Clair

Thesis Adviser

Wayne K. Hoy

John E. Lushy

H. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of special acknowledgments are gratefully and sincerely presented at this time. Initial gratitude is extended to Dr. Kenneth St.Clair, Chairman of the Advisory Committee, for his friendly encouragement and cooperative guidance during the study. Special expressions of appreciation are proffered to Dr. Wayne K. Hoy, Dr. John E. Susky, and Dr. John E. Casey for assistance and advice as members of the committee.

Special thanks are due to the personnel of the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, the Executive Secretary of the Oklahoma State School Board Association, and the school board members who cooperated by participating in the study.

The writer would also be extremely remiss were he not to acknowledge the sacrifices made by his wife, Jean. Her constant expression of encouragement, her love and understanding at crucial times, and her employment effort throughout this ordeal, represent only a few of the many sacrifices that were made.

To my children, Jan, Debi, Gregg, and Kendall, apologies are due for the days of neglect. These sacrifices are acknowledged with a promise that this time shall be generously made up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	3
Associations.	4
National School Board Association	5
Oklahoma State School Board Association	6
Statement of the Problem.	7
Definition of Terms	8
Purpose of the Study.	9
Research Questions and Hypothesis	10
Assumptions	13
Limitations of the Study.	14
Summary	15
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Practice and Perception	17
Progressive and Traditional Values.	20
Attributes of Board Members	22
Summary	24
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.	26
Preliminary Activities.	26
Sample Selection.	27
Instrumentation	29
Item Selection.	31
Data Collection	33
Statistical Treatment	34
Summary	35
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND REPORT OF THE FINDINGS.	36
Attitudes of Board Members.	36
Attributes of Board Members	61
Age of Board Members.	63
Education of Board Members.	63
Income of Board Members	64
Service of Board Members.	64
Occupation of Board Members	65

Chapter	Page
Attribute Relationship to Perception of Practice. .	67
Relationship by Age	67
Relationship by Educational Level	69
Relationship by Income.	70
Area and Size Relationship to Perception of	
Practice.	71
Relationship by Size.	72
Summary	74
V. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY.	75
Attitude Findings	75
"Progressive" or "Traditional" Viewpoint.	80
Attribute Findings.	83
Other Findings.	85
Findings Summary.	85
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	88
Review of the Purposes of the Study	88
Conclusions of the Study.	89
Recommendations	91
Further Considerations.	94
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
APPENDICES.	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Geographic Representativeness of Board Member Sample. .	28
II. School Size Representativeness of Board Member Sample .	28
III. Does the Board on Which You Serve Operate From Written School Board Policies?	37
IV. Your Feelings About Written Policies?	38
V. Does the Board on Which You Serve Set Different Salar- ies for Elementary and Secondary Teachers?	39
VI. Your Feelings About Different Salaries.	40
VII. Does the Board on Which You Serve Permit Teachers to Participate in Some Policy Formation?	41
VIII. Your Feelings About Teacher Participation in Policy Making?	41
IX. Does the Board on Which You Serve Emphasize Teaching of Subject Matter More Than the Development of the Individual Interests of the Child?	42
X. Your Feelings Toward Subject Matter Emphasis?	43
XI. Does the Board on Which You Serve Utilize Consultative Services From the Universities and Colleges?	44
XII. Your Feelings About Consultative Services?	44
XIII. Does the Board on Which You Serve Award School Purchase Contracts to Local Firms Even Though It May Increase School Expenses?	45
XIV. Your Feelings Concerning Local Award Practices?	46
XV. Does the Board on Which You Serve Support Research and Experimentation Within the School?	47
XVI. Your Feelings About Research and Experimentation Programs?	47

Table	Page
XVII. Does the Board on Which You Serve Promote Qualified Teachers to Administrative Positions Within the System?	48
XVIII. Your Feelings About Inter-System Promotional Practices?	49
XIX. Does the Board on Which You Serve Have a Long Range Building Program?	49
XX. Your Feelings Concerning Long Range Building Programs?	50
XXI. Does the Board on Which You Serve Consider Cost Factors First and Then Educational Needs in Budget Making?	51
XXII. Your Feelings About Cost Factor Considerations Before Educational Needs?	52
XXIII. Does the Board on Which You Serve Include Kindergarten as a Part of the Regular School Program?	53
XXIV. Your Feelings Toward Kindergarten Services?	54
XXV. Does the Board on Which You Serve Recognize Compromise as a Regular Procedure in Dealing with Local Pressure Groups?	54
XXVI. Your Feelings About Compromise as a Regular Procedure?	55
XXVII. Does the Board on Which You Serve Defend Teachers From Attack When They Try to Present the Pros and Cons of Controversial Social and Political Issues?	56
XXVIII. Your Feelings About the Defending of Teachers From Attack?	57
XXIX. Does the Board on Which You Serve Consider Local Values or Feelings Regarding Race, Religion, and National Origin in Filling Vacant Teaching Positions?	58
XXX. Your Feelings About Local Value Consideration?	58
XXXI. Does the Board on Which You Serve Invite Citizen Help and Study in Developing the Educational Program?	58
XXXII. Your Feelings Toward Citizen Involvement in Educational Planning?	59

Table	Page
XXXIII. Does the Board on Which You Serve Carefully Observe The Personal Life of Each School Employee?	60
XXXIV. Your Feelings Concerning Careful Observance of Employees?	61
XXXV. Does the Board on Which You Serve Emphasize Member Reading of Journals and Other Educational Materials?	62
XXXVI. Your Feelings About the Reading of Educational Materials?	62
XXXVII. Age Distribution of Board Member Sample.	63
XXXVIII. Education Distribution of Board Member Sample.	64
XXXIX. Income Distribution of Board Member Sample	65
XL. Service Distribution of Board Member Sample.	66
XLI. Occupation Distribution of Board Member Sample	66
XLII. Age and Attitude Toward Consultative Service	68
XLIII. Age and Attitude Toward Member Reading Emphasis.	68
XLIV. Education and Attitude Toward Consultative Service	69
XLV. Education and Attitude Toward Member Reading Emphasis	70
XLVI. Income and Attitude Toward Consultative Service.	71
XLVII. Income and Attitude Toward Member Reading Emphasis	72
XLVIII. School Size and Attitude Toward Planned Building Programs	73
XLIX. School Size and Attitude Toward Member Reading Emphasis	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Local boards of education had their origin in the attitudes and practices of the New England colonies. They began as a watchdog committee to be sure that the schoolmaster's religious beliefs were orthodox. They grew and expanded as legal guardians of the values of the agrarian community. They finally came to be recognized as the legal representatives of the state and community and the legitimate policy makers for the educational endeavor.

Through the years, the boards of education have been recognized as the policy making entities and the administrators have been recognized as the executors of the policies developed by the boards. The exercising of proprietary authority over the schools by boards of education, coupled with the strict managerial expectations held for the administrators, provided a division of responsibility that was both operationally convenient and functionally efficient. By regulating the issuance of rewards within the system, school boards and administrators were able to distribute numerous aspects of control in their favor.

Even to the most casual observer, it is very apparent that this culture is now in a period of great social change. This change has affected the values, customs, beliefs, and the social norms of the social system. This change has permeated the public school educational system and there is evidence that the powers and functions of both the

school boards and administrators are also being altered to meet these new social requirements. Such change is not easily accomplished. Boards of education, as well as their individual members, have philosophies, personalities, desires, and prejudices which are distinctly their own. To meet the challenge of change, boards must increase their abilities to deal effectively with the educational pressures, problems, and issues that constantly appear. These problem issues are being brought to bear by a more educated and public spirited citizenry that seeks to be included in the formulation of educational goals and policies; by a teacher group that desires a more worthy recognition of its professional potential; by special interest groups that seek to promote specific goals or maintain the values which they deem important; and by a Federal government that seeks to expand educational opportunities to all citizens of all classes. These elements of external and internal pressure have pushed the school boards and administrators toward new coordinating means.

Efforts to focus attention toward the solving of problems common to school board members everywhere have led to the formation of associations throughout these United States. Known generally as State School Board Associations, they have established as a major purpose the strengthening of local boards through programs of education.

The Oklahoma State School Board Association, organized in 1944, has attempted to carry out such a statewide developmental program. Board members have been invited to avail themselves of in-service training programs, activities, meetings, conferences, consultative services, and state membership opportunities. Such programs are

designed to provide information concerning current educational practices as well as projected implications for educational change. It is the hope of the association that broader perspectives for educational improvements can be developed in this way.

The attitudes and beliefs of those who have the immediate responsibility for public schools and education must be considered. The board of education member is considered to be such a responsible person. Unfortunately, he may never have taken the time to think seriously about the issues and problems of education. Practices, as well as perceptions of these practices, will be reflective of the attitudes and the values of the board of education and the individuals who comprise this group. Any hope for broadening and possibly changing the attitudes and beliefs of Oklahoma school board members would seem to rest with initial identification of current practices and perceptions of these practices.

This study is concerned with the following questions: What are the practices of Oklahoma school boards and the perceptions of individual members toward certain issues in education? What significant attitude differences exist between school board members who belong to the state school board association and those who do not belong? What values do board members hold in regard to certain problem issues in education?

Background of the Study

In order to set the stage for the study, it was deemed advisable to review the historical basis for the associations of school boards which are present and identifiable as operating in support of the

educational function. Reference is made to the overall concept of associations in order to establish a framework for the more specific reference made to school board associations.

Associations

The classical reference to organizations in the American culture was made by de Tocqueville (9, p. 106), following his visit to this continent in 1831. His initial aim was to study democracy itself. He ultimately related the American trait of forming associations both to the general qualities of American life and to the nature of democracy. He stated:

Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions, constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds—religious, moral, serious, futile, extensive or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found establishments for education, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; and in this manner they found hospitals, prisons, and schools. If it be proposed to advance some truth, or to foster some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society. Wherever, at the head of some new undertaking, you see the Government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure to find an association.

Inherent within the impressions expounded by this formulation is the realization that Americans organize and associate for more ends than any of us individually can conceive. Some are national in scope while others are local and regional. All of them are potent realities and in one way or another they must be taken into account. The extent to which one association group—namely school board associations—is an

important factor in our common social and political life, provided the fundamental basis upon which the investigations for this study were made.

National School Board Association

Less than thirty years have passed since an initial and short-lived attempt was made to organize a national association of local board members. Tuttle (35, p. 190), in his historical review of school boards, relates that this first attempt was stifled by organizational problems dealing primarily with the alternatives of direct local memberships versus the federation of state associations.

He further relates that, in 1940, state associations in California, Illinois, and New York, took the lead in organizing the National Council of State School Board's Associations. The growth of this organization was interrupted by World War II and a successful revival did not occur until the fall of 1945. Meetings in 1946, 1947, and 1948, saw a gradual increase in state memberships and individual participation. At the 1948 meeting the name of the National Council was shortened and changed to the National School Board's Association. From a state membership of 37 states in 1949, the Association had grown to include all 50 states by the year 1959. At the 1950 convention, in Atlantic City, the delegates from 28 states voted unanimously in support of a motion that:

"the National School Boards Association be a federation of state school boards associations, and that the National Association serve the state associations, and indirectly local boards through the state associations."

Among the statements of policies and beliefs of the National Association of School Boards, as quoted by Tuttle (35, p. 282), is listed the goal of maintaining channels for exchange of ideas through educational endeavors. These endeavors seek to inform state school board associations of new and successful techniques of operation, administration, and financing. New educational trends and new approaches to district problems can be brought to the attention of the board member through this medium. Implied within these purposes is the hope that a knowledgeable board and its members will upgrade and promote the educational program of the public schools.

Oklahoma State School Board Association

Several early attempts were made to organize and advance a state association in Oklahoma. Harris (18, p. 26), in his historical study of the Oklahoma State School Board Association, reports that the first bona fide effort resulted in the adoption of a Constitution and By Laws on September 4, 1936. He further relates that this attempt was short lived due to the mistaken belief that a large percentage of Oklahoma City members elected to official positions signified large school domination. As a result of this mistaken belief, small communities withheld their membership and their cooperation.

On September 16, 1944, a second attempt at statewide organization was made. Officers elected at this meeting represented smaller school districts from different sections of the state. Only minor alterations were made to the original Constitution and By Laws before their final acceptance by the 50 school board members attending. Membership

records since 1948 have shown that membership has gradually risen from 141 districts representing 528 members in 1948, to 257 districts with 1,273 members in 1954, and to 267 districts with 1,293 members in 1967.

Harris (18, p. 144), in his review of the purposes of the association, lists the promotion of high level board leadership through an educational service as a major objective. The hopeful results would thus produce a more informed board member whose behavior and action would result in better educational programs for the local school districts.

Statement of the Problem

The Oklahoma State School Board's Association has been in operation for over 22 years. During that period of time various efforts have been made to promote the educational endeavor. In one way or another, the association has acted as a referent for many school board members. The influence of membership or non-membership in the association has long been a debatable issue among various peoples connected with public school education. The extent of indirect influence that the association may have on the non-member has never been investigated.

The problem investigated in this study concerned itself with the concept of association membership or non-membership; an attempt was made to determine the attitude differences toward certain educational issues that such membership might elicit. Selected practices of boards of education and the perceptions of these practices by individual members of the boards were examined. Educational issues dealing with

organization, administration, personnel, curriculum, and financing were included in considering the practices and perceptions of practice by the sampled board of education members.

Definition of Terms

Selected terms used in this study are defined as follows:

Practice - The consistent exercising of policy. Tuttle (35, p.37), defines policies as principles devised for a course of action or operation and indicates that practice involves the carrying out of a policy.

Perception - An awareness of a present situation in terms of a past experience. Sperling (32, p. 38), suggests that perception is the act of interpreting a stimulus registered in the brain by one or more sense mechanisms. Hillgard (20, p. 587), introduces prior experiences as an important factor in the process of becoming aware of objects, qualities, or relations by means of sense mechanisms.

Attitude - A mental or emotional tendency or feeling that shows a favorable or unfavorable disposition toward something. Sherif (30, p. 494), and others (28, pp. 361-362), refer to an attitude as a pre-disposition to act, think, or feel in a certain way. The positive or negative direction of an attitude is a value. Attitudes must be directed toward some object, person, or situation; they become attached to institutions, groups, and ideas.

Affiliate - A school board member who currently holds membership in the Oklahoma State School Board's Association.

Non-Affiliate - A school board member who does not currently hold membership in the Oklahoma State School Board's Association.

Progressive - Instituting and using new and reasonably proven developments soon after their inception. Kerlinger (21, p. 291), defines the progressive as favoring liberal policies and practices, favoring autonomy and independence for the child and the teacher, emphasizing the needs and interests of the child, recognizing individual differences, disciplining from within, and using relatively liberal social policies in education.

Traditional - Continuing the use of tried and proven developments to the exclusion of any new developments. Kerlinger (21, p. 291), defines the traditional as favoring the traditional outlook in education, teaching, and learning; emphasizing subject matter, external discipline, conservative social policies, heteronomy and dependence for the child and the teacher.

Purpose of the Study

The basic and primary purpose of this study was to determine if significant attitude differences exist between school board members who belong to the state school board association and those who do not. Investigation was conducted on certain aspects of practice as well as on the individual school board member's perception of those aspects of practice. Two secondary purposes were established as worthy of investigation. These were:

- 1) to determine the viewpoints of the board of education members with respect to "progressive" or "traditional" tendencies in regard to selected aspects of practice.

2) to determine certain background attributes of state school board members and the effect of variation in such attributes as related to certain aspects of board practice.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research questions which arose in connection with the purposes and the objectives of this study were:

- 1) Do the practices of an affiliated board differ from the practices of a non-affiliated board of education?
- 2) Does the affiliated board member differ from the non-affiliated board member in attitude toward certain practice?
- 3) To what extent do boards of education in this state reflect "progressive" or "traditional" educational viewpoints?
- 4) What are the age, education, income, service, and occupational attributes of the school board members of this state?
- 5) Do these attributes of board of education members differ from those reported in other studies on a state or nationwide scale?

The examination of these data is primarily concerned with the determination of differences. Garrett (14, p. 213), reported that the null hypothesis is an especially useful tool in the testing of differences. The null hypothesis for this study, reported here in general form, was as follows:

General Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the affiliated and non-affiliated school board and its members in practices or perceptions of those practices on each of the following 17 items:

- (1) Operating from written school board policies.
- (2) Setting different salaries for elementary and secondary teachers.
- (3) Permitting teachers to participate in some policy formation.
- (4) Emphasizing the teaching of subject matter more than the development of the individual interests of the child.
- (5) Utilizing consultative services from the universities and colleges.
- (6) Awarding school purchase contracts to local firms even though it may increase school expenses.
- (7) Supporting research and experimentation within the school.
- (8) Promoting qualified teachers to administrative positions within the system.
- (9) Having a long range building program on paper.
- (10) Considering cost factors first and then educational needs in budget making.
- (11) Including kindergarten as a part of the regular school program.
- (12) Recognizing compromise as a regular procedure in dealing with local pressure groups.
- (13) Defending teachers from attack when they try to present the pros and cons of controversial social and political issues.
- (14) Considering local values or feelings regarding race, religion, and national origin in filling vacant teaching positions.
- (15) Inviting citizen help and study in developing the educational program.

- (16) Observing carefully the personal lives of each of the school employees.
- (17) Emphasizing member reading of educational journals and other materials.

In addition to the general hypothesis, an examination of the "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoints for each board and its member was carried out on each of the 17 items listed. When differences were discovered, reports of the differences were presented.

When differences in board member perception of practices were discovered, the attributes of age, education, and income of the board member were introduced for further investigation.

When differences in board member perception of practices were discovered, variables regarding the area of the state and the size of the school district were introduced for further investigation.

In addition to the general research hypothesis tested with an inferential statistical method, the attributes of the sampled board members were reported in terms of the following:

A. Personal characteristics

- 1. Age of the member
- 2. Education of the member
- 3. Income of the member
- 4. Years of service of the member
- 5. Occupation of the member

The research questions listed, as well as the hypothesis presented, are designed to lead the investigations of the study while accomplishing the general objectives of the study. These objectives are presented in the same order throughout the study. The relationship of the

practices of two classes of boards of education; the perceptions of the members of the boards regarding certain aspects of these practices; the "progressive" and "traditional" viewpoints of board members; the attributes of Oklahoma board members; and the attribute differences which may occur between these board members and those of other states or nationwide, are the matters of concern.

Certain limitations of the study were evident as the study developed. These are sighted in the following sections of this chapter.

Assumptions

A number of basic assumptions were made in the process of conducting this study:

- (1) Attitudes are measurable and vary along a linear continuum.
- (2) The attitudes of board members toward individual issues in education can be measured.
- (3) The expressed responses of the sampled subjects reflected their true feelings and attitudes. Thurstone (36, p. 218), gives this explanation:

All that we can do with an attitude scale is to measure the attitude actually expressed with the full realization that the subject may be consciously hiding his true attitude or that the social pressure of the situation has really made him believe what he expresses. This is a matter for interpretation. It is something probably worthwhile to measure an attitude expressed by opinions. It is another problem to interpret in each case the extent to which the subjects have expressed what they really believe. All that we can do is to minimize, as far as possible, the conditions that prevent our subjects from telling the truth, or else to adjust our interpretations accordingly.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limiting factors apparent in this study. As a result, certain restrictions must be placed on the findings and the conclusions. These limitations were:

- (1) The data collected were limited to Oklahoma school board members representing high school districts during the school year 1966-1967.
- (2) Board members' attitudes and perceptions may be temporary, changeable, and subject to rationalization.
- (3) Because of the nature of the instrument used in obtaining the data, the validity of the responses given is contingent upon the honesty, the sincerity, and the reading skill of the respondent.
- (4) The items chosen for inclusion in the instrument are reliable only to the extent in which they can be assumed to be salient and representative of the areas of concern to board members.
- (5) The selection of the items for the opinionnaire tends to leave uncertain the exact interpretation of words and understandings of the statements as they may be conveyed to the respondents.
- (6) The results of the study may not be generalized fully to board members of other states or to items and problem areas which may appear to have a slight relationship to those mentioned.

- (7) The relationship of age, education, and income attributes, as well as the area of state and size of school variables, are limited to those items in which significant perceptions of practice differences are initially indicated.

Summary

In this chapter, brief attention is given to the origin of school boards and the development of the position of the school board member. Reference was made to the extensive social unrest which is so evident in our current culture and the resulting pressure which is inevitably placed against public education and school boards. A background of the study was presented to explore and relate the historical concept of associations to the National and State School Board Associations. The possible influence of membership or non-membership in the association was then introduced as the statement of the general problem. Differences in the practices of boards and the perception of board members toward these practices were defined as the basic concern of the study. In the latter portion of the chapter, the purposes of the study, the research questions posed, and the statement of the hypothesis were presented. Assumptions and specific limitations of the study concluded the first chapter.

Chapter II will present the review of related research as it applies to the areas of interest under investigation. These areas may be identified as: (a) Studies dealing with the attitudes of board members toward certain aspects of practices; (b) Studies dealing with the values which board of education members or others holds; and

(c) Studies dealing with the reporting of the attributes of board of education members in other states and throughout the nation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature for this study deals with the practices of boards and the perceptions of members; the "progressive" or "traditional" value concept in educational matters; and the reporting of attributes of public school board members.

Practice and Perception

The need to study the actions and practices of boards of education has been emphasized by a number of outstanding American university professors of education. Griffiths (16, p. 43), in a monograph published in 1965, was critical of earlier board of education research and suggested that more significant questions should be asked. He expressed the need for making studies of the opinions of various classes of board members and reporting these opinions of educational issues. Cunningham (7, p. 194), in a report prepared for the second area conference of the Eight State Project, expressed the need for quality improvement in the lay leadership of boards of education. He further stated:

There is a need to study school board action much more definitively than we have in the past. Ways must be found to process difficult problems more rapidly and to avoid the current queuing up of educational matters that seem to immobilize some boards of education. Similarly new views of the roles and relationships of board members and school

superintendents must be explored in order to "loosen up" the top management of the nation's schools.

Gross (17, p. 136), in his investigation of school board and superintendent viewpoints toward educational issues in Massachusetts, found that considerable disagreement existed among board members themselves on certain policies and programs of the school. He concluded that the attitudes and beliefs thus exhibited could be presumed to exert a most important influence on the kind and quality of education offered. An all inclusive conclusion in this study expressed the need for more professionally oriented members who clearly understand all legal rights and obligations.

A study of board attitudes and practices conducted by Caughran (5), found that board members in Illinois varied significantly in their feelings toward holding official open meetings, in acceptance of federal aid for education, in certain board procedures for operation, and in the financing of the school program. A high degree of favorable agreement was found among the board members on issues involving experimentation within the school, resistance to pressure groups, and elimination of close restrictions on teachers' personal conduct.

Teal (35), in his study of board members in Pennsylvania, alluded to the possibility that college educated members of boards of education in that State were either hesitant to carry forward broad outlooks toward program improvement or were failing to assume a responsible position of leadership. A study by Shock (31), found that expressions of opinion and suggestion were unusually frequent on matters concerning finance while curriculum, personnel, and general operation matters were seldom mentioned.

Lipham (23, p. 4) and Rossmiller, in studies conducted in Wisconsin, found that school board members are generally in disagreement concerning both the functions (role) of the board and the functions of the school. From their study they concluded that school board members generally do not comprehend the nature of what the educational program should be. A series of case studies by Minar (24), in the Chicago area, found that school boards grew weary and timid rather quickly when faced with ordinary obstacles and common problems posed by municipal officials. In the face of resistance to new practice, the boards were inclined to retreat to a traditional posture in conducting the business of education.

Campbell (4, p. 18) visualizes the board of education as a melting point between the school and its norms and the larger society and its values. He maintains that the value norms of the school are being influenced and supported by the experienced board member while the new board member tends to reflect the values of the constituent group. He mentions, as examples, the pressuring influence of government and the enticing invitations of business as powerful regulators of board practice.

Finlay (12, pp. 74-80) and Reeves, in a study in Alberta, Canada, found that school boards there expected the superintendent to deal primarily with matters of instruction and personnel; secondarily with facilities, administrative structure, and public relations; and least with matters pertaining to school finance.

Goldhammer (15, p. 230), in his study conducted in Oregon, found that board members expected the superintendent to side with them on most issues involving employees of the school system. As a result, teacher

groups developed the feeling that they were isolated and poorly represented on most special issues of vital concern. He further speculated that boards should make it a point to have representatives of various categories of employees present at board meetings in order to reduce conflict and social distance between the two groups.

Progressive and Traditional Values

In the many social psychological studies of attitudes made during the past 20 to 30 years, there have been relatively few attempts to study the "progressive" and "traditional" attitude structures of the individual. Kerlinger (21, pp. 287-329), in his study utilizing the Q technique, represents an attempt to set up and test a theory of educational values and attitudes and to study the attitude structure of the individual. More specifically, he attempted to break down attitudes into two broad categories which he labeled as permissive-progressive and restrictive-traditional. The results of the study showed that educational professors were high in the permissive-progressive scale while outside people were restrictive or only slightly permissive; differences, however, were found to be at a low level of significance.

Allport and Vernon (2, pp. 231-248), in their earlier work, made an interesting attempt to use a measure of individual consistency in the field of values. Later developments have led to the scale for measuring the dominant interests in personality and classifying these as either theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, or religious. This type of value scale is referred to as a contrasting type, in that it must measure the relative strength or importance of

paired or designated items together rather than allowing free choice of all questions. There is little motivation by question in this type of scale test.

The terms "progressive" and "traditional", as they refer to education and educational matters, have had varied and uncertain meanings. Dewey (10, pp. 193-211), in an early publication, alluded to a basic dichotomy which might be described by the vague terms "authoritarianism" and "democracy". Moehlman (25, p. 309), in his important book on educational administration, made much of the authoritarianism of administrators, stressing the incommensurability of their ideas of efficiency and democratic ideas of educational equality. Curti (8, p. 582), in his book, introduced the split between status quo-preserving conservatism and liberalism in education. Beale (3, p. 610), in his work on the "freedom" of American teachers, issued a severe condemnation of the autocratic and conservative practice of American educators and school boards. Sutthoff (34), in his study of locals and cosmopolitans, alluded to a newer conception of the dichotomy. He concluded that school board members who are locally oriented would act to preserve the status quo while the cosmopolitan oriented would look beyond this narrow basis.

Gross (17, p. 131), in his book which gave an analysis of the views of board members, explained the method used to determine "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoint:

A number of professors of education were asked to tell us which of the items used in the study seemed to them to reflect "progressive" and which "traditional" viewpoints. . . . it was possible to derive a scale which differentiated school board members according to whether they

tended to hold more or less "progressive" opinions with respect to the policies and programs of their school systems.

Gross implied that "progressive" and "traditional" viewpoint could be secured on the level of individual items as well as on the scale, however, this would tend to involve voluminous amounts of material. It is interesting to observe that the terms "progressive" and "traditional" are used frequently in the book by Gross (17); however, there is not a positive definition of the terms to be found anywhere in the text.

Attributes of Board Members

Numerous studies of the characteristics of board members have been made through the years. As early as 1916, Nearing (26, p. 5) showed that slightly over 61 percent of the board members in his study came from classifications of merchants, manufacturers, bankers, brokers, real estate men, doctors, and lawyers. An unauthored study (11, p. 3), by the teachers' union of New York City in 1919, covered 67 cities with populations of more than 40,000. This study revealed that in only 17 of these cities were representatives of labor included on the boards. Struble (33, p. 48), in a study of 169 cities with population of more than 2,500 and less than 250,000, found that approximately 60 percent were drawn from the five occupational groups, including merchants, bankers, lawyers, physicians, and business executives. He also reported that only 54 of the 761 members studied were classed as manual laborers. Other studies by Form (13, pp. 336-338), and Havighurst and Neugarten (19, p. 278), reported that representation by organized labor on boards of education was becoming more frequent.

The first intensive study of board attributes was made by Counts (6, p. 52), in 1927. His study showed that 55 percent of the boards of education were represented by members in professional, business, or high management positions; that about 50 percent of the members had some college education; that the median income was approximately \$4,000; that the average number of years of board service was 4.1 years; and that the median age of the member was 48.3 years. Counts also pointed out that much of the qualitative advance of public education was being restricted by personal board decisions which reflected a narrow set of values.

Albert (1), in a comprehensive study of board members conducted in 1958, reported that approximately 52 percent of the members of boards represented business, professional, and management positions; 72 percent reported some college education; the median income was approximately \$11,968; the average length of board service was 6 years; and the median age of members was 48.6 years.

Studies conducted on a limited, or statewide scale, have shown considerable variance from the national averages reported. Woods (40, pp. 31-33), in 1954, reported that the average West Virginia board member was 53.8 years of age; had served 8.5 years on the board; earned a mean income of \$4,250; that 26 percent of the member total had some college training; and that approximately 40 percent represented the business, management, or professional positions. Tiedt (37), in his 1961 study of Oregon board members, showed that professional, management, and business positions were held by 61 percent of the members sampled; that 63 percent had some formal college education; that the mean income was approximately \$9,000; that the average number

of years of board service was 4.7 years; and that the median age of the members was 42.5 years of age.

Caughran (5), in his study of Illinois board members, found that 66 percent represented the business, professional, or managerial occupations; that 50 percent had indicated some college education; that the average length of board service was 6 years; and that the median age was 49 years. His report did not include the mean income of board members.

Proudfoot (27), in his study of board members in Alberta, Canada, in 1962, reported that 44 percent represented professional, business or managerial positions; that the median income was \$6,900; that the average years of service was 4.5; and that the median age of members was 45.8. He reported that only 25 percent indicated some college training. This figure could not be used for comparisons since it did not include attendance at non-degree-granting institutions.

Summary

Professors of education and other recognized educational authorities, have cited the need for studies concerning school boards and their relationship to the total educational endeavor. Numerous studies of the attributes, attitudes, practices, and values of boards of education and their members have been conducted. These studies have followed a variety of designs. The most common of these studies have been those dealing with the attributes of board members. Studies dealing with the practices of boards of education are likewise quite

common. Those studies dealing with the attitudes of board members and the values that members hold are not as common.

The review of the literature was quite instrumental in prompting the author to attempt the particular design procedure used in this study. This procedure involved the study of board practices as revealed by a member of that board; the perception of that member toward that aspect of practice; and the extent of "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoint elicited by the member response to each item.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Preliminary Activities

At the outset of the study, interviews were conducted with a number of persons closely associated with board of education members in Oklahoma. Among those interviewed were representatives of the State Department of Education, the State Superintendent of Schools, the Oklahoma State School Board Association, individual members of boards of education, and superintendents of schools. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain background materials from which to develop a suitable research instrument. Suggestions were requested from each of these representatives interviewed. Two of the suggestions, which were made by at least one representative from each of the above groups, concerned the matters of verbal simplicity of question design and school district reorganization. These suggestions were based upon the assumption that inclusion of the items would tend to discourage a full and representative return.

Following the preliminary activities, a number of separate yet interdependent steps were carried out in conducting the study. These steps are presented here as an introductory overview and will be discussed in more detail in the following sections of this chapter. The first consideration was given to the population and sampling procedure.

The next steps were concerned with instrumentation and item selection. The two concluding steps involved the collection of data and the statistical treatment.

Sample Selection

The entire population of school boards of high school districts with a random type selection of one board member from each board, was defined as a useful sample for this study. Through the cooperation of the Oklahoma State School Board Association and the State Department of Education, the names of all school board members in the 524 high school districts were secured. Consolidation and reorganization of a number of these districts reduced the useable number to 516. One board member from each of these 516 districts was mailed a letter of explanation, an opinionnaire, and a personal information form. A total of 262 usable responses were received. The state was divided into four equal area quadrants for the purpose of representativeness. These areas were designated as Northwest, Northeast, Southwest, and Southeast. The extent to which the study sample is representative of the geographical location in the state is related in Table I.

The schools of the state were divided into four categories according to size. The smallest school represented a student enrollment of below 400; the next an enrollment from 400 to 1,199; the third an enrollment from 1,200 to 2,499; and the largest an enrollment above 2,500. The extent to which the study sample is representative on the criteria of school size is indicated in Table II.

TABLE I
GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATIVENESS OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

Geographical Area	Pop. Per.	No. Asso. Affiliates	Per.	No. Asso. Non-Affiliates	Per.	Total	Percent
Northwest	25	43	30	23	19	66	26
Northeast	35	42	30	38	31	80	30
Southwest	20	34	24	24	20	58	22
Southeast	25	22	16	36	30	58	22
Total		141		121		262	

TABLE II
SCHOOL SIZE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

School Size	Pop. Per.	No. Asso. Affiliates	Per.	No. Asso. Non-Affiliates	Per.	Total	Percent
Below 400	53	43	30	71	59	114	43
400 -1199	33	48	34	40	33	88	34
1200-2499	7	21	15	7	6	28	11
Above 2500	7	29	21	3	2	32	12
Total		141		121		262	

For purposes of statistical analysis, the respondents of the study were classified in the following manner:

Affiliates - School board members who are currently holding membership in the Oklahoma State School Board's Association.

Non-Affiliates - School board members who do not currently hold membership in the Oklahoma School Board's Association.

For the purposes of comparing "progressive" and "traditional" viewpoint and for the comparing of attributes, board of education members were combined and scores were calculated as a total. Reference to viewpoint may be found in Appendix F and the reporting of the data concerning the attributes of board members will be presented in Chapter IV.

Instrumentation

Personal interviews, individual field contacts, and a review of the literature, provided data for the development of the instrument used in this study. The opinionnaire was selected as the instrument for data collection on the basis of the method used for the research. Information to be garnered for this study would have been gained by one of two possible approaches:

- 1) A study of the practices that exist through research of laws, state programs, plans, operating principles, and related documents.
- 2) A survey method of research which would gather data regarding the opinions, attitudes, and preferences of the sample selected.

Van Dalen (39, p. 187), indicates that both of these approaches have certain weaknesses as well as strengths. He had this to say about the use of documentary analyses:

- (a) They can describe specific conditions and practices that exist in school and society.
- (b) They can spot trends.
- (c) They can detect weaknesses.
- (d) They can disclose differences in practices of various areas, states, and regions.
- (e) They can detect the attitudes, interests, and values of people.
- (f) Investigators can easily draw faulty conclusions from the data.
- (g) Investigators fail to analyze the trustworthiness of source materials.

He has this to say about the survey method of research:

- (a) The environment of the survey may affect the data.
- (b) The opinion survey which is not carefully structured produces unreliable information.
- (c) If the people are uninformed concerning the topic, they can only give arbitrary decisions or snap judgments. Measuring the intensity or depth of opinion is difficult.
- (d) The opinion survey is better than hunches, blind guesses, of pressure group demands.

Kerlinger (22, p. 396), however, lists advantages that outweigh the disadvantages. These include a wide scope, with a great deal of information from a large population, economy, and accuracy of survey

information within sampling range. A major point is that the respondent presumably knows about his beliefs, opinions, and attitudes toward education and reacts truthfully on an opinionnaire.

In light of the large board member sample and the wide distribution, the opinionnaire was employed as the foundation instrument for securing the opinions for this study. Caution and care was given in an attempt to recognize a probable wide range of reading ability of the respondents. A copy of the final opinionnaire form appears in Appendix B.

Item Selection

Associated with the construction of a measuring instrument is the problem of obtaining items that will represent the particular universe of interest. The instrument in this study was actually composed of two scales treated as a single entity. One scale measured attitudes of boards of education as they were related to certain aspects of practice. These practices were recorded in a positive or negative fashion. Another scale measured the perceptions of board members toward these certain aspects of practice. These perceptions were recorded in a simplified Likert type fashion showing favorable, neutral, or unfavorable response.

The approach to the selection of items used in this study included the following steps:

- (1) Personal interviews with professional and non-professional personnel and the review of pertinent literature provided over 100 items which could be classed as problem issues for boards of education. Sources for these items included: The American School Board Journal,

The Oklahoma School Board Journal, The National Education Association Journal, The Oklahoma Education Association Journal, The Nation's Schools, School Management, School and Society, Overview, and others.

Attention was given to selecting those items which had received special references in the periodicals over the past three year period.

(2) A preliminary investigation of the items by the chairman and the author resulted in a reduction of the items to 62. These items were then categorized into basic areas of administration, organization, financing, curriculum, and personnel. Further investigation by the study advisor and the author reduced the items to 40.

(3) These 40 items were then presented to a panel of five professional education experts in the three major universities of the state for critical analysis and a check of "face" validity. These experts were also asked to evaluate these items as either "progressive" or "traditional" in tendency. Seventeen items, which were judged as "progressive" or "traditional" by at least three of the five educational experts, were selected for final use. On the 85 categorizations by the five experts, (5 x 17 items) there was 92 per cent agreement. A sample of the 40 items and the manner in which they were judged by the experts is presented in Appendix G.

(4) Because of recent disturbances in the State concerning reorganization and teacher sanctions, and because of the uncertain meaning which some of the items implied, only those in which a consensus of opinion among the educational experts resulted were used.

(5) A tri-dimensional opinionnaire was then devised to cover these 17 items. Practice, perception of practice, and voluntary comments were requested from each school board member sampled. A

sample of the opinionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

Data Collection

Data for the study were obtained through the use of the instrument which has been discussed in a previous section of this chapter. This instrument was mailed to one school board member of each of the high school districts in the state of Oklahoma.

Initial mailings of the instrument were made on May 15, 1967. On June 1, 1967 and again on June 15, 1967, follow-up reminder cards were mailed to all members who had not responded. Refusals to participate were received from 44 members. Extreme illness and death caused five of the refusals; thirty-four of the refusers stated that board policy did not encourage the participation in such investigation. Substitute mailing, in these cases, was not attempted. On July 29, 1967, a final letter and opinionnaire form was mailed to each member who had not responded. A total of 268 board members responded. This represented approximately 57 percent of the total eligible sample. Since two of the opinionnaires were received after the data had been tabulated and four others were determined as non-usable, the total number applicable and usable in this study was established as 262. Inasmuch as the original sample included the entire population of boards of education and the member selection was a random type, it was felt that the data collected were representative and adequate. Information concerning the introductory letters, the opinionnaire, and the follow-up procedures is presented in the Appendices A, B, and C.

Statistical Treatment

The varieties of data collected made possible two types of statistical treatment: (a) analysis by type of board member and (b) relationships by attributes and by "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoint.

The chi square test of significance was used to ascertain whether a difference existed between the responses of the affiliated and the non-affiliated on each of the 17 items of the opinionnaire. Chi square values were also computed to test the null hypothesis introduced in Chapter I. This function is reported by Seigel (29, p. 175):

When frequencies in discrete categories (either nominal or ordinal) constitute the data of research, the χ^2 test may be used to determine the significance of the differences among k independent groups. . . . The null hypothesis is that the k samples of frequencies or proportions have come from the same population or from identical populations. This hypothesis, that the k samples do not differ among themselves, may be tested by applying formula.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

where O_{ij} = observed number of cases categorized in i th row of j th column

E_{ij} = number of cases expected under H_0 to be categorized in i th row of j th column, as determined by method presented.

$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k$ directs one to sum over all cells.

The null hypothesis was rejected if the observed value of chi square was such that probability associated with its occurrence was equal to or less than .05.

The data were key punched into cards, verified, and processed through the IBM 1410 computing facilities of the Computer Center at Oklahoma State University.

Summary

Data were collected from all four areas of the state and from four, all inclusive, sizes of school districts. The data consisted of 262 responses from school board members representing the high school districts in Oklahoma.

The instrument used in this study was the opinionnaire. There were two parts to the opinionnaire. Part I consisted of 17 items in which a report of practice as well as a perception of that aspect of practice was reported by each board member on each practice. The total responses were thus 17 on practice and 17 on perception of that practice, for a total of 34 responses. Part II contained ten questions designed for the purpose of obtaining personal attribute information. The answers to these questions were used to classify the respondents according to age, education, income, years of board service, and annual income. Classification by area of state and size of district represented were also secured through questions in this part.

Educational experts from three of the largest universities in the state were used to assist in the determination of suitable items as well as to assist in their classification as "progressive" or "traditional."

The chi square test of significance was used to determine if a difference existed between the responses of the affiliated and the non-affiliated board members on each of the 17 items used in the opinionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze and report the data of the study involving the practices of sampled boards of education as well as the individual member's perceptions of these practices; to describe and report the attributes of the sampled school board members of this state and make comparisons as suggested in the objectives of the study; and to report the extent of "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoints of boards and members.

The analysis of the data is accomplished by presenting the 17 items of the study in individual tabular form. A short explanation of the results preceeds each table. When significant differences were found between the affiliated and non-affiliated members, further examination by age, education, and income classification of the composite membership was introduced. A summary of the responses of board practices is presented in Appendix E, while a summary of board member perceptions of those practices is presented in Appendix F.

Attitudes of Board Members

In this portion of the study data were obtained from a total of 262 board of education members. Of this number, 141 were positively identified and classified as affiliated with the state school board

association while 121 of the number were classed as non-affiliated.

The practices of the boards of education from each class, the perceptions of individual members from each class, and the "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoints of each class were analyzed and reported.

Though column totals for both classes were not required to meet objectives of the study, they were included for the purpose of making overall comparisons.

The data presented in Table III indicate the actual practice of the two classes in regard to operation from written policy. Both classes indicate operation from written policy; however, the extent to which the affiliated members adhere is significantly greater than is that of the non-affiliated. Affiliated boards are more "progressive" in this practice than are non-affiliated. Taken in total, three-fourths of the boards follow the practice while one-fourth do not.

TABLE III

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE OPERATE
FROM WRITTEN SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES?

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	117	83	24	17
Non-Affiliate	83	69	38	31
	<u>200</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>24</u>
$\chi^2 = 7.46$ Reject H_0 at .01 N = 262				

The attitudes of members of the two classes is presented in Table IV. There is not a significant difference in the perceptions of the two classes. Affiliated members do indicate a somewhat greater favor for the practice and might thus be considered as more "progressive" toward this aspect of practice than the non-affiliate. If taken in total, slightly more than four-fifths of the board members sampled were favorably inclined toward the use of written school board policies.

TABLE IV
YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT WRITTEN POLICIES

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	127	90	9	6	5	4
Non-Affiliate	97	80	17	14	7	6
	<u>224</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>
$\chi^2 = 5.33$	Retain H_0 at .05					$N = 262$

The actual practice of the two groups in the matter of salary differentiation for elementary and secondary teachers is shown in Table V. Though there is not a significant difference in the practice, figures do reveal that a slightly larger percentage of non-affiliated

boards do establish a different level for elementary teachers. Slightly over one-third of all boards sampled indicated they do follow a practice of setting different salary levels. Non-affiliated boards are only slightly more "traditional" in this practice than are affiliated boards.

TABLE V

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE SET DIFFERENT
SALARIES FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	46	33	95	67
Non-Affiliate	45	37	76	63
	<u>91</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>65</u>
$\chi^2 = .5989$	Retain H_0 at .05			$N = 262$

Perceptions of the board members of the two groups, toward different salaries, are shown in Table VI. Investigation of the data reveals that there is not a significant difference between the two groups. A somewhat larger percentage of the non-affiliated group favor a differentiation in salary between the elementary and the secondary

teachers. Taken in total, board members view this "traditional" practice with more favor than they do disfavor.

TABLE VI
YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT DIFFERENT SALARIES?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	61	43	22	16	58	41
Non-Affiliate	60	50	19	15	42	35
	<u>121</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>38</u>
$\chi^2 = 1.26$		Retain H_0 at .05				N = 262

The practice of permitting teachers to participate in some policy formation is shown in Table VII. Figures indicate that approximately 75 percent of each of the two groups adhere to a permissive policy in this regard. Three-fourths of all boards sampled may be classed as "progressive" in the matter of allowing teachers to participate in some policy formation.

Board members of the two groups do not differ significantly in their perceptions toward teacher participation in some policy formation. A somewhat greater percentage of the affiliates (77%), in contrast to the non-affiliates (70%), positively favor teacher

participation. Affiliated members may be regarded as slightly more "progressive" than non-affiliates on this matter. This information is presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VII

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE PERMIT TEACHERS TO
PARTICIPATE IN SOME POLICY FORMATION?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	105	74	36	26
Non-Affiliate	<u>92</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>24</u>
	197	75	65	25
$\chi^2 = .086$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

TABLE VIII

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN POLICY MAKING?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	108	77	17	12	16	11
Non-Affiliate	<u>85</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>
	193	74	35	13	34	13
$\chi^2 = 1.36$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262		

The practice of emphasizing subject matter instruction more than the development of the individual interests of the child is shown in Table IX. No significant difference in practice is shown between the two board groups. Only slightly less than fifty percent of the board groups sampled indicated the "traditional" practice.

TABLE IX

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE EMPHASIZE TEACHING OF SUBJECT MATTER MORE THAN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL INTERESTS OF THE CHILD?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	69	50	70	50
Non-Affiliate	55	46	65	54
	<u>124</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>52</u>
$\chi^2 = .37$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 259

Though board members of both groups perceive somewhat differently concerning subject matter emphasis, this difference is not significant. A rather large percentage (20%) of both groups were neutral or undecided concerning their feelings toward the practice of subject matter emphasis. Approximately two-fifths of the boards sampled seemed to favor this "traditional" practice. This information is related in Table X.

TABLE X
YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SUBJECT MATTER EMPHASIS?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	51	37	30	21	58	42
Non-Affiliate	54	45	24	20	42	35
	<u>105</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>39</u>
$\chi^2 = 1.93$		Retain H_0 at .05				N = 259

The data presented in Table XI show the practice of the two groups toward the utilization of consultative service from universities and colleges. Statistical inference reveals that there is a significant difference in practice between the two groups. Affiliate boards seem to carry out this "progressive" practice more readily than do the non-affiliate boards.

The perceptions of board members toward consultative service of universities and colleges is shown in Table XII. A significant difference is shown to exist between the affiliated and the non-affiliated members in their feelings about this practice. Affiliated members seem more favorably inclined toward this "progressive" practice than are the non-affiliated.

Shown in Table XIII is the data related to awarding of purchase contracts to local firms. Slightly less than one-third of the boards

sampled, as well as each of the groups individually, carry out this "traditional" practice. No significant difference in the two groups is found.

TABLE XIII

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE AWARD SCHOOL PURCHASE CONTRACTS TO LOCAL FIRMS EVEN THOUGH IT MAY INCREASE SCHOOL EXPENSES?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	41	29	100	71
Non-Affiliate	36	28	85	72
	<u>77</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>71</u>
$\chi^2 = .014$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

The perceptions of both affiliates and non-affiliates toward the awarding of school purchases to local firms is indicated in Table XIV. Although there is not a significant difference in the perceptions of the two groups, a slightly larger percentage of the affiliated group is positively favorable to the awarding of purchases to local firms. Nearly two-fifths of the board members sampled favored this "traditional" practice.

TABLE XIV
YOUR FEELINGS CONCERNING LOCAL AWARD PRACTICES?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	58	41	18	13	36	46
Non-Affiliate	44	36	19	16	58	48
	<u>102</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>47</u>
$\chi^2 = .825$ Retain H_0 at .05 N = 262						

Information concerning the support of research and experimentation within the school is presented in Table XV. No significant difference is found between the groups. Nearly three-fourths of all board members sampled, as well as the separate groups, indicate that this "progressive" practice is being carried out.

The data in Table XVI represent the perceptions of both groups of board members toward programs of research and experimentation within the school. No significant difference in perception is indicated. A slightly larger percentage of the affiliated group feels that the programs are worthy of support. Nearly four-fifths of all board members sampled tended to favor this "progressive" practice.

The extent to which the two groups actually practice the promotion of qualified teachers to administrative positions within the system is shown in Table XVII. Figures reveal that there is no significant difference in the practice of the two groups. Over

TABLE XV

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE SUPPORT RESEARCH AND
EXPERIMENTATION WITHIN THE SCHOOL?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	105	74	36	26
Non-Affiliate	90	74	31	26
	<u>195</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>26</u>
$\chi^2 = .0003$				
Retain H_0 at .05				
N = 262				

TABLE XVI

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAMS?

Perceptions

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	112	79	24	17	5	4
Non-Affiliate	91	75	23	19	7	6
	<u>203</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>
$X^2 = 1.00$	Retain H_0 at .05					$N = 262$

nine-tenths of the boards sampled indicated they adhere to this "traditional" practice.

TABLE XVII

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE PROMOTE QUALIFIED TEACHERS
TO ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS WITHIN THE SYSTEM?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	132	94	9	6
Non-Affiliate	113	93	8	7
	<u>245</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>
$\chi^2 = .005$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

Perceptions of board members of both groups toward the interpromotional practice is presented in Table XVIII. There is no significant difference between the two groups. Almost 90 percent of each group, as well as the composite, indicate favor for this "traditional" practice.

Information relative to long range building practices of boards of education is presented in Table XIX. An investigation of the data shows that there is a significant difference between the two classes of boards concerning this matter. The majority of affiliated boards (55%)

tend to follow this "progressive" practice while a majority of the non-affiliated boards (59%) do not.

TABLE XVIII

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT INTER-SYSTEM PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	125	89	10	7	6	4
Non-Affiliate	107	89	10	8	4	3
	<u>232</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>
$X^2 = .272$	Retain H_0 at .05					N = 262

TABLE XIX

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE HAVE A LONG RANGE BUILDING PROGRAM?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	77	55	64	45
Non-Affiliate	50	41	71	59
	<u>127</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>52</u>
$X^2 = 4.61$	Reject H_0 at .05			N = 262

The perceptions of board members concerning long range building program practices is shown in Table XX. Although affiliated and non-affiliated members are not significantly different in their feelings toward this practice, a slightly higher percentage of the affiliated group tend to give positive favor to this "progressive" practice. Four-fifths of all board members sampled expressed favor for this practice.

TABLE XX

YOUR FEELINGS CONCERNING LONG RANGE BUILDING PROGRAMS?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	124	88	9	6	8	6
Non-Affiliate	97	80	15	12	9	8
	<u>221</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>
$\chi^2 = 3.35$		Retain H_0 at .05				N = 262

The practices of boards in considering cost factors first before educational needs is depicted in Table XXI. Statistics show that a significant difference exists between the two board groups. Sixty-four percent of the affiliated boards follow the practice of considering educational needs first while fifty-two percent of the non-affiliated

boards tend to follow the "traditional" practice of considering cost factors first. When the two board groups are figured together, slightly more than two-fifths of all board members sampled favor the practice of considering cost factors before they consider educational needs.

TABLE XXI

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE CONSIDER COST FACTORS FIRST
AND THEN THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN BUDGET MAKING?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	51	36	89	64
Non-Affiliate	63	52	58	48
	<u>114</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>56</u>
$\chi^2 = 6.46$	Reject H_0 at .05			N = 261

The perceptions of the two classes of board members toward the practice of considering cost factors before educational needs is revealed in Table XXII. Although a significant difference is not indicated, affiliated members do feel somewhat differently about this matter. One-half of the affiliated members do not favor this "traditional" practice while almost one-half (47%) of the non-affiliated

members do favor the practice. When taken in total, two-fifths of the board members sampled indicated they favored this "traditional" practice.

TABLE XXII

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT COST FACTOR CONSIDERATION
BEFORE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	48	34	22	16	70	50
Non-Affiliate	57	47	16	13	48	40
	<u>105</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>45</u>
$\chi^2 = 4.46$	Retain H_0 at .05					N = 261

The extent to which boards of education include kindergartens as a part of the regular school program is shown in Table XXIII. An analysis of data discloses that no significant difference in practice prevails between the two groups. A slightly greater percentage of the affiliated boards include kindergarten as a part of the regular school program. Taken in total, only one-third of the boards tend to follow this "progressive" practice.

TABLE XXIII

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE INCLUDE KINDERGARTEN
AS A PART OF THE REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	46	33	95	67
Non-Affiliate	29	24	92	76
	<u>75</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>71</u>
$\chi^2 = 2.40$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

Board members of both groups perceive kindergarten service in a favorable manner. Table XXIV indicates the degree to which affiliated members are somewhat more favorably inclined toward this "progressive" practice than are non-affiliates. No significant difference exists.

There is no significant difference in the practices of the two board groups in the matter of recognizing compromise as a regular procedure in dealing with local pressure groups. Affiliated boards tend to utilize this "traditional" practice more often than do the non-affiliate boards. Taken in total, somewhat less than two-fifths of the boards sampled followed this practice. Table XXV contains this data.

The perceptions of the two groups toward the practice of recognizing compromise as a regular procedure in dealing with pressure groups is presented in Table XXVI. There is no significant difference

between the two groups. Members of both groups, as well as the composite, look with disfavor upon this "traditional" practice. Less than one-third of the members favor this practice.

TABLE XXIV

YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD KINDERGARTEN SERVICE?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	97	69	12	8	32	23
Non-Affiliate	69	57	17	14	35	29
	<u>166</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>26</u>
$\chi^2 = 4.21$	Retain H_0 at .05					N = 262

TABLE XXV

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE RECOGNIZE COMPROMISE AS A REGULAR PROCEDURE IN DEALING WITH LOCAL PRESSURE GROUPS?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	53	38	88	62
Non-Affiliate	41	34	80	66
	<u>94</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>64</u>
$\chi^2 = .389$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

TABLE XXVI

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT COMPROMISE AS A REGULAR PROCEDURE?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	45	32	19	13	77	55
Non-Affiliate	38	31	19	16	64	53
	<u>83</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>54</u>
$\chi^2 = .263$	Retain H_0 at .05					N = 262

There is no significant difference in the practices of the two board groups relative to the defense of teachers who present the pros and cons in the discussion of controversial issues. The extent to which the affiliated boards slightly exceed the non-affiliated boards in following this "progressive" practice is revealed in Table XXVII.

The perceptions of board members concerning the practice of defending teachers is described in Table XXVIII. Affiliates do not differ significantly from non-affiliates in their attitudes about the defense of teachers. Approximately two-thirds of all members sampled indicated their favor of this "progressive" practice. Between the groups, non-affiliates were slightly more favorable to the practice than affiliates.

The data presented in Table XXIX indicate the extent to which the two classes of boards follow the practice of considering certain local values or feelings in employing teachers. No significant difference

TABLE XXVII

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE DEFEND TEACHERS FROM ATTACK WHEN THEY TRY TO PRESENT THE PROS AND CONS OF CONTROVERSIAL SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	104	74	37	26
Non-Affiliate	84	69	37	31
	188	72	74	28
$\chi^2 = .603$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

is indicated between the two groups. Both the affiliated and non-affiliated boards adhere to the "traditional" practice of considering local values or feelings regarding race, religion, and national origin in the filling of vacant teaching positions.

Information concerning the local value influence is presented in Table XXX. Members of both groups, as well as the composite, perceive the practice of considering race, religion, and national origin in filling vacant teaching positions as favorable. Three-fifths of all board members sampled expressed favor for this "traditional" practice.

Information shown in Table XXXI indicates the extent to which both board groups invite citizen participation in the development of the educational program. Although there is not a significant difference in the practices of the two groups, a slightly larger percentage of the

affiliated boards actually carry out this "progressive" practice. Two-thirds of all boards invite citizen participation.

TABLE XXVIII

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE DEFENDING OF TEACHERS FROM ATTACK?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	92	65	26	19	23	16
Non-Affiliate	81	67	17	14	23	19
	<u>173</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>18</u>
$X^2 = 1.07$	Retain H_0 at .05					N = 262

TABLE XXIX

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE CONSIDER LOCAL VALUES OR FEELINGS REGARDING RACE, RELIGION, AND NATIONAL ORIGIN IN FILLING VACANT TEACHING POSITIONS?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	87	62	54	38
Non-Affiliate	78	64	43	36
	<u>165</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>37</u>
$X^2 = .213$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 262

TABLE XXX

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT LOCAL VALUE CONSIDERATION?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	85	60	18	13	38	27
Non-Affiliate	73	60	19	16	29	24
	<u>158</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>26</u>
$\chi^2 = .623$ Retain H_0 at .05 N = 262						

TABLE XXXI

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE INVITE CITIZEN HELP
AND STUDY IN DEVELOPING THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	90	64	51	36
Non-Affiliate	74	61	47	39
	<u>164</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>37</u>
$\chi^2 = .198$ Retain H_0 at .05 N = 262				

The perceptions of the members of both groups toward the practice of including citizen help in the development of the educational program is indicated in Table XXXII. A statistically significant difference is not recorded in the data. Affiliated members do show a slight preference in favor of this "progressive" practice.

TABLE XXXII

YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	89	64	21	15	30	21
Non-Affiliate	69	58	26	21	26	21
	<u>158</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>21</u>
$X^2 = 1.97$	Retain H_0 at .05					$N = 261$

The practice of carefully observing the personal lives of school employees is shown in Table XXXIII. There is not a significant difference between the two board groups. Fifty-five percent of the affiliated boards and sixty-six percent of the non-affiliated boards indicate that they do practice a careful observance of the personal lives of their employees. Three-fifths of all boards sampled indicated they follow this "traditional" practice.

TABLE XXXIII

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE CAREFULLY OBSERVE
THE PERSONAL LIFE OF EACH SCHOOL EMPLOYEE?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	77	55	63	45
Non-Affiliate	80	66	41	34
	<u>157</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>40</u>
$\chi^2 = 3.36$	Retain H_0 at .05			N = 261

The perceptions of board members toward the practice of carefully observing school employees is shown in Table XXXIV. There is not a significant difference between the two groups. Non-affiliated members are somewhat more favorable than the affiliated members toward this "traditional" practice.

The extent to which board groups emphasize the reading of educational materials is depicted in Table XXXV. Eighty-four percent of the affiliated boards follow this practice as compared to sixty percent of the non-affiliated boards. This difference is statistically significant at the .001 level. Taken in total, nearly three-fourths of the boards follow this "progressive" practice.

Members of both board groups perceive the practice of reading educational materials in a favorable vein. Table XXXVI relates this information. A significant difference does exist between the two board

groups in their perceptions of this practice. Ninety-one percent of the affiliated members sampled favor this "progressive" practice as compared to seventy-four percent of the non-affiliated members.

TABLE XXXIV

YOUR FEELINGS CONCERNING CAREFUL OBSERVANCE OF EMPLOYEES?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	80	57	16	11	44	32
Non-Affiliate	77	64	18	15	26	21
	<u>157</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>27</u>
$\chi^2 = 3.47$		Retain H_0 at .05				N = 261

Attributes of Board Members

In this portion of the study classificatory information concerning age, education, income, length of board service, and occupation for 262 Oklahoma school board members was collected. Although total distributions are the major concern of this portion of the study, separate categorizations representing affiliated and non-affiliated members are shown for purposes of comparison. A summarization of selected state and national studies of board attributes is presented in Appendix D.

TABLE XXXV

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE EMPHASIZE MEMBER READING
OF JOURNALS AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS?

Practice

Association	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
Affiliate	118	84	23	16
Non-Affiliate	<u>72</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>40</u>
	190	73	72	27
$\chi^2 = 19.32$	Reject H_0 at .001			N = 262

TABLE XXXVI

YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE READING OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS?

Perception

Association	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Affiliate	128	91	8	6	5	3
Non-Affiliate	<u>90</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
	218	83	33	13	11	4
$\chi^2 = 14.41$	Reject H_0 at .001					N = 262

Age of Board Members

The age distributions of school board members included in this study are shown in Table XXXVII. There appears to be very little difference in the age categories of the two types of members. The median age of all board members sampled is 46.2 years.

TABLE XXXVII
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

Type of Board Member

Age—in years		Affil.	Percent	Non-Affil.	Percent	Comb.	Percent
Under	33	4	3	3	2	7	3
34	- 42	30	21	34	28	64	24
43	- 51	74	53	54	45	128	49
Over	51	33	23	30	25	63	24
		<u>141</u>		<u>121</u>		<u>262</u>	

Education of Board Members

The levels of educational attainment of school board members included in this study are shown in Table XXXVIII. A considerable degree of difference is evident between the two classes of board members. The average level of educational attainment for the school board members sampled was approximately 12.1 years.

TABLE XXXVIII
EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

Type of Board Member

Extent of Education	Affil.	Percent	Non-Affil.	Percent	Comb.	Per.
Less than 8 yrs.	3	2	3	2	6	2
Less than 12 yrs.	11	8	25	21	36	13
High School (12 yrs.)	43	30	52	43	95	37
Less than college	40	29	28	23	68	26
College (16 yrs.)	44	31	13	11	57	22
	<u>141</u>		<u>121</u>		<u>262</u>	

Income of Board Members

The annual income of board members included in this study is presented in Table XXXIX. Investigation of the data reveals a greater percentage of affiliated members in the higher income categories than is the case of the non-affiliated member. Fifty-nine percent of the affiliated members were earning \$11,000 or more compared with twenty-six percent of the non-affiliated members who were earning that same amount. The mean income of all board members sampled in the state is approximately \$9,000.

Service of Board Members

The service tenure of school board members included in this study is shown in Table XL. The data indicate very little categorical

difference between the two types of board members. The average number of years, for all of the members sampled, is calculated as 7.2.

TABLE XXXIX
INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

Type of Board Member

Annual Income	Affil.	Percent	Non-Affil.	Percent	Comb.	Percent
Less than \$5,000	5	3	7	6	12	5
\$5,000 \$7,999	30	21	42	35	72	27
\$8,000 \$10,999	24	17	40	33	64	24
\$11,000 \$14,000	32	23	14	11	46	18
More than \$14,000	50	36	18	15	68	26
	<u>141</u>		<u>121</u>		<u>262</u>	

Occupation of Board Members

Data presented in Table XLI indicate the type of employment reported for the school board members sampled. Very little difference was found between the affiliated and the non-affiliated member in any of the categories listed. Forty-three percent of all board members sampled reported farming/ranching as their occupation. The next highest occupational category was business, with a 24 percent indication.

TABLE XL
SERVICE DISTRIBUTION OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

Type of Board Member

Service in Years	Affil.	Percent	Non-Affil.	Percent	Comb.	Percent
1 - 3 years	19	14	16	13	35	13
4 - 6 years	49	35	42	35	91	35
7 - 9 years	25	18	24	20	49	19
Over 9 years	48	34	39	32	87	33
	<u>141</u>		<u>121</u>		<u>262</u>	

TABLE XLI
OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTION OF BOARD MEMBER SAMPLE

Type of Board Member

Occupation	Affil.	Percent	Non-Affil.	Percent	Comb.	Percent
Business	38	27	26	21	64	24
Professional	20	14	13	11	33	13
Farm/Ranch	59	42	53	44	112	43
Industry	19	13	23	19	42	16
Other	5	4	6	5	11	4
	<u>141</u>		<u>121</u>		<u>262</u>	

Attribute Relationship to Perception of Practice

A secondary objective of this study was to investigate the relationship of board member attributes to perception of practice. The relationship of age, education and income of board members was introduced on those items where significant differences were originally discovered. Significant differences in perception of practice were found on 2 of the 17 items. These items were:

- (a) Utilizing consultative services from universities and colleges.
- (b) Emphasizing member reading of educational journals and other materials.

The relationship by age, education and income is presented separately and in tabular form below.

Relationship by Age

The information in Table XLII indicates the relationship of board member age to board member attitude concerning the use of consultative services of universities and colleges. Although there is not a significant difference in the perceptions of the age groups, a greater percentage of the older and the younger group positively favor this practice. Twenty-five percent of the middle group view the practice in a neutral-disfavorable light.

The relationship of board member age to board member attitude concerning member reading emphasis of educational materials is shown in Table XLIII. The data reveal a significant difference in the attitudes of the members of the various age groups. Members occupying the

middle age grouping show an attitude which is noticeably less positive toward this member reading emphasis. Twenty-four percent of this group perceive the practice in a neutral-disfavorable vein.

TABLE XLII

AGE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD CONSULTATIVE SERVICE

Age	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Under 42 yrs.	62	87	5	7	4	6
43 - 51 yrs.	97	75	27	21	4	4
Over 51 yrs.	53	84	7	11	3	5
	<u>212</u>		<u>39</u>		<u>11</u>	

$\chi^2 = 8.84$
Retain H_0 at .05
N = 262

TABLE XLIII

AGE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD MEMBER READING EMPHASIS

Age	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Under 42 yrs.	64	90	7	10	0	0
43 - 51 yrs.	97	76	20	16	11	8
Over 51 yrs.	57	90	6	10	0	0
	<u>218</u>		<u>33</u>		<u>11</u>	
$\chi^2 = 9.59$	Reject H_0 at .05					N = 262

Relationship by Educational Level

The data presented in Table XLIV show educational attainment of members as related to their attitudes toward consultative services. A major and significant difference exists between the educational groupings of members. Those members with a lesser amount of educational attainment are proportionally less positive in their expression of favor for this type of service.

TABLE XLIV
EDUCATION AND ATTITUDE TOWARD CONSULTATIVE SERVICE

Education	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Less than 12 yrs.	29	69	6	14	7	17
High School (12 yrs.)	76	70	18	19	1	1
Less than College	54	79	11	16	3	5
College (16 yrs.)	53	93	4	7	0	0
	<u>212</u>		<u>39</u>		<u>11</u>	
$\chi^2 = 22.61$ Reject H_0 at .05 N = 262						

The relationship between the educational level of attainment of board members and their attitudes toward their own reading emphasis of educational journals and other materials is shown in Table XLV. Members with lower educational attainments tend to be less favorable toward

this emphasis. The statistical analysis does not reveal a significant difference at the selected level.

TABLE XLV
EDUCATION AND ATTITUDE TOWARD MEMBER READING EMPHASIS

Education	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Less than 12 yrs.	31	74	8	19	3	7
High School (12 yrs.)	78	82	12	13	5	5
Less than College	57	84	8	12	3	4
College (16 yrs.)	52	91	5	9	0	0
	<u>218</u>		<u>33</u>		<u>11</u>	
$\chi^2 = 8.63$ Retain H_0 at .05 N = 262						

Relationship by Income

The information presented in Table XLVI shows the relationship of board member income level and member attitude toward consultative services. Studies of the data disclose no significant difference in the attitudes of the members of the various income levels. A positive relationship is shown between high income level and favor toward consultative services.

TABLE XLVI
INCOME AND ATTITUDE TOWARD CONSULTATIVE SERVICE

Annual Income		Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Less than	\$ 8,000	60	71	19	23	5	6
\$8000	\$10,999	50	78	9	14	5	8
\$11,000	\$14,000	43	93	3	7	0	0
More than	\$14,000	59	87	8	12	1	1
		<u>212</u>		<u>39</u>		<u>11</u>	
$\chi^2 = 11.97$		Retain H_0 at .05				N = 262	

Information concerning board member income and board member attitude toward their own reading emphasis of educational materials is related in Table XLVII. Members in the low middle income groupings seem to be less favorably inclined toward this emphasis than do members of the other income groups. The data reveal no significant difference in the attitudes of the various income groups. There is a positive relationship shown between high income level and favor toward reading emphasis by members.

Area and Size Relationship to Perception of Practice

A third objective of the study was to investigate the relationship of these two additional variables: (a) area of the state and (b) the size of the school which the board member represented.

TABLE XLVII
INCOME AND ATTITUDE TOWARD MEMBER READING EMPHASIS

Annual Income	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Less than \$ 8,000	68	81	12	14	4	5
\$8000 \$10,999	50	78	7	11	7	11
\$11,000 \$14,000	39	85	7	15	0	0
More than \$14,000	61	90	7	10	0	0
	<u>218</u>		<u>33</u>		<u>11</u>	
$\chi^2 = 8.39$	Retain H_0 at .05				N = 262	

Inspection of the data revealed that members of boards of education from various areas of the state did not differ significantly in their attitudes or perceptions of board practice on any of the items in which there was an initial difference.

When size of the school district was introduced for examination, significant differences were established on two of the five items in which initial difference occurred.

Relationship by Size

The information in Table XLVIII shows the relationship of board member attitude toward planned building programs and the size of the school which he represents. Statistical data reveal that a significant difference does exist between the size categories. Members of smaller

size schools did not perceive the planning of building programs as favorably as did the members of the larger size schools.

TABLE XLVIII

SCHOOL SIZE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD PLANNED BUILDING PROGRAMS

Size	Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Up to 399	88	77	15	13	12	10
400 - 1,199	77	88	7	8	4	4
1,200 and up	56	95	2	3	1	2
	<u>221</u>		<u>24</u>		<u>17</u>	
$\chi^2 = 12.23$			Reject H_0 at .05			N = 262

The relationship of board member attitude toward member reading of educational journals and other materials and the size of the school which the board member represents is shown in Table XLIX. Inspection of the data indicates that a significant difference does occur in the attitudes of the board members who represent the small school categories as compared to those who represent the large school category. Large school representatives on the board are virtually unanimous in their indicated favor of this practice while those representing the two smaller groupings show an 80 percent indication of favor.

TABLE XLIX

SCHOOL SIZE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD MEMBER READING EMPHASIS

Size		Favor	Percent	Neutral	Percent	Disfavor	Percent
Up to	399	91	80	17	14	7	6
400	1,199	70	80	15	17	3	3
1,200	and up	57	96	1	2	1	2
		<u>218</u>		<u>33</u>		<u>11</u>	
$\chi^2 = 14.23$		Reject H_0 at .01				N = 262	

Summary

School board practice, on the 17 selected items, and the member perception of these aspects of practice, were analyzed and reported in this chapter. The extent to which affiliated and non-affiliated boards and their members differed in practice and perception of that practice was determined through the use of the chi square test for differences. On those items where a significant difference in perception of practice occurred, the attributes of age, education, and income, for the composite board sampling, was introduced for further comparison. When significant differences were found, the relationship of the variables state area and school size were injected for still further comparison.

In addition to the reporting of practice and perception of the practice, the tendencies toward "progressive" and "traditional" viewpoint were investigated and reported in this chapter. Results of these findings will be reported in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings as analyzed and reported in Chapter IV. Attention will be given to assure a reporting of the findings which concern themselves with the basic objectives of the study. These objectives were: the comparison of attitudes of the association affiliated and the non-affiliated school board member as reflected in certain practices as well as perceptions of those aspects of practice; the apparent "progressive" or "traditional" tendency of boards of education and their members as reported on each of the 17 items presented; the reporting of attributes of Oklahoma school board members and their comparison with those of other studies of other states or nationwide; and the relationship of area of state and size of the school district upon those item issues where initial significant differences were found.

Attitude Findings

The following results pertaining to the practices of boards of education and the perceptions of the individual board members toward these practices were obtained.

Significant differences between the responses of the sampled affiliated and non-affiliated board members were indicated at the .05

level of significance or less on the following of the 17 items:

Item Number 1. On the matter of operation from written school board policies, the affiliated boards indicate a significantly larger percentage who carry out this practice. Although a significant difference does not appear in the perception of the two groups toward these practices, a larger percentage of the affiliated members do indicate favor. There was no relationship between the attributes of age, education, and income of the board members sampled and their attitudes toward the practice. No relationship was found between attitude of the sampled members and the area of the state or the size of the school which the member represented.

Item Number 5. On the matter of utilizing consultative services from universities and colleges, the affiliated boards show a significantly larger percentage who actually carry out the practice as well as a larger percentage of members who favorably perceive this aspect of practice. A significant relationship was found between high level of educational attainment of the board member and favorable attitude toward this practice. Age, income, area of the state, and size of the school were variables which had no relationship with the attitudes of the members toward this practice.

Item Number 9. On the matter of using planned and long range building programs, affiliated boards practice this policy and differ significantly from the non-affiliated boards. The perceptions of both types of members do not differ. The relationship

of age, education, income, or area of the state of the member and the attitude toward the practice is not significant. A positive and significant relationship was found between large school size and favorable attitude toward the practice of planned and long range building programs.

Item Number 10. On the matter of considering cost factors before educational needs, a significant difference exists in the practice between the two classes of boards. A greater percentage of the affiliated boards consider educational needs first while a greater percentage of the non-affiliated boards consider cost factors first. There is not a significant difference in the perceptions of the members of the two classes of boards toward this practice. A positive relationship between high level of educational attainment and member disfavor of this practice is reported. Age, income, area of state, and size of the school were not significant variables.

Item Number 17. On the matter of emphasizing member reading of educational journals and other materials, a significant difference in both practice and perception of that practice was noted between the affiliated and non-affiliated boards and the members. Affiliate members were significantly more positive in their favor of the practice and were likewise only slightly less positive in their perception of this aspect of practice. Among the attributes of age, education, and income of sampled board members, only age was found to have a relationship to the practice of member reading emphasis. Members occupying the middle age category show an

attitude which is significantly less favorable than the remaining two groups. Board members of smaller size schools were found to be less favorable toward this practice than were the others.

No significant differences between the responses of the sampled affiliated and non-affiliated board members were indicated on the following of the 17 items:

Item Number 2. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the setting of different salaries for elementary and secondary teachers. Both classes indicated they did not follow this practice. Yet, both classes perceived this as a favorable one.

Item Number 3. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the permitting of teachers' participation in policy making. Both classes indicate they follow this practice and both classes of members perceive the practice very favorably.

Item Number 4. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the emphasizing of subject matter more than the development of the individual interests of the child. Both classes of boards barely indicated that they did not follow this practice. Affiliated board members perceived the practice in a disfavorable manner while a larger percentage of the non-affiliated members perceived it as favorable.

Item Number 6. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the awarding of school purchase contracts to local firms. Both classes of boards indicated that they do not carry on this practice and also perceived the practice as generally unfavorable.

Item Number 7. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the supporting of research and experimentation within the school. A rather high percentage of both classes of boards and members carried out the practice and perceived it as favorable.

Item Number 8. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the promoting of qualified teachers to administrative positions within the system. A very high percentage of the boards carry out this practice. Board members of both classes perceive this practice as highly favorable.

Item Number 11. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the including of kindergarten as a part of the regular school program. Both classes indicated a two-thirds majority or more that actually do not carry out this practice. Slightly over three-fifths of the total of both groups perceives the practice in a favorable manner.

Item Number 12. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the recognizing of compromise as a regular procedure in dealing with pressure groups. Approximately two-thirds of both classes of boards do not carry out this practice in operation. In perception of this practice, slightly more than fifty percent are positively unfavorable to its usage.

Item Number 13. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the defending of teachers from attack when they present the pros and cons of controversial social and political issues. Somewhat more than two-thirds of both board groups carry out this policy while about the same percentage of both groups perceive the practice in a favorable manner.

Item Number 14. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the local value consideration in filling vacant teaching positions. Boards of both classes indicated that they follow such practice. About three-fourths of the members of both class groups perceived this practice in a favorable manner.

Item Number 15. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the inviting of citizen help and study in development of the educational program. Boards of both classes indicated that they follow this practice. Three-fifths of the members of both groups indicated they favorably perceived this practice.

Item Number 16. Practice or perception of that practice, which concerned the careful observing of the personal lives of all school employees. Boards of both classes indicate they carry out this practice. Members of both groups indicate they favor such a practice by their reported feelings.

"Progressive" or "Traditional" Viewpoint

The following results pertaining to "progressive" or "traditional" educational view of practices of boards and the perceptions of the members toward these practices were obtained. The "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoints are determined by the positive indication of practice and the favorable indication of attitude on those items so judged by the panel of educational experts. Reference may be made to a summary of "progressive" and "traditional" item designations in Appendices E and F. Insofar as the practices and perceptions of these practices are concerned on the 17 items considered, board members differ in viewpoint from educational experts as follows:

Item Number 2. The establishing of different salaries for elementary and secondary teachers was judged to be a "traditional" viewpoint by educational experts. Board members indicate that they do not practice this differentiation as a board. Members of both classes of boards do, however, perceive the practice in a favorable manner.

Item Number 8. The promoting of teachers to administrative positions within the system was judged to be a "traditional" viewpoint by the educational experts. Board members of both groups indicate that they practice this policy and further indicated they hold great favor for such a practice by their reported perceptions.

Item Number 9. The planning of long range building programs was judged to be a "progressive" viewpoint by the educational experts. Non-affiliated boards indicate they do not follow this practice while affiliated boards indicate they do. The perceptions of both classes of members indicate definite favor for the practice.

Item Number 4. The emphasizing of subject matter over the individual interests of the child was judged to be a "traditional" educational viewpoint by the panel of experts. Both classes of boards indicate that they do not follow this practice in their schools. Board members of the non-affiliated class perceived the practice as favorable.

Item Number 10. The consideration of cost factors before educational needs was judged to be a "traditional" educational viewpoint by the panel of experts. Non-affiliated boards follow this practice and perceive this practice in a favorable manner.

Affiliated members do not follow the practice and perceive the practice in a disfavorable manner. Taken in total, boards do not follow this practice and members view it with disfavor.

Item Number 11. The including of kindergartens as a part of the regular school program was judged to be a "progressive" viewpoint by the panel of experts. Both classes of boards indicate that they do not follow this practice. The perceptions of the members of both groups indicate favor for this practice.

Item Number 14. The consideration of local values and feelings regarding race, religion, and national origin in filling vacant teaching positions was judged to be a "traditional" viewpoint by the panel of experts. Both types of boards indicated that they do follow this practice and members of both groups perceive this practice in a favorable manner.

Item Number 16. The careful observing of the personal life of each school employee was judged to be a "traditional" viewpoint by the panel of experts. On responses to both board practice and member perception, each class indicated positive reaction and favorable attitude.

No differences in viewpoint were found between the panel of educational experts and the two classes of boards and their members in regard to practice or perception of that practice on the following items:

Item Number 1. Operation of the board from written board policy which was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Item Number 3. Permitting teachers to participate in policy making which was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Item Number 5. Utilizing consultative services from the universities and colleges was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Item Number 6. Awarding school purchase contracts to local firms despite expense increase which was judged as "traditional" by the educational experts.

Item Number 7. Supporting research and experimentation within the school which was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Item Number 12. Recognizing compromise as a regular procedure in dealing with local pressure groups which was judged as "traditional" by the educational experts.

Item Number 13. Defending teachers from attack when they present the pros and cons of controversial social and political issues which was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Item Number 15. Inviting citizen help and study in developing the educational program which was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Item Number 17. Emphasizing member reading of educational journals and other materials which was judged as "progressive" by the educational experts.

Attribute Findings

The following results pertaining to the personal characteristics or attributes of Oklahoma school board members were obtained. The specific attributes which were examined were those of age, education, income, occupation, and years of board service. A chronological

summarization and comparison of state and national studies of school board member attributes is presented in Appendix D.

Investigation of the data on three of the five attributes of Oklahoma board members resulted in the following similar findings:

Age of members - The median age of Oklahoma school board members sampled was found to be 46.2 years. This does not differ greatly from previous state and national studies.

Income of members - The mean income of Oklahoma school board members sampled was found to be approximately \$9,000 per year. This does not differ greatly from the most recent state and national studies.

Service of members - The average years of service for Oklahoma school board members sampled was found to be 7.2 years. This does not differ greatly from the results of earlier studies.

Investigation of the data on two of the five attributes of Oklahoma board members resulted in the following different findings:

Occupation of members - The principal occupation of Oklahoma school board members sampled was found to be farming/ranching. Of all members sampled, 43 percent were found to be engaged in agricultural endeavors. The percentage of members in the professional, business or management occupations was found to be approximately 41 percent. These percentages are different from those found in previous state and national studies.

Education of members - The level of educational attainment for Oklahoma school board members was found to be approximately 12.1 years. Approximately 48 percent of the school board members sampled indicated some college education. This percentage is different from and considerably below those results found in earlier studies.

Other Findings

The following results pertaining to the relationship of area of the state and size of the school district were obtained:

Area of state - When responses from all of the sampled members were pooled, there were no differences in the perceptions of practice which could be associated with any particular area of the state.

Size of school - When responses from all of the sampled members were pooled, there were evidences of relationship between perception of practice and size of the school represented on these two items:

Item Number 9. On the matter of planning long range building programs, members of smaller size schools did not perceive the practice as favorably as did members of larger schools.

Item Number 17. On the matter of member reading of journals, members of smaller size schools did not perceive the practice nearly as favorably as did the members of larger schools.

Findings Summary

This chapter has summarized the findings of the study as analyzed and reported in Chapter IV. The chi square test was used to determine the difference in practices between two classes of boards and the difference in perceptions of the members of those boards on 17 selected items. The null hypothesis, stated in general form for each of the 17 items, was generally upheld. A summary of these findings is presented below:

- (1) Significant differences in practice were found on five of the seventeen items presented. Affiliated and non-affiliated

boards differed in practice regarding: operation from written school board policy; utilization of consultative services; pre-planning of building programs; consideration of cost factors before educational needs; and the emphasizing of member reading of educational materials. On two items, pre-planning of building programs and consideration of cost factors before educational needs, directly opposite practices were indicated. On the remaining three items, the difference was in degree and not in kind.

- (2) Significant differences in perception of practice were evident on only two of the items. Differences were found on the utilization of consultative services and the emphasizing of member reading of educational materials. The difference between the two classes of board members on these items was in degree and not in kind.
- (3) Boards of education, taken as a whole, indicated their adherence to "traditional" practice on 3 of the 8 items so designated by the panel of educational experts. These items concerned the promoting of teachers to administrative positions within the system; the considering of local values and feelings in employing teachers; and the careful observing of the personal lives of school employees. On one other item, that of emphasizing subject matter more than individual interests of the child, almost one-half of the boards (48%) indicated that they follow this practice.

- (4) Members of boards, taken as a whole, perceived 5 of the 8 "traditional" items in a favorable vein. These items concerned the setting of different salaries for elementary and secondary teachers; the emphasizing of subject matter more than the individual interests of the child; the promoting of teachers to administrative positions within the system; the considering of local values or feelings in filling vacant teaching positions; and the careful observing of the personal lives of all employees.
- (5) Boards of education, taken as a whole, indicated their adherence to "progressive" practice on 8 of the 9 items so designated. The one item where difference occurred concerned the including of kindergarten as a part of the regular school program.
- (6) Members of boards, taken as a whole, perceived all 9 of the "progressive" items in a favorable manner.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of the Purposes of the Study

During the past decade, and particularly over the last five years, local boards of education have been subjected to unprecedented pressures for social and educational change. Many different groups have advocated programs which they believe are designed to cure the ills of public school education. School board members are often in disagreement among themselves concerning the purposes, the goals, and the practices of the educational endeavor. The conflicting expectations concerning their function, the nature of the program, and the relative emphasis within various segments of the program, bring uncertainty and confusion on the part of board members. Thus, the need for a vigorous and informed board leadership in education is stronger than ever.

Associations are an integral part of democracy and American life. The promotion and encouragement of a great example is frequently carried out through the effort of an association. School board associations have been formed throughout this country with the express purpose of promoting and encouraging the general advancement of education. The dissemination of information as a service function is inherent within this stated purpose. Various programs of education have thus been established to inform and strengthen local boards of education.

Membership in the Oklahoma State School Board's Association is completely voluntary. Some school boards have taken advantage of the in-service and educational opportunities which the association offers, while other boards have been hesitant in their desires to participate. After 22 years of operation, approximately one-half of the high school districts and their boards of education have been enlisted into the membership of the association.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of board members toward selected issues in education and to determine if a significant difference existed between those members who were affiliated with the state school board association and those who were not. This was accomplished by comparing the attitudes of 141 affiliate board members with 121 non-affiliate members. The study also sought to determine the extent of "progressive" or "traditional" viewpoint of the sampled board members. The attributes of age, education, income, occupation, and service of the sampled board members were also investigated.

The chi square test was used on each item to determine significant difference. The IBM computing facilities of the Computer Center at the Oklahoma State University were used to process the data.

Conclusions of the Study

The research data and the statistical analysis resulting from the present study indicate the following conclusions:

1. There was not a significant difference in attitude between the two classes of members on a large majority (88%) of the 17 selected

items used in this study. The null hypothesis was thus generally upheld.

2. In addition to the two items, in which significant attitude differences were found, there were five other items (of the remaining 15) in which noticeable, but not significant, differences were also revealed. The direction of the difference on the 3 "progressive" items of these 5, showed a more favorable attitude for the affiliated members. The direction of the difference on the 2 "traditional" items of these 5, showed a more disfavorable attitude for the affiliated member.

3. When the 7 "progressive" items, in which there were no significant attitude differences, were placed together, it was found that affiliated members were slightly, but not significantly, more favorable than non-affiliated members on 6 of these 7 items.

4. When the 8 "traditional" items, in which there were no significant attitude differences, were placed together, it was found that non-affiliated members were slightly, but not significantly, more favorable than affiliated members on 4 of these 8 items; affiliated members were slightly, but not significantly, more favorable on 2 of the 8 items; and there was no difference on the 2 remaining items.

5. Taken as a whole, boards indicated an adherence to "traditional" practices on 3 of the 8 items so judged, while members indicated an attitude of favor toward 5 of these 8 items.

6. The attributes of age, education, and income were found to have little relationship to the attitudes of members toward the selected items. Members in the older age brackets, members with a higher level of educational attainment, and members in the higher income levels were

found to be more favorable toward the "progressive" item issues used for comparison.

7. There was little relationship between area of the state and attitude difference among the members on the items used for comparison.

8. There was a relationship between the size of the school and the attitude of board members on the two "progressive" items used for comparison. Members of smaller schools were significantly less favorable toward both of these item issues.

9. A comparison of the attributes of Oklahoma board members with those reported in earlier state and national studies show that the educational level of attainment is considerably lower. Another major difference showed that the principal occupation of the sampled members was farming/ranching as compared to business, professional, and management occupations in the earlier studies.

Recommendations

Before general recommendations pertaining to this study are made, the author would like to make a personal observation. This observation developed from early impressions and became more evident as the study progressed. This impression concerns the apparent suspicion and mistrust among board of education members toward efforts of research. Despite repeated pleadings for cooperation and assurances of confidentiality, only slightly more than 55 percent of the selected membership chose to participate.

The stimulation of research in the school board field, as well as the interpretation of the results of such research, has been established as a future service goal of the school board association. In

light of this goal subscription, the association has much to do in order to properly acquaint and assure its members of the value of research participation.

The following general recommendations were made as a result of this study:

1. The efforts of the Oklahoma State School Board's Association should be intensified. The present membership percentage is less than one-half of the eligible total. The membership growth rate in the past 14 years has been less than two percent. Overall improvement of the association may very well be tied to an increased and more representative school board membership.

2. On the basis of the data from this report, the board of education members of this state, as well as their boards, exhibit an apparent "traditional" viewpoint on a majority of educational issues so designated. Closer coordination between the college and university educational experts and the public schools might very well bring about a more universal value orientation to the members.

3. Further studies should be conducted in order to include the perceptions of laymen, teachers, and administrators. An assessment of the role of the board member from these legitimate sources would better define the inter-relationships of these groups and might assist in planning strategies for inducing profitable change.

4. Further studies which would investigate the relationship of school size and board member-administrator-teacher attitude, might be profitable.

5. Based upon the results of the investigation, administrators and school board members should develop immediate plans to involve teachers in more of the policy making which is significant and vital to their interests. Perhaps some study should be given toward the defining and identifying of these areas of vital concern.

6. Further study should be conducted concerning the extent to which possible discrimination exists in employment practices and violation of personal and individual rights of teachers and other employees.

7. Encouragement should be given to boards of education and their members to willingly participate in efforts of board member research. Criticisms of the board and uncertainties of the educational program by the general public might thus be partially alleviated.

8. Colleges and universities might make an increased effort toward communication with public schools. More consultative services, more assistance with experimentation projects, and more relating of the results of current and applicable research should be made available to the public school board members.

9. Based upon the reference made to "local" issues in this study, an investigation into the extent of "local and cosmopolitan orientation" of state board members might be profitable.

10. A study might be conducted to determine the feelings and opinions of the public regarding: the qualifications of the position of school board member; the extent to which these positions might be salaried; the possibility of recall from the position; the number of positions deemed most desirable; and the most satisfactory length of term for the position.

Further Considerations

On the basis of the data collected in this study and the results of the statistical tests administered, there is considerable reason to believe that the State School Board's Association is having only a small and rather insignificant influence upon the school board membership of this state. This lack of influence may be partially attributed to the inherent deficiencies of the voluntary association. The control of membership, committee assignments, official positions, and the function of the association itself, may be concentrated in the hands of too few persons. Meaningful involvement by all school board members, whereby active interest is developed and mutual benefits are realized, would seem to be a worthwhile, even necessary, goal of the association.

In planning for its future, it would seem that the Oklahoma School Board Association might have three alternatives: (a) Continue to operate and ignore the ineffectiveness; (b) Convert to another status which might inspire greater participation; (c) Dissolve the association. The last course of action would seem to be the least desirable; the first course least controversial; and the second course most revolutionary.

Education is much too important an endeavor, locally, statewide, and nationally, to be stifled by an inept association. Perhaps some thought should be given to the establishment of a compulsory state association.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Albert, F. R., Jr. "Selected Characteristics of School Board Members and Their Attitudes Towards Certain Criticism of Public School Education." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XX (1959), pp. 1,234-1,235. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1959).
- (2) Allport, G. W. and P. E. Vernon. "A Test for Personal Values," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. XXVI (1931), pp. 231-248.
- (3) Beale, H. K. Are American Teachers Free? New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1936).
- (4) Campbell, Roald F. "School Boards in an Era of Conflict," National School Public Relations Association Publication. Washington (1966), p. 18.
- (5) Caughran, Roy W. "Backgrounds and Attitudes of Illinois School Board Members." Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XVII (1957), pp. 289-290. (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956).
- (6) Counts, George S. The Social Composition of Boards of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1927).
- (7) Cunningham, Luvern L. "Leadership and Control," Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society. (An Eight State Project, Denver, Colorado, 1967, pp. 193-194.)
- (8) Curti, M. The Social Ideas of American Educators. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1935).
- (9) de Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America, Vol. II, New York: Alfred A. Knopf (1945).
- (10) Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan and Company (1916).
- (11) "Few Cities Have Labor on Boards of Education," The Headgear Worker, Vol. IV (1919), p. 3. (Quoted in Counts, op. cit.)

- (12) Finlay, J. H. and A. W. Reeves. "Expectations of School Boards for the Role of the Provincially Appointed Superintendent of Schools in Alberta," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol. VII (1961), pp. 74-80.
- (13) Form, W. H. "Organized Labor's Place in the Community Power Structure," Democracy in Urban America, Oliver P. Williams and Charles Press (editors), Chicago: Rand McNally and Company (1961), pp. 336-338.
- (14) Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co. (1953), p. 213.
- (15) Goldhammer, Keith. "The Roles of School District Officials in Policy-Determination in an Oregon Community," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1954).
- (16) Griffiths, Daniel E. "Research and Theory in Educational Administration," Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences. (The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1965, pp. 42-43.)
- (17) Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (1958).
- (18) Harris, A. M. "The Oklahoma State School Boards Association," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Oklahoma State University, 1955).
- (19) Havighurst, Robert J. and Bernice L. Neugarten. Society in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. (1962).
- (20) Hilgard, E. R. Introduction to Psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co. (1957).
- (21) Kerlinger, Fred. "The Attitude Structure of the Individual: A Q-Study of the Educational Attitudes of Professors and Laymen," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. LIII (1956), pp. 283-329.
- (22) _____. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. (1966).
- (23) Lipham, James M. and R. A. Rossmiller. "A Study of Citizen's Expectations of School Boards," Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin (quoted in Campbell, op. cit., p. 4), Madison (1967).
- (24) Minar, David. "Educational Decision-Making in Suburban Communities," Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2440, Northwestern University, Evanston (1966).

- (25) Moehlman, A. B. School Administration. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co. (1940).
- (26) Nearing, Scott. "Who's Who on Our School Boards," School and Society, Vol. V (1907), p. 5 (quoted in Counts, op. cit.).
- (27) Proudfoot, Alexander. "A Study of the Socio-Economic Status of Influential School Board Members in Alberta as Related to Their Attitudes Toward Certain Common Problems Confronting School Boards," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XXIII (1962), pp. 1,586-1,587. (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1962).
- (28) Remmers, H. H. and N. L. Gage. Educational Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Harper and Brothers (1955), pp. 361-362.
- (29) Seigel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. (1956).
- (30) Sherif, M. and C. Sherif. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Row (1956), pp. 494-495.
- (31) Shock, Donald P. "Patterns in the Decision-Making Process of a School Board," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XXI (1960), pp. 1,113-1,114. (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1960).
- (32) Sperling, A. P. Psychology Made Simple. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. (1957), p. 38.
- (33) Struble, George S. "A Study of School Board Personnel," American School Board Journal, Vol. LXV (October, 1922), pp. 48-49, 137-138.
- (34) Suthoff, John. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Participation in School Affairs," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. IX (November, 1960), No. 3.
- (35) Teal, Hal C. "Attitudes of Selected School Board Members Concerning Problems Facing Public Education," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XVI (1956), p. 2,375. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956).
- (36) Thurstone, L. L. The Measurement of Values. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1959).
- (37) Tiedt, Sidney W. "Oregon School Board Members in the Willamette Valley," Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Vol. VI, No. 6 (Eugene, Oregon: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1962).

- (38) Tuttle, Edward M. School Board Leadership in America. Chicago: Interstate Press (1960).
- (39) Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. (1962).
- (40) Woods, Roy C. "The West Virginia School Board Member," The American School Board Journal, Vol. CXXVIII (April, 1954), pp. 31-33.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER WHICH ACCOMPANIED OPINIONNAIRE FORM SENT
TO SAMPLE OF STATE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**

Department of Education
FRontier 2-6211, Ext. 273

74074

May 15, 1967

Your service as a member of your Board of Education is a vital and responsible service of educational leadership. Your views and opinions concerning education matters are of great importance on the national and state as well as the local level. Prior studies concerning opinions and attitudes toward education programs have been directed mainly toward the citizens, administrators, teachers, or students. I am conducting a study with the express purpose of determining the individual opinions of selected board members.

I realize that your time is limited, particularly at this time of the year. For this reason, a single opinionnaire and information sheet has been designed so that it may be completed in approximately 15 to 25 minutes. May I assure you too, that no names are to be mentioned and all information will be treated as absolutely confidential.

Even though elections may have brought changes to the board, your service during this past year qualifies you as a valid participant in this study. Since this is a random sample, you are the only member of your board who is truly eligible to complete the opinionnaire.

Your help in completing and returning this opinionnaire at your early convenience will be most gratefully appreciated. A self-addressed and stamped envelope is enclosed for your use.

Please accept my sincere thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Respectfully,

E. F. Rezabek, Graduate Assistant
University Placement Services
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

APPENDIX B

OPINIONNAIRE FORM SENT TO SAMPLE
OF STATE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

OPINION - INFORMATION BLANK

Please complete the following opinionnaire by placing a check ☒ in the proper Yes or No space; a circle ☐ of choice indicating feelings of Favor, Neutrality, or Disfavor; and a voluntary Comment in the space provided. Will you please make this an expression of your own individual opinion concerning these educational practices? No names are to be mentioned and information will be treated as confidential.

FAVOR - DISFAVOR KEY

F ——— Favor
N ——— Neutral
D ——— Disfavor

DOES THE BOARD ON WHICH YOU SERVE ———

- F N D 1. (a)—operate from written policy? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings concerning written policies?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 2. (a)—set different salaries for elementary and secondary teachers? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings about different salaries?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 3. (a)—permit teachers to participate in some policy formation? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings about participation?; Comment _____.
- F N D 4. (a)—emphasize the teaching of subject matter more than the development of the individual interests of the child? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings about this emphasis?; Comment _____.
- F N D 5. (a)—utilize consultative services from the universities and colleges? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings about consultative services?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 6. (a)—award school purchase contracts to local firms even though it may increase school expenses somewhat? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings about local award practices?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 7. (a)—support research and experimentation within the school? Yes ____ No ____; (b) Your feelings about these programs?; (c) Comment _____.

- F N D 8. (a)--promote qualified teachers to administrative positions within the system? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings about inter-promotional practices?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 9. (a)--have a long range building program on paper? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings about planned programs?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 10. (a)--consider cost factors first and then the educational needs in budget making? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings about this procedure?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 11. (a)--include kindergarten as a part of the regular school program? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings toward kindergarten service?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 12. (a)--recognize compromise as a regular procedure in dealing with local pressure groups? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings concerning this procedure?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 13. (a)--defend teachers from attack when they try to present the pros and cons of controversial social and political issues? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings toward this defense?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 14. (a)--consider local values or feelings regarding race, religion, and national origin in filling vacant teaching positions? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings toward this consideration?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 15. (a)--invite citizens help and study in developing the educational program? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings toward this citizen involvement?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 16. (a)--observe carefully the personal life of each school employee? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings concerning careful observance of employees?; (c) Comment _____.
- F N D 17. (a)--emphasize member reading of educational journals and other materials? Yes ___ No ___; (b) Your feelings toward this emphasis?; (c) Comment _____.

PERSONAL INFORMATION SHEET

NO NAMES are to be used. This information is STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. This information is vital to the overall outcome of the study and will be used only in this respect. Please check ☒ in appropriate interval blank.

YOUR AGE _____

____ Under 25
 ____ 25 — 33
 ____ 34 — 42
 ____ 43 — 51
 ____ Over 51

HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED _____

____ Less than 8
 ____ Less than 12
 ____ High School (12)
 ____ Less than College (16)
 ____ College Graduate

YEARS OF BOARD SERVICE _____

____ Under 1
 ____ 1 — 3
 ____ 4 — 6
 ____ 7 — 9
 ____ Over 9

SELF-EMPLOYED? ____ Yes ____ No
(Type of Employment)

____ Business
 ____ Professional
 ____ Farmer or Rancher
 ____ Industry
 ____ Other _____

ANNUAL INCOME _____

____ Less than \$ 5,000
 ____ \$ 5,000 — \$ 7,999
 ____ \$ 8,000 — \$10,999
 ____ \$11,000 — \$14,000
 ____ More than \$14,000

ENROLLMENT OF YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT (k- 12) _____

EVALUATION OF YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT _____

WERE YOU APPOINTED ____ OR ELECTED ____ TO THE BOARD?

DO YOU BELONG TO A LABOR UNION? YES ____ NO ____ OTHER UNION? _____
Name

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE STATE SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION? ____ YES ____ NO

COMMENT _____

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW UP LETTERS AND CARDS SENT TO SAMPLE
OF STATE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

July 29, 1967

Dear Mr. _____:

About May 20, 1967, I sent a letter and a questionnaire form asking for your help in a state wide study concerning the individual opinions of a selected number of school board members toward certain school issues.

I especially need your help now in completing this study. A questionnaire and a self-addressed envelope are enclosed for your convenience. Would you please take a few minutes and complete the form now? It would mean so much to me and I would be sincerely grateful.

Your information will be kept confidential. Coding, by numbers, has been a necessity in order to follow up on those not responding.

Sincerely,

E. F. Rezabek, Graduate Assistant
University Placement
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

1ST FOLLOW-UP POSTAL CARD

June 1, 1967

Dear Sir:

This card is written as a personal plea for your immediate assistance. Several weeks ago you received an opinionnaire concerning service as a school board member.

Sampling requirements make it imperative that a high percentage of responses be received from the selected participants. Though coding is necessary to follow up on those not responding, the information as well as all names will be absolutely confidential.

If the questionnaire has been misplaced, I have additional copies which I will be glad to forward. I will be most grateful for your help.

Sincerely,

E. F. Rezabek, Graduate Assistant
University Placement Services
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

2ND FOLLOW-UP POSTAL CARD

June 15, 1967

Dear Sir:

This card is written as a personal plea for your immediate assistance. Several weeks ago you received an opinionnaire concerning service as a school board member.

Sampling requirements make it imperative that a high percentage of responses be received from the selected participants. Though coding is necessary to follow up on those not responding, the information as well as all names will be absolutely confidential.

If the questionnaire has been misplaced, I have additional copies which I will be glad to forward. I will be most grateful for your help.

Sincerely,

E. F. Rezabek, Graduate Assistant
University Placement Services
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF SELECTED STUDIES OF CHARACTERISTICS
OF BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

SUMMARIZATION OF SELECTED STATE AND NATIONAL STUDIES BY
THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

<u>Author</u>	<u>Year of Study</u>	<u>Geog. Area</u>	<u>Percentage in Prof., Bus., or Mgmt. Occup.</u>	<u>Percentage With Some College Edu.</u>	<u>Mean Income</u>	<u>Years Service</u>	<u>Median Age</u>
Counts	1927	U.S.	55	50	\$ 4,000	4.1	48.3
Woods	1954	W. Virg.	40	26	\$ 4,250	8.5	53.8
Albert	1958	U.S.	52	72	\$11,986	6.0	48.6
Tiedt-Garmire	1961	Oregon	61	63	\$ 9,000	4.7	42.5
Rezabek	1967	Oklahoma	41	48	\$ 9,000	7.2	46.2

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

Woods, Roy C. "The West Virginia School Board Member," The American School Board Journal, Vol. CXXVIII (April, 1954), pp. 31-38.

Albert, Frank R. Jr. "Selected Characteristics of School Board Members and Their Attitudes Towards Certain Criticism of Public School Education." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1959).

Tiedt, Sidney W. "Oregon School Board Members in the Willamette Valley," Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Vol. VI, No. 6 (Eugene, Oregon: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1962), p. 7.

Garmire, Leonard. "A Study of the Attitudes of School Board Members as They Relate to the Reasons for Seeking Office," Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Eugene, Oregon: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1962), p. 15.

Rezabek, Ernest F. "A Study of the Practices and Perceptions of Two Classes of Public School Board Members in the State of Oklahoma." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Oklahoma State University, 1967).

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY RESPONSES OF BOARD PRACTICES IN 141 ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATED AND 121 NON-AFFILIATED SCHOOLS

SUMMARY RESPONSES OF BOARD PRACTICES IN 141 ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATED SCHOOLS AND 121 NON-AFFILIATED SCHOOLS.

P = Progressive
T = Traditional

<u>Board Practices</u>	<u>Affiliate</u>		<u>Non-Affiliate</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Operate from written school board policies. (P)	117	24	83	38	200	62
2. Set different salary levels for teachers. (T)	46	95	45	76	91	171
3. Permit teacher participation in policy-making. (P)	105	36	92	29	197	65
4. Emphasize subject matter over individual interests. (T)	69	70	55	65	124	135
5. Utilize university consultative services. (P)	109	32	79	42	188	74
6. Award purchases to local firms. (T)	41	100	36	85	77	185
7. Support research and experimentation. (P)	105	36	90	31	195	67
8. Promote teachers to administrative positions. (T)	132	9	113	8	245	17
9. Use planned building programs. (P)	77	64	50	71	127	135
10. Consider costs before educational needs. (T)	51	89	63	58	114	147
11. Include kindergartens in regular program. (P)	46	95	29	92	75	187
12. Recognize compromise with pressure groups. (T)	53	88	41	80	94	168
13. Defend teachers from attack. (P)	104	37	84	37	188	74
14. Consider local values in filling vacancies. (T)	87	54	78	43	165	97
15. Invite citizen help in educational planning. (P)	90	51	74	47	164	98
16. Observe personal lives of teachers. (T)	77	63	80	41	157	104
17. Emphasize board reading of educational materials. (P)	118	23	72	49	190	72

APPENDIX F

SUMMARY RESPONSES OF BOARD MEMBER PERCEPTIONS IN 141 ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATED AND 121 NON-AFFILIATED SCHOOLS

SUMMARY RESPONSES OF MEMBER PERCEPTIONS OF 141 ASSOCIATION AFFILIATED
MEMBERS AND 121 NON-AFFILIATED MEMBERS

P = Progressive
T = Traditional

F = Favor
N = Neutral
D = Disfavor

Member Perceptions	Affiliated			Non-Affiliated			Total		
	F	N	D	F	N	D	F	N	D
1. Operate from written school board policies. (P)	127	9	5	97	17	7	224	26	12
2. Set different salary levels for teachers. (T)	61	22	58	60	19	42	121	41	100
3. Permit teacher participation in policy-making. (P)	108	17	16	85	18	18	193	35	34
4. Emphasize subject matter over individual interests. (T)	51	30	58	54	24	42	105	54	100
5. Utilize university consultative services. (P)	124	13	4	88	26	7	212	39	11
6. Award purchases to local firms. (T)	58	18	65	44	19	58	102	37	123
7. Support research and experimentation. (P)	112	24	5	91	23	7	203	47	12
8. Promote teachers to administrative positions. (T)	125	10	6	107	10	4	232	20	10
9. Use planned building programs. (P)	124	9	8	97	15	9	221	24	17
10. Consider costs before educational needs. (T)	48	22	70	57	16	48	105	38	118
11. Include kindergartens in regular program. (P)	97	12	32	69	17	35	166	29	67
12. Recognize compromise with pressure groups. (T)	45	19	77	38	19	64	83	38	141
13. Defend teachers from attack. (P)	92	26	23	81	17	23	173	43	46
14. Consider local values in filling vacancies. (T)	85	18	38	73	19	29	158	37	67
15. Invite citizen help in educational planning. (P)	89	21	30	69	26	26	158	47	56
16. Observe personal lives of teachers. (T)	80	16	44	77	18	26	157	34	70
17. Emphasize board reading of educational materials. (P)	128	8	5	90	25	6	218	33	11

APPENDIX G

SAMPLE OF ITEMS JUDGED BY EDUCATIONAL EXPERTS

SAMPLE OF ITEMS

Listed below are statements of educational policy or practice. Would you please express your judgment concerning the categorization of each of these statements by placing a check mark where you feel it best applies?

P - Progressive policy or program ()
 **Not used in final T - Traditional policy or program Classification
 instrument N - Neither by experts

SCHOOL BOARD PRACTICES THAT	Are	P	T	N
** 1. —separate pupils into "bright" and "slow" classes	—	(3)	(2)	
2. —depend upon a written set of school board policies—	(5)	—	—	
** 3. —set maximum class size at 25 in the elementary school—	(1)	(2)	(2)	
4. —establish different salaries for elementary and secondary teachers—	—	(5)	—	
5. —permit teachers to participate in policy formation—	(5)	—	—	
** 6. —specify academic standards in order to be promoted in the first six grades—	—	(5)	—	
7. —promote qualified teachers to administrative positions—	—	(4)	(1)	
8. —utilize consultive services from colleges and universities—	(5)	—	—	
** 9. —emphasize the development of the individual interests of the pupils rather than the teaching of subject matter—	(5)	—	—	
10. —emphasize the teaching of subject matter rather than the development of the individual interests of the pupils—	(1)	(4)	—	
**11. —actively support the Oklahoma School Boards Association—	(4)	—	(1)	
12. —invite citizen study and help in developing the educational program—	(4)	(1)	—	
**13. —establish some kind of psychological guidance facility available to all pupils throughout the schools—	(4)	—	(1)	
**14. —specify numerical grading be given on regular report cards in the first six grades—	—	(5)	—	
**15. —actively support the Oklahoma Education Association—	(2)	(1)	(2)	

**16. —place a great deal of emphasis on a program of extracurricular activities—	—	(3)	(2)
**17. —establish a sex education program in the elementary school—	(1)	—	(1)
**18. —expect pupils to be formed into lines to pass—	—	(5)	—
**19. —give monetary support to in-service training—	(5)	—	—
**20. —permit use of schools as community centers—	(5)	—	—
21. —support research and experimentation programs within the school—	(5)	—	—
22. —include kindergarten as part of the total program—	(5)	—	—
**23. —have teachers act as advisers in extra-curricular activities—	—	—	(5)
**24. —provide extensive use of psychological and mental tests—	(3)	(1)	(1)
25. —award school contracts to local firms even though it may increase school expenses somewhat—	—	(4)	(1)
**26. —accept full responsibility for the decisions of the superintendent—	(3)	—	(2)
27. —keep a watchful eye on the personal life of all school employees—	—	(4)	(1)
**28. —place importance on members speaking to major civic clubs or other groups in the community at least once a year—	(1)	(1)	(3)
29. —have long range building program on paper—	(5)	—	—
30. —give consideration to local values or feelings regarding race, religion, and national origin in filling vacant teaching positions—	(1)	(3)	(1)
31. —defend teachers from attack when they try to present the pros and cons of controversial social and political issues—	(5)	—	—
**32. —give help to fellow board members up for re-election—	—	(1)	(4)
**33. —pass upon curriculum change without consulting teachers—	—	(3)	(2)
34. —compromise regularly with local pressure groups	—	(4)	(1)
**35. —require personal inspection of all school plants at least once a year—	(1)	(2)	(2)
**36. —take a neutral stand on evenly divided public issues—	—	(2)	(3)

37. —emphasize member reading of educational journals— (5) — —
- **38. —avoid involvement with factional groups in the community— (2) (1) (2)
39. —give greater consideration to cost factors than educational needs when drawing up the budget— — (4) (1)
- **40. —use merit rating alone in the appointment, promotion, or dismissal of school employees— (1) (1) (3)

VITA

Ernest Frank Rezabek

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF THE PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF TWO CLASSES OF
PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born near Wilber, Nebraska, November 12, 1925, the
son of Frank F. and Mary Z. Rezabek.

Education: Attended grade school in Jefferson, Oklahoma; graduated
from Jefferson High School in 1943; attended Oklahoma A & M
College, Stillwater, Oklahoma; attended Military Service
Schools during World War II; attended Northern Oklahoma Junior
College, Tonkawa, Oklahoma; attended Central State College,
Edmond, Oklahoma; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from
Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, May 26, 1949;
received the Master of Education degree from the University
of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, June 5, 1950; attended National
Community Leadership Institute at Tulsa University, Tulsa,
Oklahoma, in the Spring, 1966; completed requirements for the
Doctor of Education degree in May, 1968.

Professional Experience: Entered United States Army in 1944, and
served as cadre and instructor from 1944 to 1946; taught
social studies and coached at Henryetta Junior High School,
Henryetta, Oklahoma, 1950-1952; served as Principal of the
High School and taught at Newkirk, Oklahoma, 1952-1955; served
as Principal of the High School and taught at Cleveland, Okla-
homa, 1955-1958; served as Superintendent of Schools at Cleve-
land, Oklahoma, 1958-1966; served as Graduate Assistant in
Placement Services, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,
Oklahoma, 1966-1968.

Professional Organizations: Member of Kappa Delta Pi; member of Phi Delta Kappa; member of National Education Association; member of Oklahoma Education Association; member of National Association of School Administration; member of Oklahoma Association of School Administration; past president of the Oklahoma Northern District School Administrators.