

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOLS OF
LINCOLN AND PAYNE COUNTIES, OKLAHOMA
1936-1937

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY
JAN 12 1939

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOLS OF
LINCOLN AND PAYNE COUNTIES, OKLAHOMA.

1936-1937

BY

Melvin Edgar Hatchett

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Baptist University

1930

LIBRARY
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
OKLAHOMA

Submitted to the School of Education
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

1939

APPROVAL:

J. P. Muennerman

In Charge of Thesis

J. P. Conroy

Head of Department

D. C. McIntosh

Dean of Graduate School

111233

PREFACE

The preparation of this thesis is an attempt to bring together and to interpret the more important facts concerning the origin and development of educational opportunities of Lincoln and Payne Counties in such manner that facts here presented may reveal the defects and inequalities in our present school system in Oklahoma and with the realization of these defects, set out to make such remedial corrections through legislation that will assure equal educational opportunities for all.

The author wishes to acknowledge his obligation and express his sincere thanks to Dr. J. C. Muerman, under whose supervision this study was made, for his instruction, inspiration and guidance. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Haskell Pruett, who so ably assisted in the absence of Dr. Muerman; County Superintendents, Mrs. Hart and Mr. Carl Anderson, of Payne and Lincoln Counties respectfully, for allowing us access to their annual Report to the State Department of Instruction; John Vaughan and his successor A. L. Crable, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and their associates for the use of departmental files; to all others who have been of material assistance in this study.

Agra, Oklahoma
July 15, 1938

Melvin Edgar Hatchett

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Preface	iii
Introduction.	1
1. The extent of this survey	
2. Specific need for the study	
3. Source of data	
4. Related studies	
Chapter I. The Economic, Social and Religious Conditions in Lincoln and Payne Counties	4
Chapter II. Educational Conditions in General	12
Table I. General Information of Schools by County	20
Table II. Number of Teachers Employed in Various Types of Schools	25
Table III. Preparation of Teachers.	26
Table IV. Range of Salary Paid High School Teachers	28
Table V. Range of Salary Paid Grade Teachers. .	29
Table VI. Salary Distribution by Classification of School.	31
Table VII. Personnel Report of High Schools Within Each County	33
Table VIII. Range of Teacher Experience in Rural And Urban Schools.	35
Table IX. A.B.C. Valuation of Rural Districts of Payne County According to Their Rank in Wealth.	38
Table X. A.B.C. Valuation of Rural Districts of Lincoln County According to Their Rank in Wealth.	43
Table XI. A.B.C. Number of Dollars of Taxable Property Per Pupil in A.D.A. in each District. In Payne County. (Rank according to wealth)	46

C O N T E N T S (Continued)

	Page
Table XII. Number of Dollars of Taxable Property Per Pupil in Average Daily Attendance in Urban Districts by Counties	48
Table XIII. Assessed Valuation of Counties. Dollars Spent by Each County to Support Education.	49
Table XIV. A.B.C. Effort Put Forth By each District to Support Education in Lincoln County	51
Table XV. A.B. Effort Put Forth by Each District to Support Education in Payne County .	54
Chapter III. Summary and Conclusions.	58
General Bibliography.	65

INTRODUCTION

The extent of this thesis deals with the rural and urban school districts of Lincoln and Payne Counties, Oklahoma. Particular attention is given in this study to the equality of educational opportunities afforded by the various school districts comprising this educational survey.

There is a great need of accurate information concerning the question of equality in educational opportunities in rural communities throughout the entire State of Oklahoma. Much good would come from a complete survey on the educational conditions in our State, but to extend this study further than the two counties the author would find that the report would be too extensive to serve its purpose.

It is our purpose to choose counties in making this survey that will serve as typical examples of the general rural conditions throughout the entire state. It is hoped that with the cooperation with local school officials, County agencies and The State Department of Education, that the results of this survey will have general value, because it reveals conditions in typical communities of Oklahoma.

In compiling the data for this survey the author has visited a number of the school districts in each county of both the wealthy and poor districts, and has acquired a fair knowledge of conditions in general. But, withholding personal opinions and any prejudice that might exist, it is believed that such facts and findings as are presented in this thesis will be more convincing than mere opinion.

First hand information has been supplemented from various records of the County Superintendents of Lincoln and Payne Counties, reports made by the "Research Division" of the Oklahoma Tax Commission, Preliminary Report of the Oklahoma State Planning Board of the year 1936, Oklahoma Almanac, which is published by the Oklahoma Publishing Company, 1931, the Directory of Oklahoma Manufacturers, Compiled by H. G. Thuesen of the Department of Industrial Engineering, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Records from the County Assessors Offices and other official reports from the State Department of Education, and reports and conversations of teachers and patrons from the two counties included in our study.

In order that the present educational conditions within the scope of our study might be understood properly, it will be well to give some facts concerning the conditions in general that may be used as a basis for comparisons. The Territory of Lincoln County was organized in May 1890, and Payne County was organized in October 1891, their designations were first known as County "A" and Sixth County, respectively. The names of the two counties were derived from the eminent men of Abraham Lincoln and David L. Payne. The population according to the last census of 1930, was Lincoln County 33,738, and Payne County 36,905. The area in square miles is Lincoln 760 and Payne 678. The altitude is Lincoln 950 ft. and Payne is 890 ft. The average rainfall is Lincoln 36 inches and Payne 31.47 inches. The two counties have an

assessed valuation of:

	PERSONAL	REAL	PUBLIC SER.	TOTAL
Lincoln County	\$4,118,943	\$7,369,557	\$7,562,506	\$19,051,006.
Payne County	9,040,143	11,744,939	5,217,588	26,002,760.

The county seat of Lincoln County is Chandler, and of Payne, Stillwater. The number of acres of land are Lincoln 613,780 and Payne 341,440. The annual income from farms is Lincoln \$4,919,000 and Payne \$4,215,000. This is for crops only and does not include income from livestock.

We can see from the above figures that the two counties are about equal in most respects. And that neither out rank the other to the extent that the difference would effect the educational advantages materially. As to their location, the two counties are in the North Central part of the state. Payne County joins Lincoln County on the north, and any advantages or disadvantages geographically are shared in common. They lie in the great Redbeds region; the drainage, topography, timber and other native resources are very much the same

CHAPTER I

THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN LINCOLN AND PAYNE COUNTIES

Economic Conditions

Under the present system of financing schools in Oklahoma every school district within the state is vitally effected by the economic conditions of that district. Therefore, we shall treat the economic conditions of these two counties in our study, in order that we may know the source of strength or weakness of the various districts.

The study of economics deals with the wealth-getting and wealth-using activities of man. And, since there is a vast difference in the commercial and industrial activities within the two counties, it will be necessary to treat the subject with each county separately.

Lincoln County is almost exclusively an agricultural county. Corn, wheat, cotton and forage crops are the principal crops grown throughout the county. Cotton is grown extensively but the yield per acre is relatively small. Alfalfa does very well, especially in the stream valleys. Stock-raising is carried on extensively in connection with farming, and there are some large pasture lands in the eastern part of the county.

Many attempts have been made to secure oil and gas in the county, but so far, with little success. There are several small fields that are now producing oil and gas, but none of major importance to the industry. Perhaps the

Davenport field is the largest field within the county, but her hey'day was of a short duration and is now a matter of history. Other small fields include the Stroud, Chandler, and a few scattering wild-cat wells.

Although agriculture is the major industry, the oil and gas development have been of material help financially to the districts where they are located. But aside from these two industries just mentioned, there are other sources of material help to the county that should be mentioned in our study. Stone that is suitable for building purposes can be found in any direction from the county seat. This material has been used more extensively in more recent years. Under the program of the Government there have been several school buildings, armories, park improvements, bridges and highway improvements made from this native stone.

It appears now that there is almost an unlimited quantity of various types of stone to be found and secured with very little expense. In addition to stone in building materials, building sand may be secured in various parts of the county, however, the grade is not equal to the better grades of sand that may be shipped into the county from nearby quarters. Lumber is found in small quantities in various parts of the county.

Payne County is primarily an agricultural county. Corn, wheat, cotton, and forage crops are produced extensively. Stock-raising in connection with farming is an important industry. Alfalfa does well in the valleys along the Cimar-

ron River and its tributaries.

Oil and gas have been found in paying quantities in various sections of the county. The discovery of the famous Cushing field and its early development into a major oil producing and refining center has long been known and realized more than any other oil producing center in the state. However, the region known generally as the Cushing field includes a greater area than one would ordinarily include in the Cushing territory. Yale, Drumright, Quay, and Oilton are not located in Payne County. Yet, when we explain the meaning of the term "Cushing Field", it includes these regions just mentioned because of the fact that Cushing is an oil refining and oil storage center. It is due to the refining and the storage of oil that Cushing has become famous more than the production of oil and gas. And it is more so in the light of our study that some districts have become and have remained a great source of wealth due to these economic factors. Cushing at one time was known to the oil industry to have the greatest tank farm in the United States, if not the largest in the world. This storage industry extended over a wide area, including several school districts that profited much from this great source of revenue. It was from this source of wealth, the storage and refining of oil brought into this county through great network of pipe-lines and trunk-lines, that made the great source of difference in the valuations of various school districts within Lincoln and Payne Counties.

In addition to the great taxable wealth brought into Payne County from the sources just mentioned, there is another great advantage derived from such concentration of wealth, and that is the wealth-using activities of man that is always experienced in such commercial enterprises. The number of men employed and the vast pay-rolls of these employed is of no little factor in determining the economic conditions within a locality. This advantage is also reflected in the schools of these fortunate districts.

Of all the advantages and disadvantages of one county might well be comparative to the other until we study the economic conditions, then one is compelled to admit that there is a great difference in the two counties in this respect. And it is in this respect that the schools of Payne County and Lincoln County furnish us a basic study of the inequalities in educational opportunities within the State of Oklahoma.

Social Conditions

The social life of man has developed many complex phases, among which might be included art, government, industry, education, morality and religion. These are merely some of the products of the social life of man. It may be said that the school is two-fold in its institutional significance. It is an educational institution, we all agree, but it is also a social institution because it furnishes the most systematic association of individuals outside the home. The individual is an expression of the social life

surrounding him. Perhaps there is no better way of judging the efficiency of our schools than to study the products of our educational institutions. On the other hand society is largely an expression of the individual character.

A community may be judged by many social factors, but the more important of these are communication and transportation. In this respect Lincoln and Payne Counties may again be compared. Both counties are well supplied with transportation facilities. Railroads traverse the counties in various directions to the extent that the most remote district in either county can be reached by nearby roads.

Both counties have paved highways running from East to West making contact with Tulsa and Oklahoma City. Payne County has also paved road running from South to North making connections with Highways 64 on the North and 33 on the South. Highway 18, an untreated gravel road extends through both counties from North to South making connections with Pawnee on the North and Shawnee on the South.

Another great social factor in Payne County is the location of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Stillwater. However, the influence of this great school is not limited to the county boundary lines, for its influence is felt far beyond these counties. The influence of the college as a social factor cannot be over estimated.

There are other social factors at work in these counties, but most of them are common within Lincoln and Payne as of other counties in the state. There is one other great

social factor that we shall treat briefly, not because of its insignificance as a social factor nor for the lack of value to our study, but due to the limited reliable material that we are able to collect by way of statistical information that will give conditions in general.

Religious Conditions And Activities

As we have just stated above, that the limited material that we are able to collect on the religious conditions in both counties will not be sufficient to use as picturing the religious conditions in general. But it is believed that great good can be derived from these facts as presented, for they will at least show us that the religious life of these counties is being woefully neglected.

According to records of the Oklahoma Every Community Survey of 1926, there were at that time 115 Church organizations among the Protestant bodies in Lincoln County, and 66 in Payne County. Of the religious activities of these churches the following percentage of the population in that county were being reached, Lincoln County 24.7% and Payne County 30.4%. Of the total membership of the above church organizations there were in Lincoln County 8,280 and Payne County 9,184.¹

The most recent report available of any survey on religious conditions within any given community within the two counties was one made by the Agra Baptist Church in

¹Oklahoma Every Community Survey, of the National Home Mission Council. Rev. E. N. Comfort, Norman, Oklahoma Sect., 1926

March 1935. It was the authors privilege while pastor of the above named church to sponsor a survey of the religious conditions in the Agra Community. With the able assistance of a number of the adult members of this church, the territory was mapped out by districts and two persons were assigned as captains to direct the taking of the census within each district. The territory to be covered comprised sixty four square miles, each district being four squar miles. The territory was completely covered and very accurate information was gathered by each group. The only part of this territory not included in this report is the one-half of the Northeast quarter, being a strip two miles long equally dividing the Northeast quarter.

The results found in this survey are as follows:

Population, 936, including those of all ages. The report by ages were grouped by tens in the following manner-number reported ages of 1-10 were 232, being 25% of total population. Those from

11-20	were	230,	being	less	than	25%	of	population
21-30	"	140	"	"	"	15%	"	"
31-40	"	112	"	"	"	12%	"	"
41-50	"	89	"	"	"	9-2/3%	"	"
51-60	"	51	"	"	"	5 1/2%	"	"
61-70	"	47	"	"	"	5%	"	"
71-80	"	31	"	"	"	3 1/2%	"	"
81-90	"	4	"	"	"	.004%	"	"

Those attending Sunday School at all were 362, which

included the regular and the irregular attendances. Those attending Church services either full time or part time were 416. This included part-time preaching services which were conducted in some communities. Number reporting as professed Christians were 426. Number reporting as member of some Church, 364. Church membership by each denomination as reported, Baptist 109; Methodist 73, Christian 60, Quaker 35, True Followers 29, Church of the First Born 14, Luthern 14, Penticostal Holiness 12, Nazarine 8, United Brethern 7, Congregational 3.

Grouping the results of Church membership on the percentage basis are as follows:

Percent of population reported as professed Christians, 39%, Church affiliations 33.69%, Attending Sunday School 33.78%, Attending Church Services 35%.

Church programs with regular time reported were: Churches having full time work 2, 1/2 time 2, and number of organized Sunday Schools where no church reported 4, number Sunday Schools where Church located 6. Number of denominational Churches within territory 10.

Number of professed Christians were 426

Number of non-professed " 298

Non-professions by ages, 60 yrs." 10, 50 yrs. were 23

70 " " 23, 40 " " 2

80 " " 1, 30 " " 3

CHAPTER II

EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS

Taking into consideration the vast wealth in our great state and particularly the facts presented in the previous chapter under the topic of Economic Conditions, one would think that there would be no need for any school district to suffer for want of money or adequate school facilities under such conditions. But only one side of the picture, the economic conditions of the country as a whole and not in any particular part, was presented in the previous discussion. Facts shall be presented in the present study to show that the conditions as previously stated are not the general conditions within our study, but rather the exception. And, it is these exceptions that make our present educational system the most undemocratic and the most unequal in advantages and opportunities.

Most people have a common conception that man is by creation, born free and equal. Children are taught in our schools the declaration of equality to all men everywhere. Looking into our present educational system and finding the inequalities in opportunities so apparent, one is made to question the sincerity in our teaching of equality. If these inequalities in our educational system had just been discovered of late, one might feel a bit excusable. But, on the contrary, our representatives in legislatures have faced the cry of educators from the first session to the last, to equalize the educational opportunities in our state.

The study of the development of Oklahoma Educational system is of great interest. The first legislative act relative to the present school problem was under Act of Congress of 1890, Oklahoma Territory was organized. One of the provisions of this Act was to extend to the new Territory various laws of Nebraska, in so far as they were "locally applicable," and that these laws should remain in force until after adjournment of the first session of the Territorial Legislature.

The settlement of Oklahoma Territory became very rapid from the first opening 1889, to the time the Territory was organized on May 2, 1890. During this time no legal form of government existed, and the maintenance of an adequate school system was impossible. Since no form of state support for schools had been provided, the only school system was by subscription, and this was left to the discretion of the towns. By the Federal Act organizing the Territory the legislature was empowered to provide for a school system. Accordingly, sections 16 and 36 in each township were set aside for school purposes and became known as "School Land." An appropriation of \$50,000 was also made for the immediate use of schools to be established by the legislature.¹

The first legislature, which was in session in 1890-'91, passed a detailed school law making the township the local unit of school organization, providing for a Territorial board of education and for a Territorial superintendent and

¹Report of a Survey of Public Education in Oklahoma, 1922.

county superintendents of schools, prescribing a system of certification of teachers, and otherwise setting the school system in motion under Oklahoma enactments. The township form of organization only remained in operation two years, for the new school law of 1893, displaced the township with the district unit of local control.

The first Territorial legislature provided for the establishment of the University of Oklahoma, at Norman; the Agricultural and Mechanical College, at Stillwater, and a State Normal School, at Edmond. Normal schools were later established at Alva, in 1897, Weatherford in 1901. The Colored Agricultural and Normal University, at Langston, was established in 1897, and the University Preparatory School at Tonkawa, in 1901.

The Curtis Act of 1898 authorized the incorporation of towns and the maintenance of town schools, but made no provision for a public school system for white children up to the time of the State's admission in 1907.²

The development of Oklahoma Educational system under Statehood was very much of a continuance of the system set under Territorial Period. The Act admitting the State to the Union included several provisions relating to education. (1) "In lieu of sections 16 and 36 and other lands of Indian Territory," Congress appropriated \$5,000,000 for the common schools of the State. (2) Section 13 in each township of

²Report of a Survey of Public Education in Oklahoma, 1922.

certain open Indian reservations and of all other lands opened to settlement in the Territory of Oklahoma were for the benefit of the higher institutions. Each receiving a share as set forth in this Act. (3) Provided a State levy of 3 1/2 mills on an ad valorem basis for the support of common schools. (4) Authorized a county tax of 2 mills for county highschools and the common schools, with the proviso that not more than one mill of this amount could be used for highschool purposes. (5) Authorized district levies, including town and city districts, to the amount of 15 mills, with an additional ten-mill levy permitted for building purposes.

The Article on "Education" directed the legislature to (1) establish and maintain a system of free public schools for all children of the State, (2) to establish and maintain institutions for the care and education of the deaf and the blind, (3) to provide separate schools for the white and colored children, (4) to enact school attendance legislation for children between the ages of 8-16, (5) to provide for a uniform system of text books, (6) to provide for instruction in common schools in agricultural subjects and household arts.³ (7) Provided for an ex-officio State Board of Education to supervise instruction in the public schools and to retain its composition as then prescribed until otherwise provided by law.

³ Extracts from Report of a Survey of Public Education in Oklahoma, 1922.

The first State legislature met in the fall of 1907, and remained in session until the spring of 1908, without enacting any fundamental amendment to the school law as it existed under territorial government.

The second legislature met in the fall of 1909, and this session seemed as dilatory in the enacting of any notable school law as was the first. The Act of March 8, 1901, authorizing the establishment of a county highschool was repealed, with some provisions for the schools that had already been established under this act. An act providing for the establishing of three additional State normal schools was enacted.

The third State legislature met in 1911, and made the first important enactment for educational advancement for the common schools. An Act provided for a State Board of Education with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, ex-officio member, and six members appointed by the governor for overlapping terms of six years. This board was to have general supervision of the public schools, to formulate the course of study and the certification of teachers.⁴

The most important acts of the fourth legislative session which met in 1913, was to extend aid to Union Graded and Consolidated schools, the enacting of a law to provide state aid for districts unable to maintain a school term of five months with a ten-mill levy. But this amendment

⁴Extracts from Report of a Survey of Public Education in Oklahoma, 1922.

failed when submitted to the people. Another amendment was enacted which provided for the tax on public service corporations operating in more than one county to be paid into the State School Fund. The necessary supplementary legislation for this act to be effective was never enacted.

The 1915 session passed laws relating to consolidation and transportation of pupils who live more than two miles from school under certain provisions of the law. A special session was held in 1916 in which the "gross production tax" on asphalt, certain metal bearing ores, crude oils, and natural gas was to aid the common schools of the counties in which these products were produced. The sixth and seventh as well as each succeeding legislative session passed only laws of minor importance to the question of equalizing educational opportunities in the system. It was not until House Bill 212, enacted by the fifteenth legislative session, was in force that the schools were receiving any material help from the state. With the enactment of this bill, came the Primary and Secondary Aid to all districts within the state that could qualify for such aid by law.

Without question, House Bill 212 made the first great major change in our educational system for constructive improvement and correction of the inequalities in the entire system. This bill, however, was enacted for only a period of two years or until the enactment of House Bill 6 by the last legislature, which superceded House Bill 212 in its entirety. Although it appears that the schools will exper-

ience a somewhat setback under the present law, yet there are many good features to be seen that point to even better conditions since the Primary and Secondary Aid feature of the previous bill were retained with some modifications.

Since numerous sessions of the legislature have failed to make the necessary school laws, the future generation will be compelled to pay the price of the present generation's failures and blunders. If Oklahoma had the proper method of school finance and administration for her rural schools, with her great wealth of natural resources and with proper management, she would soon scan the heights of educational progress and advancement.

Some children have by their accidental birth, been reared in communities where they have access to the best educational opportunities that money and conditions can afford, while others have been unfortunate in that they were born in one of those communities where regardless of effort made on the part of the citizens toward a good school, are forced to attend school where facilities and opportunities are so limited that it is impossible for them to have the advantages afforded pupils in the more fortunate communities.

"Equality of opportunity is the essence of democracy. The purpose of a public school system is, or should be to guarantee to every child, regardless of the accident of birth, an equal opportunity to obtain whatever type of education is provided by the state. Such equality of opportunity implies that every child shall be enabled to attend school as many days as any other child, to receive instruction from a well-trained teacher and in a suitable building, to be transported to school if the

walking distance is too great, and to receive the kind of training that may reasonably be expected to make him a happy and useful member of society."¹

The present district unit system of school organization was an enactment of the second legislature during Territorial Period of 1893. Under provisions of this act the authority was invested in a local board of education elected by the citizens of the respective districts. Oklahoma now has 4,816 of these units of organized school districts, varying in size from a one teacher school to 1,000 teachers. Districts are classified as independent and dependent for the whites and separate districts for the colored children. All districts having a city of the first class or an incorporated town and four year highschool are independent districts. Districts not meeting the requirements for independent are classed as dependent.

According to the Brookings Institute Report of 1935, Oklahoma has 3,136 one-room schools in the dependent districts; and 1,189 two-room schools in the same class. The teachers of these districts have less professional training and least experience. The report further states that Oklahoma apparently, has progressed about as far as it can until the artificial barriers in the form of district lines are removed.¹

¹Brookings Institute Report, 1935.

TABLE I
GENERAL INFORMATION OF SCHOOLS BY COUNTY

	LINCOLN COUNTY		PAYNE COUNTY	
	<u>Grade</u>	<u>H.S.</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>H.S.</u>
NUMBER OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS				
Common Districts	109	1	67	2
Union Graded	0	1	0	0
Consolidated	1	1	7	5
Independent	2	9	5	2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	112	12	79	9
One-Teacher Schools	85		67	
Two-Teacher Schools	22		5	
Three or more Teacher	3		7	
SCHOOL BUILDINGS				
Wood	94	0	65	0
Brick	9	12	7	9
Stone	6	0	1	0
Concrete	3	0	1	0
ORIGINAL COST OF RURAL BLDGS.				
Sights	\$31,025.00		\$10,258.00	
Furniture and Fixtures	48,925.00		58,911.00	
Buildings	181,525.00		361,738.00	
Instructional App.	25,050.00		12,132.00	
PRESENT VALUE OF BLDGS. AND CONTENTS				
	\$274,375.00		\$330,160.00	
INSURANCE IN FORCE	\$223,150.00		\$297,146.00	
SCHOOLS DISORGANIZED, 1936-'37		5		2 (1)

1. County Superintendents reports of Lincoln and Payne Counties.

From the general report of County Superintendents shown on Table I, we note that Lincoln County has a total of 85 one-room schools, 22 two-room and 3 having three or more teachers. Making a total of 112 dependent grade schools in the county, and two dependent highschoools. One of these 12 schools is a consolidated district Con. 2, with a valuation of \$4,013,843. This is almost twenty five times the valuation of district 141 which is the lowest in rank of wealth in the county. Consolidated 2 has more than six times the average daily attendance of district 141. Consolidated 2 has more than eleven times the valuation of the next district in rank of wealth. This district has a valuation of more than one-fourth of the total valuation of all rural districts in the county. And more than 75% of the total value of all urban districts in the county.

Payne County has a total of 67 one-room schools, 5 two-room and 6 three or more teacher schools. This is a total of 79 schools that are rural in the county. Seven of the 79 schools are consolidated districts and are furnishing transportation for their grade pupils. The wealth of Payne County schools is very unequal. The highest valuation of all rural districts is Consolidated 6 which has a valuation of \$3,380,543. The district ranking the lowest in valuation is district 61, with a valuation of \$34,613. Consolidated 6 has a valuation more than nine times that of 61, and a little less than one-sixth of the total valuation of all rural schools.

In the report for Lincoln County, only one district, Consolidated 2, had a valuation of enormous wealth. While in Payne County there are four schools that rank above the million dollar mark. Consolidated 6, \$3,380,543; Dist. 98, \$2,758,834; Consolidated 4, \$1,389,222 and Consolidated 7, \$1,074,690. These four districts have a combined valuation of \$8,603,289. More than half the valuation of all rural districts of the county, and more than 95% of the total valuation of all urban districts in the county. The total valuation of all urban districts in the county is \$9,436,803. The number of dollars of taxable property per pupil in average daily attendance in the above named districts will show further inequality in the study. District 98 ranks first in valuation per pupil in average daily attendance with \$42,444; Consolidated 6, \$39,771; Consolidated 4, \$19,556; Consolidated 7, \$13,778.

A study from the table on valuation per pupil in average daily attendance we find that the four districts ranking the lowest in the county are 102, \$973; 9, \$1,101; 99, \$1,569; and district 94, \$1,594. District 98 has more than 43 times the valuation per pupil in average daily attendance as district 102 has, but district 102 has more than two and on-half times the number of pupils in average daily attendance that district 98 has.

District 98 has a tax rate of 1.2 mills, and district 102 has a tax rate of 11.2 mills. In comparing the effort with the valuations and average daily attendance, we find

that district 102 puts forth more than nine times the effort to support education for their 173 pupils in A.D.A. as does district 98 for their 63 pupils in average daily attendance.

From this table is also presented facts as to comparative value of buildings, type of material in construction, the original cost of buildings, fixtures and apparatuses. From these figures it will be seen that Payne County exceeds Lincoln County in many respects, especially in those districts in which the valuation is high. Without exception, Payne County has fewer rural schools including the one and two teacher schools and more than twice as many three or more teacher schools. This condition is due to the high valuation of some districts in which they have added territory and are furnishing transportation for grade pupils to attend school.

From the preceding table II we find the total number of teachers employed in each county is the one, two and three or more teacher schools in the rural districts, and rural or urban highschoools. A comparative number of these teachers are women. Lincoln County has a total of 85 one-teacher schools, of which 26 are men and 59 are women teachers. There is a striking comparison of the number of men and women teachers in the various school systems of the county. For instance, in the one-teacher schools, there are more than twice as many women as men. While in the two-teacher schools the number of women out number the men more than three times. In the three or more teacher schools,

there are more than three times as many women as men, but in the highschools there are 42 men compared to 94 women. This is a little more than twice the difference.

In Payne County, the number of women teachers compared to that of men, runs very much the same as that of Lincoln County. In the one-teacher schools, the number of women with that of men teachers is greater than in Lincoln County. The number of women are 46 compared to 13 men teachers. The two-teacher schools run near the same number in the employment of sex, the number of women out numbering the men more than three times. And the highschool teachers compare favorably with that of Lincoln County, there are 63 men teachers and 142 women teachers employed.

These figures do not show any material advantage or disadvantage in the employment of more women than men, except in the one-teacher schools where Lincoln County has almost half as many men as women teachers, where Payne County has more than three times as many women teachers in the one-teacher schools as that of men.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED IN THE ONE, TWO,
THREE OR MORE TEACHER SCHOOLS AND IN
THE HIGHSCHOOLS OF EACH COUNTY
1936-1937

COUNTY	ONE TEACHER:		TWO TEACHER:		THREE OR MORE:		HIGHSCHOOL	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
Lincoln County	26	59	11	33	3	10	42	94
Payne County	13	46	5	7	6	18	63	142
Totals	<u>39</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>236</u>

TABLE III
 PREPARATION OF TEACHERS IN VARIOUS DIVISIONS
 IN EACH COUNTY, LISTING COLLEGE
 HOURS AND STANDARD DEGREES

COLLEGE PREPARATION	LINCOLN COUNTY TEACHERS		PAYNE COUNTY TEACHERS	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
County Cert.	1	0	2	1
Less than 60 hrs.	15	1	6	2
60 to 89 hrs.	73	18	35	12
90 to 124 hrs.	24	18	24	33
Standard Degree				
A.B.	26	88	21	120
M.S.	3	6	5	37
Special Certificates				
Music	0	6	2	4
Manual Art	0	3	0	2

In table III, will be found the preparation of teachers in the various divisions in each county. The number of College hours and standard degrees are listed accordingly for each district. In Lincoln County the lowest rated teacher in college preparation is one rural teacher who has only a County teachers Certificate, while in Payne County there are three with such qualifications. Two of these are teachers in rural schools and one in small town school.

The number in each county with less than 60 college hours is, Lincoln County has 15 rural teachers and one urban teacher, while Payne County has 6 rural and two urban. The number having from 60 to 89 college hours, is Payne County has 35 rural and 12 urban, and Lincoln 73 rural and 18 urban. The number having from 90 to 124 college hours, but without degree, Lincoln County has 24 rural and 18 urban, while Payne County has 24 rural and 33 urban. From these figures it will be noted that a number of the small highschools have teachers employed in the grades who rank low in college preparation; this is more so in Payne County than in Lincoln County.

Teachers in each division having a standard degree are, Lincoln County has 123 teachers out of the 278 who have standard degrees. Of this number 29 are rural teachers and 94 are urban. In Payne County there are 183 teachers out of 300 teaching in rural and urban schools that have standard degrees. The percentage of degrees is higher in Payne County than in Lincoln County.

TABLE IV
RANGE OF SALARY PAID TEACHERS IN HIGH SCHOOL BY DISTRICTS
(Lincoln County)

DISTRICT	TEACHERS	TOTAL SALARY PAID TEACHERS	RANGE IN LOWEST	SALARY SCHEDULE HIGHEST	AVERAGE
1	23	\$23,312.50	\$675	\$2,750	\$1,013.58
54	19	20,367.00	765	2,420	1,071.94
UG3	17	14,935.00	675	2,100	878.53
103	14	14,224.50	765	1,932	1,016.11
CD1	12	12,804.00	630	2,354	1,067.00
95	10	8,950.00	675	1,750	895.00
134	7	6,844.00	810	1,420	977.71
105	7	6,604.00	630	1,420.	943.43
UG1	8	6,783.00	765	1,332	847.88
107	6	5,500.00	720	1,360	916.67
125	6	5,455.00	765	1,360	909.17
77	7	6,574.00	765	1,420	939.14
County-136		<u>\$132,353.00</u>	<u>\$630</u>	<u>\$2,750</u>	<u>\$972.45</u>

(Payne County)

16	58	\$70,115.00	\$450.	\$3,600	\$1,208.45
67	63	62,905.00	720	2,400	998.49
103	22	22,794.75	756	2,700	1,036.14
CD3	15	15,563.50	720	2,156	1,037.56
CD56	14	15,336.00	459	1,974	1,024.00
CD1	9	8,163.00	675	1,837	907.00
98	9	12,220.00	1,080	2,500	1,357.78
101	8	7,090.50	450	1,525	886.25
CD2	7	6,684.00	720	1,824	954.86
County-205		<u>\$220,871.75</u>	<u>\$450</u>	<u>\$3,600</u>	<u>\$1,077.42</u>

TABLE V

SALARY DISTRIBUTION BY CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL

SALARY SCALE	LINCOLN COUNTY SCHOOLS COMMON SC. HIGHSCHOOL	PAYNE COUNTY SCHOOLS COMMON SC. HIGHSCHOOL
Less- 300	1	-
300-399	2	1
400-499	9	-
500-599	19	14
600-699	50	8
700-799	18	28
800-899	19	4
900-999	20	30
1,000-1,099	-	27
1,100-1,199	-	3
1,200-1,299	1	3
1,300-1,399	1	51
1,400-1,499	1	3
1,500-over	1	2
	136	93
	105	205

Table IV gives the salary paid highschool teachers in each county. The lowest annual salary paid teachers in Lincoln County is \$630.00, while in Payne County the lowest is \$450.00. The highest salary paid in Lincoln County is \$2,750.00, while in Payne County this was \$3,600.00. The average salary paid teachers in Lincoln County was \$972.45, and in Payne County the average was \$1,077.42. There is more difference in the salary paid teachers in Payne County than in Lincoln County. This is due largely to the fact that some districts have more money to spend on schools than others, and also there are some who have higher qualifications, since their schools are members of the North Central Association of Schools.

Table V gives the range of salary paid rural teachers in each County. It was found that the lowest salary paid any teacher in Lincoln County was \$300.00, and the highest ranged within the \$1,500.00. The highest in Payne County ranged within the \$1,300.00, and the lowest in the \$400.00. The larger percentage of salaries paid were in the lower bracket. There were only three rural teachers in Lincoln County and six in Payne County who received salaries ranging in \$1,300.00 and over.

The only noticeable difference in salaries paid in the two counties was in the wealthier districts, and these were from two to three or more teacher schools.

TABLE VI

PERSONNEL REPORT OF HIGHSCHOOLS WITHIN EACH COUNTY

(Lincoln County)

DIST- TRICT	TEACH- ERS	EXPERIENCE			TENURE			AGE		
		HIGH:	LOW:	AV.	HIGH:	LOW:	AV.	HIGH:	LOW:	AV.
1	23	22	1	9.8	22	1	6.3	50	23	32.2
54	19	32	1	8.1	25	1	3.5	55	21	31.0
UG3	17	23	1	4.8	12	1	2.9	42	21	26.4
103	14	23	1	11.3	16	1	5.4	58	22	35.4
95	10	13	1	6.5	10	1	4.0	35	22	26.4
CD1	12	13	1	5.6	7	1	1.8	33	21	26.0
134	7	12	3	5.6	8	1	3.6	36	20	27.6
105	7	16	1	6.7	4	1	1.4	35	24	28.6
77	7	17	2	6.9	8	1	3.4	48	22	29.4
UG1	8	13	4	7.1	8	1	4.1	38	22	29.2
107	6	13	2	7.3	3	1	2.0	41	22	30.0
125	6	14	3	6.3	7	3	4.3	33	22	27.3
County	<u>136</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.5</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>29.6</u>

(Payne County)

16	58	36	1	13.3	26	1	6.7	59	20	34.2
67	63	37	1	9.7	19	1	6.5	65	21	33.3
103	22	31	1	10.2	22	1	3.1	51	22	32.0
CD3	15	21	1	9.7	9	1	3.7	42	21	32.5
CD56	14	24	1	10.3	23	1	5.8	46	22	32.1
CD1	9	10	1	3.3	5	1	1.9	34	20	24.3
98	9	32	4	16.5	12	2	7.1	58	26	40.2
101	8	10	1	5.5	4	1	2.0	34	22	27.2
CD2	7	20	1	6.4	2	1	1.4	43	23	29.3
County	<u>205</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>33.3</u>

Table VI gives us a personal report of highschoools within each county. Particular attention should be given to the years of experience, the tenure of service and the age of teachers in each county. In Lincoln County the teacher having the greatest number of years of experience was in District 54 (Stroud), this teacher has had 32 years teaching experience and 25 of these have been in this system. In Payne County, is one a bit better. In District 67 (Cushing), one teacher has had 37 years experience and 19 of which have been in that system. The lowest in each county, of course, is one year. The average for Lincoln County is 7.5 and Payne County, 10.5.

The tenure of service is Lincoln County, highest 25 years, and the average is 3.9. In Payne County the highest is 26 and the average is 5.5.

The age of teachers shows a distinct contrast in the number of teachers. Lincoln County records show that the oldest teacher in service is 58 years, and the youngest is 20, while the average age is 29.6. In Payne County, the oldest teacher in service is 65 and the youngest 20, while the average for this county is 33.3.

TABLE VII

JAN 12 1939

RANGE OF TEACHER EXPERIENCE IN RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOLS

YEARS	LINCOLN COUNTY		PAYNE COUNTY		YEARS	LINCOLN CO.		PAYNE CO.	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban		Rural	Urb.	Rural	Urb.
1	16	14	7	22	21	0	1	1	7
2	21	12	9	17	22	1	1	1	1
3	5	13	5	9	23	0	1	0	2
4	14	16	4	10	24	0	0	0	3
5	10	8	12	9	25	0	0	0	0
6	10	6	4	9	26	0	0	0	0
7	14	7	5	10	27	0	0	1	4
8	12	3	4	9	28	0	0	1	0
9	2	8	7	20	29	0	0	1	1
10	4	13	3	11	30	0	1	1	2
11	6	5	4	6	31	0	0	0	1
12	3	7	6	12	32	0	1	0	1
13	3	7	6	5	33	0	1	0	0
14	2	5	5	2	34	0	0	0	1
15	3	1	2	4	35	0	0	0	0
16	0	3	1	4	36	0	0	0	1
17	0	2	0	2	37	0	0	0	1
18	2	0	2	5	38	0	0	0	0
19	1	0	1	5	39	0	0	0	0
20	1	0	1	7	40	0	0	0	1

Table VII, the range of experience of teachers in rural and urban schools show that Lincoln County has 16 rural teachers with one year experience and 14 urban teachers. Lincoln County has 4 rural and 13 urban, while Payne County has 5 rural and 11 urban teachers with 10 years experience. Lincoln County has 1 rural and no urban teacher with 20 years experience. Payne County has one rural and 7 urban. With 30 years experience, Lincoln rural none and urban 1, Payne County has 1 rural and two urban. Lincoln and Payne Counties each have one teacher who has had 40 years experience teaching in the rural schools.

The noticeable fact about the age of teachers is that many of the older teachers have entered into other business and thereby have enabled more of the younger bracket to teach. However, this fact cannot be counted to the betterment of the teaching service for the greater percent of our teachers only have from 1 to 4 years teaching experience.

TABLE VIII A
VALUATION OF RURAL DISTRICTS OF LINCOLN COUNTY
ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK IN WEALTH

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK
Con. 2	\$4,013,843	1	42	\$118,235	24
9	344,466	2	21	116,876	25
90	236,797	3	41	112,122	26
61	216,868	4	65	108,145	27
53	215,140	5	16	106,974	28
72	201,561	6	44	105,231	29
30	184,819	7	39	104,149	30
126	180,823	8	31	103,530	31
66	173,421	9	96	101,637	32
83	162,950	10	25	100,197	33
110	158,642	11	40	96,439	34
50	158,842	12	34	95,479	35
84	154,577	13	11	93,253	36
68	150,240	14	8	87,009	37
59	146,050	15	19	82,984	38
52	144,115	16	4	82,743	39
51	143,427	17	7	82,471	40
139	141,703	18	92	79,520	41
18	137,473	19	89	79,030	42
43	135,672	20	44	78,746	43
133	135,623	21	123	76,600	44
91	134,349	22	108	75,945	45
17	134,123	23	14	75,539	46

TABLE VIII B
VALUATION OF RURAL DISTRICTS OF LINCOLN COUNTY
ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK IN WEALTH
(continued)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK
81	\$75,398	47	5	\$61,155	70
6	75,215	48	113	60,745	71
67	74,679	49	36	58,958	72
38	73,572	50	112	58,636	73
64	72,623	51	135	58,360	74
75	72,472	52	106	57,647	75
26	70,693	53	121	56,321	76
79	69,750	54	28	54,271	77
114	69,331	55	71	54,172	78
86	68,733	56	87	53,986	79
94	67,335	57	37	52,625	80
46	66,841	58	35	52,576	81
124	66,471	59	132	52,229	82
88	66,111	60	102	51,461	83
130	64,709	61	32	51,197	84
138	64,354	62	47	50,485	85
76	64,271	63	80	49,910	86
18	64,052	64	14	49,598	87
27	63,520	65	82	46,824	88
15	63,417	66	60	46,798	89
20	63,182	67	3	46,434	90
140	62,832	68	J9	43,981	91
93	61,251	69	93	42,917	92

TABLE VIII C
 VALUATION OF RURAL DISTRICTS OF LINCOLN COUNTY
 ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK IN WEALTH
 (continued)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK
2	\$41,939	93	97	\$32,690	102
118	41,401	94	119	32,215	103
85	40,650	95	111	30,170	104
100	38,530	96	23	29,879	105
24	37,803	97	12	29,356	106
101	37,745	98	109	28,116	107
116	35,139	99	70	21,318	108
13	33,623	100	141	16,121	109
48	32,745	101			

TABLE IX A
VALUATION OF RURAL DISTRICTS OF PAYNE COUNTY
ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK IN WEALTH

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK
Con. 6	\$3,380,543	1	9	\$88,092	24
98	2,758,834	2	15	87,602	25
" 4	1,339,222	3	38	83,649	26
" 7	1,074,690	4	99	83,179	27
47	852,023	5	4	80,426	28
51	646,724	6	12	80,396	29
" 8	585,925	7	2	80,063	30
" 2	421,352	8	8	77,834	31
104	175,263	9	33	77,071	32
102	168,314	10	68	75,523	33
43	147,062	11	21	75,456	34
18	146,647	12	86	74,916	35
5	143,307	13	35	74,230	36
91	142,681	14	58	74,027	37
93	141,954	15	37	73,191	38
27	110,680	16	36	73,062	39
52	102,706	17	28	72,168	40
41	102,396	18	72	72,113	41
7	101,256	19	59	71,949	42
65	100,871	20	40	70,498	43
6	92,529	21	23	68,061	44
53	92,441	22	32	67,208	45
90	91,940	23	69	67,090	46

TABLE IX B
 VALUATION OF RURAL DISTRICTS OF PAYNE COUNTY
 ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK IN WEALTH
 (continued)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION OF DISTRICT	RANK
29	\$66,513	47	19	\$58,796	59
13	66,505	48	82	58,415	60
11	65,387	49	14	57,586	61
46	65,143	50	73	56,730	62
31	64,983	51	105	55,392	63
92	63,542	52	62	51,141	64
83	63,265	53	66	48,747	65
37	63,225	54	95	48,340	66
17	61,725	55	96	46,836	67
1	61,234	56	50	43,011	68
88	59,101	57	94	41,489	69
45	58,902	58	61	34,613	70

Table VIII gives the valuation of rural districts of Lincoln County and ranks the districts according to their wealth. It will be found that the great difference in the type of schools and their rating as per efficiency is largely determined by the valuation of the district. In rank of wealth, Consolidated school district 2, ranks first, having a valuation of \$4,013,843.00. This is a rural school teaching from grades one to eight inclusive. This district has a valuation greater than the combined valuation of all cities and towns in the county. Total valuation of towns and cities is \$2,619,370. When this amount is subtracted from the amount of \$4,013,843, we have a difference of \$1,404,473. These facts present a most vivid picture of the inequalities of our present educational system, especially in the way of financing our schools. We further see from this comparison that Consolidated District 2 has a valuation per pupil in average daily attendance in that school of 75,740, while the next school district 9, ranks second with a valuation of \$17,222. per child in average daily attendance. This is more than four times the amount of valuation behind each pupil in average daily attendance of one district with that of the next district in rank. Another fact in this respect is that Consolidated 2 has a tax rate of 1.61 while the highest tax rate is for district 43, Fallis, of 12.14 mills. Again we may compare the valuation behind each pupil in average daily attendance taking the highest and the lowest and we find that with Consolidated 2, with

a valuation of \$1,005 per pupil. More than 75 times as much valuation per pupil in Consolidated 2 as the lowest ranking school, District 28.

Table IX, in like manner, gives us another glimpse of the inequalities in educational opportunities afforded under our present school system. These figures give us the valuation of rural districts of Payne County according to their rank. We find that Consolidated District 6 has a valuation of \$3,380,543 ranking first among all schools of the county. District 61, ranks last with a valuation of \$34,613. This is a difference of more than 90 times that of district 61. The next four districts in rank have more than 1/3 the valuation of the one in first rank. Yet the district in fifth rank has a little more than 1/4 the valuation of that of first rank.

These figures present the vast difference in wealth of the various districts of each county, thereby providing a better school system for the pupils of the wealthier school districts.

Table X and XI further show that the districts ranking first in valuation ranks first in valuation per pupil in average daily attendance. That is to say that these districts have a much higher valuation than other districts, but they are not taxed for educational purposes as much as other districts, and neither are they educating as many pupils accordingly. This is gross inequality in the distribution of school funds to where the greatest number of

pupils attend school.

Table XII gives the number of dollars of taxable property per pupil in average daily attendance in the urban school districts. These facts are very much the same as that of the rural districts, in that they also show a vast difference in the taxable property in various districts per pupil in average daily attendance. However, one can account for the difference in the urban schools, due to the amount of taxable property in each district. Also a difference can be expected here in the higher qualifications of the teachers, the broader scope of studies, special schooling in various fields, and greater operating expense.

There are some exceptions in this vast difference in the case of District 98, Norfolk, a rural highschool teaching grades from 1-12 inclusive, having a higher pupil valuation than District 16, Stillwater. Even though Norfolk is a rural school, her valuation would permit her to have an investment in school equipment almost equal to that of the larger schools of the county, yet she has only a small percentage of pupils to be educated in proportion to the number of the larger schools.

What is true with Payne County in this respect is also true in Lincoln County. There are a few districts in which the greater wealth is located, yet the number of pupils in attendance is small.

TABLE X A
 NUMBER OF DOLLARS OF TAXABLE PROPERTY PER PUPIL IN
 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN EACH DISTRICT
 (Lincoln County)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK
Con. 2	\$75,740	1	75	\$5,177	24
9	17,222	2	110	5,117	25
91	11,197	3	21	5,077	26
50	10,722	4	71	5,019	27
53	9,779	5	66	4,926	28
51	9,562	6	43	4,846	29
34	9,547	7	52	4,804	30
72	8,398	8	31	4,705	31
2	8,387	9	61	4,518	32
68	7,954	10	5	4,508	33
30	6,845	11	90	4,385	34
20	6,318	12	7	4,346	35
81	6,286	13	84	4,175	36
16	5,941	14	124	4,154	37
139	5,905	15	79	3,875	38
83	5,819	16	114	3,852	39
39	5,785	17	17	3,815	40
18	5,728	18	14	3,815	41
126	5,619	19	26	3,725	42
41	5,606	20	25	3,711	43
11	5,485	21	J9	3,657	44
42	5,376	22	135	3,648	45

TABLE X B
 NUMBER OF DOLLARS OF TAXABLE PROPERTY PER PUPIL IN
 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN EACH DISTRICT
 (Lincoln County)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK
59	\$5,216	23	123	\$3,648	46
97	3,632	47	15	2,642	70
108	3,616	48	44	2,631	71
65	3,605	49	92	2,565	72
46	3,523	50	85	2,541	73
96	3,504	51	40	2,527	74
64	3,458	52	37	2,505	75
102	3,431	53	130	2,489	76
23	3,319	54	8	2,485	77
140	3,307	55	3	2,453	78
89	3,293	56	35	2,389	79
19	3,191	57	29	2,345	80
4	3,064	58	32	2,325	81
98	3,062	59	86	2,217	82
106	3,034	60	38	2,163	83
104	3,029	61	138	2,145	84
6	3,008	62	82	2,128	85
36	2,947	63	94	2,104	86
13	2,802	64	12	2,096	87
78	2,785	65	93	2,056	88
49	2,715	66	100	2,027	89
24	2,700	67	141	2,015	90

TABLE X C

NUMBER OF DOLLARS OF TAXABLE PROPERTY PER PUPIL IN
AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN EACH DISTRICT

(Lincoln County)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK
76	\$2,678	68	111	\$2,011	91
88	2,644	69	70	1,935	92
80	1,919	93	27	1,588	102
101	1,887	94	67	1,567	103
133	1,865	95	113	1,557	104
112	1,675	96	118	1,533	105
116	1,673	97	87	1,349	106
60	1,671	98	47	1,328	107
132	1,632	99	109	1,222	108
119	1,611	100	48	1,169	109
121	1,609	101	28	1,005	110

TABLE XI A
 NUMBER OF DOLLARS OF TAXABLE PROPERTY PER PUPIL IN
 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN EACH DISTRICT

(Payne County)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK
98	\$42,444	1	87	\$4,863	24
Con. 6	39,771	2	21	4,714	25
" 4	19,556	3	86	4,645	26
" 7	13,778	4	31	4,641	27
18	7,332	5	32	4,480	28
" 8	6,869	6	41	4,452	29
" 90	6,567	7	2	4,213	30
" 92	6,342	8	15	4,171	31
104	6,288	9	Con. 2	4,132	32
23	6,187	10	33	4,056	33
4	6,186	11	7	4,052	34
35	6,185	12	12	4,009	35
58	6,168	13	83	3,954	36
5	5,971	14	62	3,933	37
36	5,620	15	40	3,913	38
65	5,603	16	8	3,708	39
72	5,547	17	93	3,569	40
43	5,447	18	82	3,436	41
17	5,143	19	68	3,432	42
91	5,096	20	52	3,313	43
27	5,030	21	46	3,256	44
11	5,029	22	105	2,915	45
6	4,869	23	51	2,811	46

TABLE XI B
NUMBER OF DOLLARS OF TAXABLE PROPERTY PER PUPIL IN
AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN EACH DISTRICT

(Payne County)

(Continued)

DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK
28	\$2,698	47	88	\$2,118	59
59	2,664	48	73	2,101	60
38	2,536	49	53	2,054	61
13	2,463	50	30	2,048	62
69	2,443	51	95	1,934	63
66	2,437	52	47	1,835	64
14	2,399	53	19	1,781	65
1	2,267	54	61	1,618	66
29	2,224	55	94	1,594	67
37	2,217	56	99	1,509	68
45	2,181	57	9	1,101	69
96	2,119	58	102	973	70

TABLE XII
NUMBER OF DOLLARS OF TAXABLE PROPERTY PER PUPIL IN
AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN URBAN DISTRICTS

PAYNE COUNTY			LINCOLN COUNTY		
DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK	DISTRICT NUMBER	VALUATION PER PUPIL IN A.D.A.	RANK
*98	\$26,527	1	U.G.3	\$2,236	1
Con. 4	2,772	2	Con.1	1,661	2
16	1,998	3	77	1,651	3
103	1,905	4	54	1,545	4
Con. 56	1,682	5	1	1,377	5
Con. 3	1,089	6	103	1,291	6
101	838	7	*U.G.1	1,125	7
			125	997	8
			107	913	9
			134	715	10

In order to simplify matters for the reader, we designate the school districts in the above table by name.

*98	Norfolk, a rural highschool, therefore, listed with Urban schools for this study.				
16	Stillwater		U.G.3	Davenport	
103	Yale		Con.1	Wellston	
Con. 56	Perkins		77	Sparks	
Con. 3	Ripley		54	Stroud	
101	Glencoe		1	Chandler	
67	Cushing(Records un- available)		103	Prague	
			*U.G.1	Rural Highschool	
			125	Tryon	
			107	Kendrick	
			134	Agra	

Records were not available for Meeker 95 and Carney 105.

TABLE XIII
 ASSESSED VALUATION
 1935-1936

PERSONAL, REAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE PROPERTY BY COUNTIES
 (Lincoln County)

PERSONAL	REAL	PUBLIC SERVICE	TOTAL WEALTH
\$4,118,943	\$7,369,557	\$7,562,506	\$19,051,006
21.6%	38.7%	39.7%	100%

(Payne County)

\$9,040,143	\$11,744,939	\$5,217,588	\$26,002,670
34.8%	45.2%	20%	100%

DOLLARS SPENT BY EACH COUNTY TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

County	Subdivision Taxing Unit	Cost Per Pupil In A.D.A.	Valuation per Pupil In A.D.A.
Lincoln	Urban	\$17.44	\$1,472.32
	Rural	23.44	4,837.86
Payne	Urban	16.46	1,650.13
	Rural	44.03	7,860.98

Note: There were 10 schools reported out of 12 for Lincoln County and 8 out of 9 schools for Payne County in the above calculations.

Table XIII gives the assessed valuation in personal, real, and public service property in each county.

Lincoln County has less than one-half the assessed valuation in personal property as that of Payne County. 21.6% of the property in Lincoln County is personal property. Payne County has a total of 34.8% in personal property. Lincoln County has 38.7% of real property, and Payne County has 45.2%. Lincoln County has 39.7% in Public Service property, and Payne County has 20%. Lincoln County exceeds Payne County in assessed valuation only in Public Service valuation. But when we take into consideration the entire county wealth, Payne County has a total wealth of \$26,002,670 compared with \$19,051,006 for Lincoln County.

The table further shows that Lincoln County spends \$17.44 per pupil in average daily attendance for her urban schools and \$23.44 for her rural schools. Payne County spends \$16.46 for her urban schools and \$44.03 for rural school support. Lincoln County has a rural valuation per pupil in average daily attendance of \$4,887.85, and for urban schools \$1,471.32. Payne County has \$7,860.98 per pupil for rural and \$1,650.13 for urban school children in average daily attendance.

TABLE XIV
EFFORT PUT FORTH BY EACH DISTRICT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

(Lincoln County)
Rural

DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGETH OF TERM	DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGETH OF TERM
2	none		137	28	8.89	9.05	156
3	3.67	3.6	158	29	9.95	1.19	149
4			176	30	.90		169
5			157	31	.04		157
6			150	32	10.62		169
7	7.94		154	36			156
8	1.31		172	37			160
9	1.08	1.64	176	38	10.74		156
11	6.50		174	39	.55		175
12	5.05		135	40	4.62		170
13	8.83		154	41	5.58		177
14	4.25		155	42	.96		155
15	3.86	7.12	160	43			180
16	3.37		175	44	3.05		175
17	3.05		173	46	5.76		155
18	4.92		178	47	5.18		155
19	4.75		154	48			160
20	4.57		155	49	2.71		180
21	4.04		170	50			160
24	10.00		156	51	3.68		173
25			178	52	1.44		178
26		2.5	175	53	2.35	2.89	179
27			155	55	5.03		154

TABLE XIV B
EFFORT PUT FORTH BY EACH DISTRICT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

(Lincoln County)
Rural

DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM	DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM
58	2.55		154	86			150
59			176	87	7.93		176
60	6.33		172	88			158
61	4.13		174	89	10.34		174
64		4.98	175	90	6.18		174
65	12.50	1.80	175	91	.88		179
66	4.68	1.16	177	92	4.50	5.92	160
67	7.67		157	93	9.53		170
68	6.73		180	94	2.42		170
70	11.03	9.65	121	96	2.62		149
71	12.23		170	97	6.32		156
72	2.86		180	98	.56		160
75	8.73		155	100	4.48		155
76	1.00		160	101			156
78		2.27	160	102	.50		157
79	3.45	2.09	173	104	.61		160
80	5.94	5.06	180	106	1.48		154
81	2.51	3.45	179	108		2.40	151
82	8.42		177	109	10.85	10.50	170
83	2.68		180	110	5.72		175
84	.83		155	111	7.48		140
85	9.08		156	112			154

TABLE XIV C
EFFORT PUT FORTH BY EACH DISTRICT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION
(Lincoln County)
Rural

DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM	DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM
113	4.05	2.20	156				
114	9.23		175				
116	4.34		171				
118	6.70		176				
119	7.77		163				
121	7.00		176				
123	.95		153				
124	8.08		156				
126	3.58		173				
130			155				
132	10.95		152				
133	3.80		153				
135	4.24		173				
138	10.70		175				
139	10.00		175				
140	11.89		177				
141	8.70		170				
Con.2	1.61		171				
J9	10.45		171				
JC3	10.65		170				

TABLE XV A
EFFORT PUT FORTH BY EACH DISTRICT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION
(Payne County)

DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM	DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM
1			155	33			160
2	5.51		157	35	6.08		155
4	4.89		160	36	1.60		180
5	4.08		172	37			153
6	4.43		177	38		5.31	160
7	3.98		174	40	13.04		160
8	7.33		174	41	12.66	3.91	148
9	6.45		156	43	6.00		180
11	2.98		180	45	4.89		171
12			160	46	1.73		156
13			151	47	1.55		173
14	2.10		159	51	6.47		175
15			180	52	4.62		175
17	7.91		156	53	10.24		180
18	3.27		171	58	7.56		173
19	8.26		157	59	5.03		158
20			177	61	5.40		173
21	9.94		173	65	.71		157
23	2.35		180	66	5.34		157
27			180	67	7.13		158
28	7.76		156	69	.37		160
29			156	72	9.86		148
30	1.77		176	73	2.20		158
31	1.76		156	82	4.49		154
32	6.40		158	83	5.69		176

TABLE XV B
EFFORT PUT FORTH BY EACH DISTRICT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

(Payne County)
Rural

DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM	DIST- RICT	GENERAL LEVY	SINKING FUND	LENGTH OF TERM
86	8.68		179				
87	12.88						
88	1.04		153				
90	6.32		176				
91	8.37		178				
92	11.80		183				
93	12.93		164				
94	6.38		169				
95	2.29		160				
96	10.53		180				
99	8.71		175				
102	11.20		171				
104	8.37		180				
105	10.71		175				
Con.2	13.20		178				
Con.4	8.90		170				
Con.6	4.48		167				
Con.7	13.05	.17	170				
Con.8	12.37	6.50	173				

Table XIV and table XV gives the effort put forth by each rural district to support education in the respective county, and also gives the amount of sinking fund each district pays. The length of term is also given in order that we may correlate the length of school term with the ability to support education in that district. It is noticeable that school districts as a whole have the length of term for which they are able to pay, however, there are a few exceptions to this rule. For instance, District 2 does not pay a general fund levy nor a sinking fund levy, yet they had 137 days of school. District 12 has a general fund levy of 5.05 mills and 135 days of school. District 24 has a general fund levy of 10 mills and 156 days of school. District 65 has a general levy of 12.5 mills and a sinking fund levy of 1.80 mills, and 175 days of school. District 70 has a general fund levy of 11.03 and a sinking fund of 9.65 and 121 days of school. There is a close relation th the value of districts and the type of school within a given district. In Payne County the same thing is true, in that the length of term is governed largely by the ability of the district to support education. Districts 41 and 72 are both listed as having 148 days in school attendance. District 41 has a general levy of 12.66 mills and a sinking fund of 3.91 mills. District 72 has a general levy of 9.86 mills and no sinking fund levy. The number of consolidated schools within the county are listed as five, and each of these districts have a relatively high general levy, and

only two, Consolidated 7 and 8, have sinking fund levies.

In comparison the two counties vote levies necessary to support their respective schools; Payne County has only four districts carrying a sinking fund levy, while Lincoln County has nineteen. The average length of term of school in both counties ranges about 165 days of school term. As a general rule, taxes for support of schools in Lincoln County is higher than that of Payne County. With exception of the few districts having an unusual taxable wealth in the districts, the counties rank about the same in school opportunities. However, it is these few exceptions that make the outstanding inequalities so noticeable. Lincoln County has only one rural school with excessive wealth of over a million dollars in assessed valuation, while Payne County has four. None of the urban schools in either county have excessive wealth.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is a brief summary of each of the preceding chapters with some definite conclusions relative to the educational opportunities available in the two counties under study. The facts revealed in the study have a direct and important bearing upon the state's policy of organization, administration, and supervision of schools in Oklahoma.

SUMMARY

The extent of this survey. In the beginning the author proposed to make a comparative study of the equality in educational opportunities available in various schools in the selected counties and to use this information as a sample of conditions in general, prevailing under our present educational system. The rural and urban schools of Lincoln and Payne Counties, Oklahoma are included in this study.

The specific need for the study. There is every reason to believe that the present educational system is very inadequate to meet the needs of the present day. Our greatest need in making necessary corrections in the present system is accurate information concerning the inequalities in educational opportunities in our rural and urban school districts and such presentation of these facts as will arouse the people to force legislative actions to correct the defects that are so paramount.

Source of Data. Data concerning the inequalities in educational opportunities in this thesis was secured from various records of the County Superintendents of Lincoln and Payne Counties; reports made by the Research Division of the Oklahoma Tax Commission; Preliminary report of the Oklahoma State Planning Board of the year 1936; Records from the County Assessors' offices and other official reports from the State Department of Education; but the greater helps concerning the inequalities were secured by personal survey of the communities in which the schools were located and through conversations with the various teachers and patrons from the two counties included in our study.

Findings of this Study. To find the inequalities in educational opportunities of Lincoln and Payne Counties, it was necessary to get an accurate statement of facts about all districts of the territory included in this study. For convenience these facts are grouped together in tables in such manner as to show with accurate account the data pertaining to each district in comparison to other districts.

The majority of rural schools included in this survey find it difficult to operate because of lack of finances, whereas, other schools have few or no financial troubles and are able to have a full term of school without a noticeable school tax placed on their district. Many of these schools without financial burden have plenty of equipment, good buildings and well qualified teachers, and are still paying a comparative low tax.

On the other hand, there are schools with very little equipment, poor buildings, poorly qualified teachers, and short terms, but are still paying a 15 mill levy school tax, which is all the law will allow.

The relative effort of districts in each county was determined by calculating the amount of money a district can raise in relation to the type of school, the enrollment of pupils on a pupil-teacher ration, and the current expense of the school, which would give the per capita cost per pupil in each district. The average daily attendance represents the number of children that are actually being educated within that respective district. The lack of ability of any district represents a low valuation of taxable property behind each child that is being educated in that district.

The present system of taxation for schools fails to provide equality in educational opportunities. Furthermore, it makes any approach to equality impossible. If the rural and urban schools were equally able to support education and equally zealous for education, there would be no need for a change in our financing and management of schools. But, facts here presented show that the districts are not equally able and neither are they equally zealous for education.

It was found that many communities are exerting themselves far beyond their strength, while at the same time a large number of wealthier districts are escaping any real

effort in the support of their schools. It is further seen from these facts that a large majority of our boys and girls attend school in these unfortunate localities and are being deprived of the educational advantages afforded in the more fortunate districts.

"Every great American Democrat, from Thomas Jefferson to Woodrow Wilson, has insisted that without a system of free universal education, democracy is doomed. Equality in education is brief, but accurate statement of the supreme educational purpose of every State in our union."¹

"It is well known that as a group the rural schools constitute a peculiar problem in American education. Since education has largely been administered as a local district affair, and since the bulk of the wealth has in recent years been concentrated in the urban centers, the schools located in the open country and in the small populated centers have more frequently suffered from undersupport than the city schools. As a group they have consequently fallen behind in the march of educational progress, and often they have actually retrogressed."²

"Equality of opportunity is the essence of democracy. The purpose of a public school system is, or should be, to guarantee to every child, regardless of the accident of birth, an equal opportunity to obtain whatever type of education is provided by the state. Such equality of opportunity implies that every child shall be enabled to attend school as many days as any other child, to receive instruction from a well-trained teacher and in a suitable building, to be transported to school if the walking distance is too great, and to receive the kind of training that may reasonably be expected to make him a happy and useful member of society."³

-
1. Oklahoma Educational Survey, 1922.
 2. Walter H. Gaumnitz, National Educational Association, Bulletin No. 3, 1932
 3. Brookings Institute Report, Survey of Oklahoma, 1936

"Glaring inequalities in the amount of money districts could raise for the support of their schools has existed since before statehood.

With increase of wealth and development of industries these inequalities increased. The amount of money per child which could be collected on a 15 mill tax levy varied from \$1.50 to \$1,125.00. In other words, one district was 750 times as able to support its educational program as the other. He strikingly illustrated his point by calling attention to the fact that one school could have operated nine days on 15 mills and another 180 days on one-third of a mill."¹

The inequalities of cost, effort, and ability that exist in the rural and urban districts, when compared with that of the larger systems, warrants a change in methods of financing and management of the public schools of Oklahoma. A striking example of inequalities is seen when we compare the educational opportunities afforded in the one, two, and three-teacher schools, with that of the larger school systems.

In summing up the chief weakness of our educational system, as is revealed in the study of both counties, we find that the great source of our difficulties lies in the small school. Particularly is this true of the one, two, and three-teacher schools, and also the small urban schools.

The weakness as found in this study shows:

1. Poor light, heating, ventilation, and seating.
2. Lack of recreational facilities.
3. Low school attendance, and irregularity.
4. Improper building and play ground facilities.
5. Poor supervision and management of building and grounds.

1. A. L. Crable, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Harlow's Weekly, p. 6, February 12, 1938.

6. Teacher personal, qualifications, tenure and experience.
7. Low salary paid teachers.
8. Average Daily Attendance low.
9. Greater number of pupils drop from school before completing local school.
10. Narrow curriculum of studies.
11. Old district system failed to give democratic system of schooling.
12. Lack of zeal for education in rural districts.
13. Inability to finance.

Equal opportunities for every boy and girl cannot exist unless there is an approximate equality in the support of our schools. Therefore, before any approach to equality can be made, there must be a change in our financing and management of schools. A number of surveys have been made and results with recommendations have been given, but no official action has been taken that would change the organization of districts and the management of our schools. Perhaps the reason for no official action being taken on the matter is that our officials are too sensitive to public opinion on matters of any change from our present school system. But it is the opinion of the author that if such action is delayed until the public asks for it, that it will never be changed and our educational system will continue to lag in keeping with the times.

Perhaps the most far-reaching of the recommendations in a change thus far have come from the Citizens' Committee on Education. However, there have been several other proposed plans for reorganization, including the one from the State Department of Education on the County Unit System. Although this proposed plan failed by legislative veto,

another similar plan, but perhaps less drastic, is being sponsored by the State Department of Education. All of these plans for reorganization have many features in common, and all seem to agree on the elimination of the State's one-room school. The present plan that is being proposed by Mr. Holley and Mr. Ramsey of the State Department of Education does not set up districts on a county-wide basis.

The principal elements of the Holley-Ramsey proposal are:

1. Nine months of school for every district.
2. Not less than 12 years' instruction in any district.
3. No student to live more than an hour's bus ride from school.
4. Minimum number of teachers and pupils in one school as follows:
 - 1-Grades one to six, six teachers and 165 pupils;
 - 2-Grades one to eight, eight teachers and 235 pupils;
 - 3-Grades 7-9, seven teachers and 185 pupils;
 - 4-Grades 7-12, seven teachers and 170 pupils;
 - 5-Grades 9-12, seven teachers and 155 pupils;
 - 6-Grades 10-12 seven teachers and 155 pupils;

Larger units provide better schools in the way of trained teachers, broader curricula, better supervision, and more efficient administration, according to the plan.

It appears that a plan that would provide for the state to raise the money and have a general tax for schools based on the ability to pay and apportionate money according to need of program, would be a remedial matter from the standpoint of finance.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gaumnitz, W. H., Comparative Status of Secondary Education in Rural and Urban Communities. Department of Interior, Rural School leaflet No. 44, June 1923.
2. Chamberlain, L. M. and Meece, L. E., The Local Unit of School Administration in the United States. Volume 8, No. 3, March 1936.
3. Gaumnitz, W. H., Brammell, P. Roy, and Ferriss, Emery N., The Smaller Secondary Schools. Department of Interior, National Survey of Secondary Education, Bulletin No. 17, 1932.
4. Vaughan, J. S., Executive Secretary, Oklahoma Educational Survey Commission. Public Education in Oklahoma, 1922.
5. Muerman, J. C., Transportation of Pupils at Public Expense, Department of Interior. Rural School Leaflet No. 2, 1922
6. Vaughan, John, Financing Oklahoma Schools, December 1930
7. Anonymous, Oklahoma's Plan to Reorganize, Re-Finance and Redeem Its Public Schools.
8. Anderson, Carl and Hart, Superintendents of Lincoln and Payne Counties, respectively.
9. Harland, E. W., Preliminary Report of the Oklahoma State Planning Board. 1936
10. Comfort, Rev. E. N., Oklahoma Every Community Survey. National Home Mission Council. 1926.
11. Harlow, Victor E., Harlow's Weekly, February 1938.
12. Crable, A. L., State Superintendent's Annual Report. 1937
13. Research Division of the Oklahoma Tax Commission Survey. County Survey of School Districts. 1937.
14. Oklahoma Almanac, Oklahoma Publishing Company, 1931.
15. Religious Survey, Lincoln County Oklahoma, 1935.

This Thesis Typed by:

Cecil Cox
214 Hanner Hall
Stillwater, Oklahoma