

Summer 1967

# A survey of the general characteristics of local Virginia School Board members

Frank Alton Cosby

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>

---

## Recommended Citation

Cosby, Frank Alton, "A survey of the general characteristics of local Virginia School Board members" (1967). *Master's Theses*. Paper 276.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu).

A SURVEY OF THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF  
LOCAL VIRGINIA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty of the  
University of Richmond

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science in Education

---

by  
Frank Alton Cosby

August 1967

LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
VIRGINIA

APPROVAL SHEET

The undersigned, appointed by the Chairman of the Department of Education, have examined this thesis by

Frank Alton Cosby, B. A.

Candidate for the degree of Master of Science in Education, and hereby certify their approval of its acceptance.

Edward F. Overton  
Edward F. Overton, Ph. D.  
Chairman, Department of Education  
University of Richmond

Calvin H. Phippkins  
Calvin H. Phippkins, Ph. D.  
Former Professor of Education,  
Limestone College  
Visiting Lecturer in Education

W. Roland Galvin  
W. Roland Galvin, M. A.  
Principal, Westhampton Junior  
High School  
Visiting Lecturer in Education

Date: 13 July 1967

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator is indebted to many individuals who graciously assisted in the preparation of this study. Most investigators incur obligations, but I feel my debt is heavier than most.

Special thanks are due the individual local school board members who painstakingly completed the questionnaire mailed by the investigator. Without their responses this study would not have been possible.

The members of the graduate faculty in Education at the University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia, also need recognition. Their discerning guidance and stimulus to scholarship over the past five years have given me the inspiration needed in order to complete this program. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Edward F. Overton, Chairman of the Department of Education, for his many suggestions and guidance on the manuscript, much to the benefit of the final version.

Finally, the debt one never manages to acknowledge fully--the debt to one's family. My wife, Mary Page, helped with suggestions at every stage of the work. It was her continued patience and understanding that ultimately led to the completion of this study. Additional thanks are also due my wife for the many hours spent typing the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem. . . . .	1
Statement of the problem . . . . .	1
Sources. . . . .	1
Distribution and Limitations . . . . .	2
Distribution . . . . .	2
Response . . . . .	4
Limitations. . . . .	4
Organization . . . . .	7
II. BACKGROUND OF SELECTED AREAS . . . . .	8
General Statistics . . . . .	8
Area population. . . . .	8
Area economy . . . . .	11
Education. . . . .	11
Legal Basis for Composition of Local Boards. . . . .	14
Selection. . . . .	14
Exceptions . . . . .	15
III. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LOCAL VIRGINIA	
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS . . . . .	16
General Information. . . . .	16
Age group. . . . .	16
Sex of board members . . . . .	19
Marital status . . . . .	19

CHAPTER	PAGE
Children of board members. . . . .	19
Local board member occupations . . . . .	22
Occupations of spouses . . . . .	26
Religious preferences. . . . .	26
Education completed by board members . . . . .	29
Places of birth of board members . . . . .	32
School Board Experience. . . . .	32
Summary. . . . .	37
IV. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION. . . . .	39
Living Accomodations . . . . .	39
Home ownership . . . . .	39
Improvements desired . . . . .	42
Cultural and recreational participation. . . . .	43
Club Membership. . . . .	44
Civic groups . . . . .	44
Volunteer groups . . . . .	44
Church activities. . . . .	48
Youth groups . . . . .	48
Social organizations . . . . .	48
Fraternal groups . . . . .	48
Leadership . . . . .	49
Proposed Additional Recreational Facilities. . . . .	49
Summary. . . . .	52
V. PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS. . . . .	54

CHAPTER	PAGE
Friends and Leisure Associates . . . . .	54
Confidential friends . . . . .	54
Closest friends. . . . .	55
Leisure time associates. . . . .	55
Satisfaction with associations . . . . .	60
Desired Changes in Personal Associations . . . . .	60
Summary. . . . .	61
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	62
General Summary. . . . .	62
Introductory background. . . . .	62
General characteristics. . . . .	62
Community participation. . . . .	64
Personal associations. . . . .	65
Conclusions. . . . .	66
Limitations. . . . .	66
Profile of local board member. . . . .	66
Community activities . . . . .	67
Personal relationships . . . . .	68
Recommendations for Additional Studies . . . . .	68
School board - administration relationships. . . . .	69
Selection and qualifications of local school board members. . . . .	69
Compensation of school board members . . . . .	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	72

PAGE

APPENDICES . . . . . 73

    Appendix A. Questionnaire . . . . . 74

    Appendix B. Accompanying Explanatory Letter . . . . . 75

    Appendix C. Follow-up Postal Card . . . . . 76

    Appendix D. Letter to Superintendent. . . . . 77

    Appendix E. Improvements Desired by Respondents . . . . . 78

    Appendix F. Club Membership of Respondents. . . . . 80

    Appendix G. Recreational Participation of Respondents . . . . . 81

    Appendix H. Additional Recreational Facilities  
                Respondents Would Support . . . . . 82

    Appendix I. Desired Changes in Personal Associations  
                by Respondents. . . . . 84

    Appendix J. Additional Comments by Respondents. . . . . 86

VITA . . . . . 89



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Response of Board Members from Areas Surveyed . . . . .	5
II. Population and Economy of Selected Areas. . . . .	9
III. School Enrollment, Teachers, Administrators and Average Teacher Salary, 1965. . . . .	12
IV. Age Group and Sex of Respondents. . . . .	17
V. Respondents' Marital Status, Children and Age Group of Children . . . . .	20
VI. Occupation Grouping of Respondents and Their Spouses . . . . .	23
VII. Religious Preferences of Respondents. . . . .	27
VIII. Education Completed by Responding Board Members . . . . .	30
IX. Birthplaces of Responding Board Members . . . . .	33
X. Length of Service of Responding Board Members . . . . .	35
XI. Number of Years in Residence. . . . .	40
XII. Membership in Community Clubs and Organizations . . . . .	45
XIII. Organization Leadership Characteristics of Responding Board Members. . . . .	50
XIV. Closest Friends of Respondents. . . . .	56
XV. Leisure Associates of Respondents . . . . .	58

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Geographic Location of Divisions Surveyed . . . . .	3

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The individual citizens who are responsible as school board members for the operation of public schools have a very heavy responsibility in their communities. The public is often unaware of such responsibilities and is sometimes critical of the decisions made by their boards. In many cases even the obvious accomplishments of local boards go unnoticed.

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the primary purpose of this study to offer a general view of the social characteristics of the local Virginia school board member. An attempt was made to evaluate and analyze some of the social features of these individuals. It was believed that this would perhaps contribute to a better understanding of some of the varied reactions of local school boards.

Sources. The major source of information used to develop this study was the questionnaire which was compiled by the investigator and which is included in Appendix A. All seven criteria listed by Whipple in Whitney's, The Elements of Research, were followed in compiling this questionnaire. The questionnaire is similar to one

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederick L. Whitney, The Elements of Research (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 142.

used by the investigator for an undergraduate study of Hanover County school teachers while a student at Randolph-Macon College in Ashland, Virginia.<sup>2</sup> This latter project was directed by Dr. Franklin Ross Jones, now Dean of the School of Education at Old Dominion College in Norfolk, Virginia.

Other sources of information were used to establish background statistics on the areas surveyed. Credit for such sources is recorded in the bibliography. The Virginia State Board of Education cooperated by supplying the necessary mailing lists of local school board members and division superintendents.

## II. DISTRIBUTION AND LIMITATIONS

Distribution. The questionnaire was mailed to 355 individual school board members throughout the state of Virginia. Board members of forty-eight county divisions and eighteen cities were included in the survey. Two basic considerations used in selecting these divisions were size and geographic location. The geographic location of the divisions used in the study is shown in Figure 1.

The explanatory letter that accompanied the questionnaire is included in Appendix B. This letter offered a brief introduction to the project and urged school board members to respond by returning the questionnaire to the investigator. A follow-up postal card was

---

<sup>2</sup>Frank A. Cosby, "The Study of Certain Socio-metric Aspects of Hanover County School Teachers" (unpublished Bachelor's thesis, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va., 1961)



mailed ten days later and served as a reminder for those who had not replied. This card is shown in Appendix C.

Another letter was mailed to the superintendent of each division surveyed. This letter<sup>3</sup> requested each superintendent to urge his board members to respond to the study. Suggestions and criticisms were welcomed from each superintendent.

Response. The response by individual board members to the questionnaire was very good. Of the 355 who were mailed questionnaires, 261 or 73.5 per cent responded. Table I shows the number of board members responding in each division surveyed. No response pattern can be determined as board members of both large and small areas replied.

Limitations. That there were certain limitations in a study of this type is acknowledged. Nevertheless, considering the enthusiasm of many board members and the percentage (73.5) of them submitting completed questionnaires, the representations presented here can be considered fairly adequate.

No accounting was made of the members who failed to reply to the questionnaire nor of those board members not included in the study. However, the possibility does arise that of the number not surveyed many would have responded had they been given the opportunity. Nevertheless, the material results very likely would have remained

---

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix D.

TABLE I

## RESPONSE OF BOARD MEMBERS FROM AREAS SURVEYED

County	Number of members	Number responding	Percentage responding	County	Number of members	Number responding	Percentage responding
Accomack	6	4	67	James City	4	3	75
Albemarle	6	5	83	King and Queen	3	2	67
Alleghany	5	3	60	Lancaster	4	4	100
Amherst	5	3	60	Lee	5	2	40
Arlington	5	3	60	Loudoun	6	5	83
Augusta	6	6	100	Montgomery	4	4	100
Botetourt	3	3	100	Nansemond	5	4	80
Buckingham	6	4	67	Northumberland	4	2	50
Caroline	4	3	75	Nottoway	4	4	100
Chesterfield	6	2	33	Orange	5	3	60
Clarke	5	5	100	Page	4	2	50
Culpeper	5	4	80	Patrick	5	3	60
Dickenson	5	2	40	Prince William	5	5	100
Dinwiddie	5	5	100	Roanoke	6	4	67
Fairfax	7	5	71	Rockingham	4	4	100
Fluvanna	4	3	75	Smyth	6	4	67
Franklin	8	4	50	Southampton	7	5	71
Giles	5	5	100	Spotsylvania	5	3	60
Gloucester	3	2	67	Surry	3	3	100
Greene	3	1	33	Tazewell	3	2	67
Halifax	8	7	88	Warren	5	5	100
Hanover	3	3	100	Washington	10	9	90
Henrico	4	4	100	Wythe	5	5	100
Highland	3	3	100	York	7	5	71
County totals	120	89	74 av.	County totals	119	92	81 av.

TABLE I (continued)

City	Number of members	Number responding	Percentage responding
Alexandria	9	8	81
Bristol	5	4	80
Covington	5	3	60
Danville	6	4	67
Franklin	5	3	60
Fredericksburg	6	3	50
Harrisonburg	6	5	83
Lynchburg	9	9	100
Norfolk	7	6	86
Norton	3	3	100
Petersburg	9	2	22
Portsmouth	5	5	100
Richmond	5	1	20
Roanoke	7	5	71
Staunton	6	5	83
Waynesboro	5	4	80
Williamsburg	3	3	100
Winchester	9	7	78
City totals	110	80	73 av.
Grand totals	349	261	74 av.



more or less the same.

### III. ORGANIZATION

This study was divided into five parts. Besides the Introduction, Chapter II served to give background information on the areas surveyed. Statistical information involving the selected areas was treated in this chapter. Chapters III, IV and V contain the actual results of the study while the final chapter is devoted to the appraisals and conclusions by the investigator.

## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND OF SELECTED AREAS

Many of the localities included in this study were similar in statistical composition. Such similarities and differences are introduced here in order that the reader may gain additional background knowledge before considering and analyzing the study results.

#### I. GENERAL STATISTICS

Area population. The populations of the examined localities offered a wide range of differences. Highland (population: 3,127) was the smallest county investigated while Fairfax (population: 333,082) was the largest. Table II shows the complete distribution of populations of the surveyed areas. An important observation was that the majority of divisions studied were in the 5,000 to 30,000 population range.<sup>4</sup>

Norton (population: 5,013) was the smallest city selected. Norfolk (population: 321,770) and Richmond (population: 221,150) were, of course, the largest cities investigated. Many of the cities studied have a much larger metropolitan area than the population of their corporate limits indicates. However, since many of their surrounding counties were surveyed on an individual basis, no special

---

<sup>4</sup>Economic Data Summaries, Reports prepared by the Industrial Development and Planning Commission (Richmond: The Governor's Office, 1964-1966).

TABLE II

## POPULATION AND ECONOMY OF SELECTED AREAS

County	Population	Economy	County	Population	Economy
Accomack	29,971	Farming-Fishing	James City	13,923	Farming-Fishing
Albemarle	31,742	Farming-Manufacturing	King and Queen	5,617	Forestry-Farming
Alleghany	12,597	Forestry-Services	Lancaster	9,107	Farming-Fishing
Amherst	23,464	Farming-Manufacturing	Lee	24,536	Mining-Farming
Arlington	181,205	Services-Trade	Loudoun	27,245	Farming-Manufacturing
Augusta	40,143	Farming-Manufacturing	Montgomery	35,544	Manufacturing-Farming
Botetourt	17,472	Farming-Manufacturing	Nansemond	34,212	Farming-Manufacturing
Buckingham	10,658	Mining-Farming	Northumberland	11,158	Fishing-Farming
Caroline	13,296	Farming-Manufacturing	Nottoway	15,398	Manufacturing-Farming
Chesterfield	84,333	Manufacturing-Farming	Orange	13,221	Farming-Manufacturing
Clarke	8,040	Farming-Manufacturing	Page	15,652	Manufacturing-Farming
Culpeper	15,912	Farming-Manufacturing	Patrick	15,491	Manufacturing-Farming
Dickenson	19,485	Mining-Farming	Prince William	50,164	Farming-Trade
Dinwiddie	23,845	Farming-Manufacturing	Roanoke	66,447	Manufacturing-Farming
Fairfax	333,082	Services-Manufacturing	Rockingham	39,559	Farming-Manufacturing
Fluvanna	7,412	Farming-Forestry	Smyth	31,848	Manufacturing-Farming
Franklin	27,326	Farming-Manufacturing	Southampton	20,362	Farming-Manufacturing
Giles	16,835	Farming-Manufacturing	Spotsylvania	15,125	Farming-Manufacturing
Gloucester	12,174	Farming-Fishing	Surry	6,171	Farming-Manufacturing
Greene	4,873	Farming-Forestry	Tazewell	43,698	Mining-Manufacturing
Halifax	33,508	Farming-Manufacturing	Warren	14,933	Manufacturing-Farming
Hanover	29,327	Farming-Manufacturing	Washington	40,849	Farming-Manufacturing
Henrico	129,566	Manufacturing-Trade	Wythe	22,252	Farming-Mining
Highland	3,127	Farming-Forestry	York	26,059	Fishing-Farming

TABLE II (continued)

City	Population	Economy
Alexandria	101,306	Trade-Manufacturing
Bristol	17,432	Manufacturing-Trade
Covington	10,223	Manufacturing-Services
Danville	46,757	Manufacturing-Trade
Franklin	7,650	Manufacturing-Trade
Fredericksburg	14,104	Manufacturing-Trade
Harrisonburg	12,842	Manufacturing-Trade
Lynchburg	56,923	Manufacturing-Trade
Norfolk	321,770	Manufacturing-Trade
Norton	5,013	Mining-Manufacturing
Petersburg	36,946	Manufacturing-Trade
Portsmouth	117,662	Manufacturing-Trade
Richmond	221,150	Manufacturing-Trade
Roanoke	100,720	Manufacturing-Trade
Staunton	23,695	Manufacturing-Trade
Waynesboro	16,956	Manufacturing-Trade
Williamsburg	6,599	Services-Trade
Winchester	15,110	Manufacturing-Trade

<sup>a</sup>Information compiled from Economic Data Summaries prepared by the Virginia Industrial Development and Planning Commission, Richmond, Va., 1964.

consideration will be afforded the cities for the purposes of this investigation.<sup>5</sup>

Area economy. Table II, on the preceding page, has also been used to present the major economy of each area surveyed. Two such economies have been listed and the first was considered the more prevalent. As was indicated, the geographic location of each locality largely determined its economy. Farming was largely predominant among many of Virginia's rural counties. Although agriculture was still the major work in many areas, others were developing different industries for their livelihood. Fishing and the seafood industry were such examples in Virginia's coastal areas. Some counties were almost entirely dependent upon neighboring cities for employment and services. Manufacturing, trade and services were primarily the major economies of all the cities studied.<sup>6</sup>

Education. The size and composition of the school divisions examined differed in the several areas. Enrollments, number of teachers and administrators, and average annual salaries have been compiled and have been reported in Table III.

Fairfax, the most populous county, also had the largest school enrollment with 94,588 pupils. In addition, Fairfax led all other counties in the number of teachers and administrators, having 3,778

---

<sup>5</sup>  
Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>  
Ibid.

TABLE III

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS AND AVERAGE TEACHER SALARY, 1965

County	School enrollment	Number of teachers	Number of admin.	Average teacher salary	County	School enrollment	Number of teachers	Number of admin.	Average teacher salary
Accomack	7,098	259	22	\$4,670	James City	3,094	See Williamsburg City		
Albemarle	7,319	245	19	5,519	King and Queen	1,591	53	5	\$4,602
Alleghany	3,155	109	9	4,843	Lancaster	2,283	82	10	4,858
Amherst	5,061	173	16	4,598	Lee	6,972	231	19	4,830
Arlington	32,349	1,318	115	7,455	Loudoun	7,579	289	25	5,127
Augusta	10,666	396	30	4,823	Montgomery	7,983	273	21	4,842
Botetourt	4,152	168	13	4,667	Nansemond	8,839	290	20	4,869
Buckingham	3,048	112	41	4,679	Northumberland	2,452	100	8	4,724
Caroline	3,434	134	8	4,789	Nottoway	4,187	156	11	4,964
Chesterfield	24,247	909	54	5,035	Orange	3,116	121	10	5,010
Clarke	2,308	77	5	4,835	Page	3,748	144	10	4,607
Culpeper	3,978	152	14	4,868	Patrick	3,984	134	18	4,908
Dickenson	5,394	182	28	4,412	Prince William	21,718	698	51	5,742
Dinwiddie	5,444	173	14	4,977	Roanoke	18,310	649	49	5,112
Fairfax	94,588	3,778	216	6,753	Rockingham	10,577	375	29	4,764
Fluvanna	1,804	86	18	4,672	Smyth	8,090	254	17	4,573
Franklin	6,693	241	21	4,614	Southampton	5,419	180	18	4,873
Giles	4,403	164	20	5,207	Spotsylvania	3,924	148	9	4,872
Gloucester	3,074	113	5	4,739	Surry	1,625	44	2	4,218
Greene	1,132	39	5	4,387	Tazewell	10,668	410	38	4,515
Halifax	8,626	300	39	4,886	Warren	3,860	98	12	4,945
Hanover	7,701	302	20	4,757	Washington	11,247	322	28	4,615
Henrico	34,058	1,299	76	5,290	Wythe	5,488	209	16	4,683
Highland	633	23	4	4,803	York	7,129	245	13	5,334
County				av.	County				av.
totals	280,415	10,751	812	\$5,011	totals	143,773	5,505	439	\$4,648

TABLE III (continued)

City	Public school enrollment	Number of teachers	Number of administrators	Average teacher salary
Alexandria	19,819	794	46	\$6,835
Bristol	3,210	163	13	5,093
Covington	2,345	111	8	5,377
Danville	10,718	454	23	5,041
Franklin	1,565	73	5	5,103
Fredericksburg	2,803	112	7	5,882
Harrisonburg	2,286	119	8	5,366
Lynchburg	11,809	536	41	5,784
Norfolk	62,395	2,304	124	5,884
Norton	1,166	54	1	5,021
Petersburg	9,431	327	29	5,996
Portsmouth	22,863	928	65	5,307
Richmond	40,503	1,899	121	5,755
Roanoke	20,040	855	61	5,619
Staunton	5,026	198	12	5,009
Waynesboro	4,122	175	12	5,457
Williamsburg	1,129	153 <sup>a</sup>	5 <sup>a</sup>	5,344 <sup>a</sup>
Winchester	2,974	131	10	5,292
City totals	224,204	9,386	591	\$5,509 av.
Grand totals	648,392	25,642	1,842	\$5,068 av.

<sup>a</sup>Includes James City County.

<sup>b</sup>Statistics found in this table were compiled from the Annual Report, 1964-65, prepared by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Richmond, Va.

and 216 respectively. Arlington County, however, had the highest average teacher salary of \$7,455. Highland County, on the other hand, had the smallest student enrollment, which totaled 633. Highland schools were staffed by 23 teachers and 4 administrators. Surry County had the lowest average teacher salary of \$4,218.<sup>7</sup>

The total county school enrollment in Virginia was 1,041,147. These pupils were taught by ~~23,708~~<sup>38,848</sup> teachers with an average annual salary of \$5,318. Administrative and supervisory positions in Virginia counties totaled 2,346. The combined administrative and supervisory average annual salary was \$8,019.<sup>8</sup>

City school enrollment in Virginia numbered 378,865. Norfolk had the largest enrollment of 62,395 and Norton ranked lowest with 1,166. Alexandria paid the highest average salary (\$6,835) to its teachers while the average state-wide salary for city teachers was \$5,578. City school systems in Virginia were staffed by 895 administrative and supervisory personnel who earned an average annual salary of \$8,567.<sup>9</sup>

## II. LEGAL BASIS FOR COMPOSITION OF LOCAL BOARDS

Selection. Members of county school boards are appointed by

---

<sup>7</sup>State Board of Education, Annual Report, Report prepared by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Richmond: State Board of Education, 1965), pp. 282-319.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 276-280.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 280-319.



the school trustee electoral board of their counties. A trustee electoral board consists of three resident qualified voters and is appointed by the circuit court of the county. A board member is appointed for each school district in every county.<sup>10</sup>

Unless provided for by city charter, the council of each city has the responsibility of selecting the city's school trustees. Normally, city school board members serve two years while their county counterparts serve for four years.<sup>11</sup>

Exceptions. School board members in counties having a county manager or county executive form of government<sup>12</sup> are selected by a different procedure. The school board members in these counties, who usually number from three to seven, are selected by the county board of supervisors. These board members serve at the pleasure of the board of supervisors.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>State Board of Education, Virginia School Laws, A Bulletin prepared by the State Board of Education (Richmond: The Michie Company, 1963), pp. 43-46.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., pp. 60-62.

<sup>12</sup>These counties are: Henrico, Fairfax, Albemarle and Arlington. Information obtained from question presented to Mr. A. Erwin Hackney, Commonwealth Attorney, Luray, Virginia, June 26, 1967.

<sup>13</sup>State Board of Education, Virginia School Laws, op. cit., p. 59.

## CHAPTER III

### GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LOCAL VIRGINIA

#### SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

It is important that statistical data concerning local school board members be collected and reported from time to time. This provides valuable information concerning the characteristics and interests of the local citizens who manage the public schools. With such information a better understanding of local board actions can sometimes be obtained.

#### I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Age group. The majority of Virginia school board members ranged in age from 41 to 60. Of the total board members surveyed, 66.7 per cent fell in this category. Table IV reveals the age group distribution of the responding board members. Younger board members in the 31 to 40 group comprised only 17.2 per cent of board membership, while older members in the 61 to 70 group accounted for 15.7 per cent. Two individuals indicated being over 70 years of age.

Some interesting differences were revealed in the study of the age groups of local school board members. County board members in the 41 to 60 range accounted for only 60.2 per cent of the membership, while city members in this group numbered 81.3 per cent. The youngest members were evident among county divisions as 20.4 per cent responded in the 31 to 40 group. Only 8.8 per cent of the city members responded

TABLE IV

## AGE GROUP AND SEX OF RESPONDENTS

County	Age group					Sex		County	Age group					Sex	
	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	M	F		31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	M	F
Accomack	0	2	2	0	0	4	0	James City	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
Albemarle	3	1	1	0	0	5	0	King and Queen	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Alleghany	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	Lancaster	1	0	2	1	0	4	0
Amherst	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	Lee	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Arlington	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	Loudoun	0	1	1	2	1	3	2
Augusta	1	3	2	0	0	6	0	Montgomery	0	2	1	1	0	4	0
Botetourt	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	Nansemond	1	1	1	1	0	4	0
Buckingham	0	1	1	2	0	4	0	Northumberland	1	1	0	0	0	2	0
Caroline	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	Nottoway	2	2	0	0	0	4	0
Chesterfield	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	Orange	0	1	1	1	0	2	1
Clarke	0	1	3	1	0	4	1	Page	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Culpeper	2	1	1	0	0	4	0	Patrick	1	1	0	1	0	3	0
Dickenson	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	Prince William	0	1	2	2	0	3	2
Dinwiddie	1	2	1	1	0	5	0	Roanoke	1	1	1	1	0	4	0
Fairfax	2	2	1	0	0	5	0	Rockingham	0	2	2	0	0	4	0
Fluvanna	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	Smyth	1	1	2	0	0	4	0
Franklin	1	0	2	1	0	4	0	Southampton	0	3	2	0	0	5	0
Giles	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	Spotsylvania	1	0	2	0	0	3	0
Gloucester	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	Surry	0	0	0	3	0	2	1
Greene	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	Tazewell	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Halifax	1	3	2	1	0	7	0	Warren	0	3	1	1	0	5	0
Hanover	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	Washington	1	3	4	1	0	8	1
Henrico	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	Wythe	1	2	1	1	0	4	1
Highland	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	York	3	1	0	1	0	4	1
County totals	18	32	25	14	0	85	4	County totals	19	29	23	20	1	82	10

TABLE IV (continued)

City	Age group					Sex	
	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	M	F
Alexandria	1	3	3	1	0	6	2
Bristol	0	3	1	0	0	3	1
Covington	1	0	2	0	0	3	0
Danville	0	2	1	1	0	3	1
Franklin	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
Fredericksburg	0	0	3	0	0	1	2
Harrisonburg	0	5	0	0	0	5	0
Lynchburg	1	4	4	0	0	8	1
Norfolk	1	3	0	1	1	5	1
Norton	0	2	1	0	0	3	0
Petersburg	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Portsmouth	0	3	2	0	0	5	0
Richmond	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Roanoke	0	2	2	1	0	5	0
Staunton	0	2	1	2	0	5	0
Waynesboro	0	3	1	0	0	2	2
Williamsburg	0	3	0	0	0	2	1
Winchester	3	3	0	1	0	6	1
City totals	7	42	23	7	1	66	14
Grand totals	44	103	71	41	2	233	28

in this age group. Table IV on pages 17 and 18, however, shows many more city trustees than county members in the 41 to 50 age group. The oldest board members served county divisions. Approximately 18.8 per cent in the 61 to 70 group held positions in counties while only 8.7 per cent in this group served cities.

Sex of board members. Of the total responding school board members, only 10.7 per cent indicated they were women. This compared with the nationwide 9.7 per cent found by White in his study of local school boards across the United States.<sup>14</sup>

Typically, more women served on Virginia city boards than on county boards. Only 7.7 per cent of county members were women while a much larger percentage (17.5) served in the selected cities.

Marital status. As might be expected, the large majority (98.9 per cent) of local Virginia school board members were married. Information pertaining to marital status of these school board members is presented in Table V. No differences were found among county and city personnel. Both categories appeared to have had about the same percentage of married, single and widowed members. No board members surveyed reported being separated or divorced.

Children of board members. The 261 responding board members

---

<sup>14</sup>Alpheus L. White, Local School Boards: Organization and Practices, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bulletin No. 8 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 21.

TABLE V

## RESPONDENTS' MARITAL STATUS, CHILDREN AND AGE GROUP OF CHILDREN

County	Marital Status			Children & age group				County	Marital status			Children & age group			
	Sin- gle	Mar- ried	Wid- owed	No.	Pre- school	School	Adult		Sin- gle	Mar- ried	Wid- owed	No.	school	School	Adult
Accomack	0	4	0	10	0	7	3	James City	0	3	0	6	0	6	0
Albemarle	0	5	0	13	0	11	2	King and Queen	0	1	1	4	0	2	2
Alleghany	0	3	0	5	0	5	0	Lancaster	0	4	0	7	0	3	4
Amherst	0	3	0	5	0	5	0	Lee	0	2	0	3	1	2	0
Arlington	0	3	0	8	0	2	6	Loudoun	1	4	0	12	0	4	8
Augusta	0	6	0	22	0	17	5	Montgomery	0	4	0	9	0	5	4
Botetourt	0	3	0	7	1	6	0	Nansemond	0	4	0	10	0	5	5
Buckingham	2	2	0	8	0	6	2	Northumberland	0	2	0	11	1	7	3
Caroline	0	3	0	11	2	3	6	Nottoway	0	4	0	13	3	9	1
Chesterfield	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	Orange	0	3	0	5	0	0	5
Clarke	0	5	0	12	0	3	9	Page	0	2	0	6	0	6	0
Culpeper	0	3	1	11	3	7	1	Patrick	0	3	0	9	1	5	3
Dickenson	0	2	0	9	0	0	9	Prince William	0	4	1	15	0	4	11
Dinwiddie	0	4	1	12	0	6	6	Roanoke	0	4	0	11	0	6	5
Fairfax	0	5	0	18	2	12	4	Rockingham	0	4	0	10	0	6	4
Fluvanna	0	3	0	10	0	10	0	Smyth	0	4	0	11	0	5	6
Franklin	0	4	0	12	0	4	8	Southampton	0	5	0	16	0	10	6
Giles	0	4	1	11	0	4	7	Spotsylvania	0	3	0	8	1	4	3
Gloucester	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	Surry	0	3	0	7	0	0	7
Greene	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	Tazewell	0	2	0	8	2	5	1
Halifax	0	7	0	17	0	13	4	Warren	0	5	0	13	1	6	6
Hanover	0	3	0	8	2	4	2	Washington	0	9	0	27	1	12	14
Henrico	0	4	0	8	0	6	2	Wythe	0	5	0	14	1	9	4
Highland	0	3	0	7	0	6	1	York	0	5	0	18	3	11	4
County totals	3	83	3	231	10	142	79	County totals	1	89	2	252	15	132	105

TABLE V (continued)

City	Marital status			Children and their age group			
	Single	Married	Widowed	Number	Preschool	School	Adult
Alexandria	0	8	0	22	0	15	7
Bristol	0	4	0	9	0	6	3
Covington	0	3	0	9	0	6	3
Danville	0	3	1	10	0	6	4
Franklin	0	3	0	9	1	6	2
Fredericksburg	0	3	0	9	0	5	4
Harrisonburg	0	5	0	18	0	11	7
Lynchburg	0	9	0	28	0	18	10
Norfolk	0	6	0	12	1	7	4
Norton	0	3	0	7	0	6	1
Petersburg	0	1	1	2	0	2	0
Portsmouth	0	5	0	15	1	11	3
Richmond	0	1	0	2	0	1	1
Roanoke	0	5	0	12	0	8	4
Staunton	0	5	0	11	0	8	3
Waynesboro	0	4	0	12	0	9	3
Williamsburg	0	3	0	9	0	8	1
Winchester	0	7	0	21	4	12	5
City totals	0	78	2	217	7	145	65
Grand totals	4	250	7	700	32	419	249

indicated having a total of 700 children. No noticeable family size difference was apparent as both county and city school board families averaged almost three children. Table V, pages 20 and 21, also shows the age grouping of each respondent's children. The reported ages were grouped into preschool, school and adult categories. As might be expected, the majority of children were of school age.

Local board member occupations. The categories used to group the occupations held by respondents were the same as those used by the U. S. Office of Education in a 1962 study on Local School Boards: Organization and Practices.<sup>15</sup> The results of board member response are shown in Table VI.

The largest occupation category of local school board members was the business owner-manager-official group. This group accounted for 38.9 per cent of all responding members. Farming ranked second in the total membership with 22.9 per cent while the professional group accounted for 16.8 per cent.

According to the national survey, 34.5 per cent of local school board members came under the business owner-manager-official category. Farming, however, showed only 12.4 per cent in the national study while the professional group figure was 27.4 per cent. Housewives on local Virginia boards accounted for 6.1 per cent of the membership. Nationally, this figure was 7.2 per cent.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., pp. 102, 103.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 24.



TABLE VI

## OCCUPATION GROUPING OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SPOUSES

County	Professional		Manager Official		Business owner		Sales Clerical		Farmer		Skilled		Unskilled		Service		Housewife		Retired	
	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
	Accomack	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Albemarle	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Alleghany	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Amherst	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Arlington	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Augusta	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Botetourt	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Buckingham	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Caroline	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Chesterfield	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Clarke	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Culpeper	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Dickenson	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
Dinwiddie	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Fairfax	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Fluvanna	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Giles	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Gloucester	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Greene	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Halifax	0	3	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Hanover	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Henrico	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Highland	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
County totals	13	14	36	2	2	3	29	0	2	1	0	0	3	4	3	60	1	0	0	0

TABLE VI (continued)

County	Professional		Manager Official		Sales		Farmer		Skilled		Unskilled		Service		Housewife		Retired	
	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
	James City	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
King and Queen	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Lancaster	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Lee	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Loudoun	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
Montgomery	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Nansemond	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Northumberland	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Nottoway	1	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Orange	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Page	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Patrick	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
Prince William	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Roanoke	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
Rockingham	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Smyth	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Southampton	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0
Spotsylvania	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Surry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
Tazewell	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
Warren	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Washington	1	2	2	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0
Wythe	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
York	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0
County totals	13	13	29	4	6	4	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	65	7	1

TABLE VI (continued)

City	Professional		Manager Official		Sales Clerical		Farmer		Skilled		Unskilled		Service		Housewife		Retired	
	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
	Alexandria	1	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	0
Bristol	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
Covington	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Danville	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Franklin	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Fredericksburg	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Harrisonburg	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Lynchburg	2	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0
Norfolk	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	0
Norton	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Petersburg	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Portsmouth	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Richmond	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Roanoke	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Staunton	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Waynesboro	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Williamsburg	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Winchester	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	0
City totals	18	15	39	5	8	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	9	55	2	0
Grand totals	44	42	104	11	16	8	60	0	3	2	0	0	7	5	17	175	10	1

<sup>a</sup>Does not include statistics for one county respondent who failed to report this information.

A considerable difference existed between county and city board members. Almost half (48.7 per cent) of the city trustees were employed in the business owner-manager-official group. Only 35.9 per cent of the county members were employed in this category. Farming ranked second in the counties with 32.8 per cent members engaged in this occupation. The professional grouping ranked second highest in employment categories for city board members and third for county members. The occupation of housewife accounted for 11.2 per cent of city board membership and 2.7 per cent of county membership.

Occupations of spouses. Each respondent was asked to indicate the occupation of his, or her, spouse. These results are presented in Table VI on pages 23, 24 and 25. A large majority (67.0 per cent) reported that their spouse was a housewife. However, some spouses did actively work at other occupations. The professional group was the largest represented and accounted for 16.5 per cent. No noticeable differences were apparent between the work done by spouses of county and city trustees.

Religious preferences. The church preference of Virginia school board members offered no unexpected variations. Table VII lists the various church affiliations of the respondents. Of the surveyed individuals 88.5 per cent reported being affiliated with either the Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal or Presbyterian faiths. The remaining 11.5 per cent listed many different religions, including the Catholic and Jewish faiths.

TABLE VII

## RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES OF RESPONDENTS

County	Metho- dist	Baptist	Epis- copal	Presby- terian	Other	County	Metho- dist	Baptist	Epis- copal	Presby- terian	Other
Accomack	1	0	2	1	0	James City	2	0	0	0	1
Albemarle	1	2	1	1	0	King and Queen	0	2	0	0	0
Alleghany	1	1	1	0	0	Lancaster	1	2	1	0	0
Amherst	0	2	1	0	0	Lee	1	1	0	0	0
Arlington	0	1	1	0	0	Loudoun	1	1	1	1	1
Augusta	2	0	2	1	1	Montgomery	4	0	0	0	0
Botetourt	1	0	0	0	2	Nansemond	1	1	1	0	0
Buckingham	0	1	1	2	0	Northumberland	0	1	1	0	0
Caroline	0	2	1	0	0	Nottoway	1	2	0	1	0
Chesterfield	0	2	0	0	0	Orange	0	0	1	1	1
Clarke	1	0	3	1	0	Page	1	0	0	0	1
Culpeper	2	2	0	0	0	Patrick	1	2	0	0	0
Dickenson	0	2	0	0	0	Prince William	3	0	2	0	0
Dinwiddie	2	1	1	0	1	Roanoke	0	3	0	1	0
Fairfax	1	1	1	0	2	Rockingham	1	0	1	1	1
Fluvanna	1	2	0	0	0	Smyth	2	0	0	1	1
Franklin	1	2	0	0	1	Southampton	4	1	0	0	0
Giles	3	1	0	0	1	Spotsylvania	0	3	0	0	0
Gloucester	1	1	0	0	0	Surry	2	0	0	0	1
Greene	0	0	1	0	0	Tazewell	2	0	0	0	0
Halifax	1	4	0	2	0	Warren	1	2	0	1	1
Hanover	1	0	1	1	0	Washington	3	1	0	4	0
Henrico	2	1	1	0	0	Wythe	3	0	0	1	1
Highland	0	1	0	1	1	York	2	1	2	0	0
County totals	22	29	18	10	9	County totals	36	23	10	12	9

TABLE VII (continued)

City	Methodist	Baptist	Episcopal	Presbyterian	Other
Alexandria	0	0	2	2	4
Bristol	2	2	0	0	0
Covington	1	0	0	2	0
Danville	4	0	0	0	0
Franklin	2	0	0	0	1
Fredericksburg	1	0	2	0	0
Harrisonburg	2	0	0	2	1
Lynchburg	1	2	3	3	0
Norfolk	2	2	2	0	0
Norton	1	0	1	0	1
Petersburg	1	0	1	0	0
Portsmouth	0	3	0	0	2
Richmond	0	0	1	0	0
Roanoke	2	2	0	1	0
Staunton	0	0	2	3	0
Waynesboro	1	0	0	1	2
Williamsburg	2	1	0	0	0
Winchester	1	0	0	5	1
City totals	23	12	14	19	12
Grand totals	81	64	42	41	30

<sup>a</sup>Does not include figures for three county members who failed to report this information.

In general, the Virginia school board member appeared to be strongly affiliated with a particular church. Three county members failed to respond to this question and two city members listed "none" as their preference.

Education completed by board members. A. L. White reported in his study of local school boards across the country that 48.3 per cent of the members were college graduates. An additional 44.0 per cent of his respondents had completed high school and the remaining 7.7 per cent had not completed the secondary school program.<sup>17</sup>

As a group, local Virginia school board members had completed more formal education than had similar members in the national study. Table VIII shows that 56.9 per cent of the responding Virginia members had completed four or more years of college. Another 39.1 per cent had completed high school and the remaining 4.7 per cent had not completed a high school education.

Among Virginia counties, 46.9 per cent of the school trustees had completed four or more years of college; whereas, 72.5 per cent of their city counterparts had completed college degree requirements or better. These latter figures were similar to those found by White in his national survey. He discovered that among smaller divisions 43.1 per cent of school board members were college graduates, while in larger systems the figure was much larger, 72.6 per cent.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

TABLE VIII

EDUCATION COMPLETED BY RESPONDING BOARD MEMBERS

County	High School				College				Graduate			County	High School				College				Graduate		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	Over 2		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	Over 2
Accomack	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	James City	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Albemarle	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	King and Queen	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Alleghany	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	Lancaster	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Amherst	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Lee	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	Loudoun	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
Augusta	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	Montgomery	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Botetourt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	Nansemond	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Buckingham	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	Northumberland	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Caroline	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Nottoway	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Chesterfield	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Orange	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Clarke	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	Page	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Culpeper	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	Patrick	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dickenson	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prince William	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Dinwiddie	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	Roanoke	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Fairfax	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	Rockingham	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1
Fluvanna	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	Smyth	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	Southampton	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0
Giles	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	Spotsylvania	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gloucester	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Surry	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Tazewell	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Halifax	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	Warren	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Hanover	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	Washington	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	1	1
Henrico	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	Wythe	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1
Highland	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	York	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
County totals	2	2	4	17	9	5	4	29	5	2	10	County totals	3	0	1	22	9	10	4	27	5	1	8



TABLE VIII (continued)

City	High School				College				Graduate		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	Over 2
Alexandria	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	1
Bristol	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Covington	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Danville	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
Fredericksburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Harrisonburg	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1
Lynchburg	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	1	2
Norfolk	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	1
Norton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Portsmouth	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Roanoke	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0
Staunton	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	1
Waynesboro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Williamsburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
Winchester	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	0
<b>City totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Grand totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>

<sup>a</sup>Does not include figures for two county respondents who failed to report this information.

Places of birth of board members. Individuals who served on local Virginia school boards were predominantly native Virginians. Only 24.5 per cent of the total respondents were not born in Virginia. Table IX shows that many school board members were life-long residents of the divisions they served. In county systems 56.4 per cent of the respondents indicated having been born in the county they served. An additional 25.4 per cent of the county members were native Virginians. Only 17.1 per cent stated that their place of birth was outside of Virginia.

On the other hand, only 26.3 per cent of the city trustees indicated that their birthplace was the city which they served. Another 35.0 per cent were natives of the state of Virginia. A large number (36.3 per cent) of city board members were born outside of Virginia.

## II. SCHOOL BOARD EXPERIENCE

Responding school board members were asked to report the number of years they had served their local boards. This response is shown in Table X, pages 35 and 36. In general, 44.8 per cent of Virginia school board members had served less than five years. Another 24.5 per cent had served from 6 to 10 years. As additional responses, one county member remarked that he "didn't rightly know" how long he had served, while still another commented that his service was "too long".

For comparison, White found that 53.4 per cent of his national

TABLE IX

## BIRTHPLACES OF RESPONDING BOARD MEMBERS

County	Home County	Virginia	United States	Foreign	County	Home County	Virginia	United States	Foreign
Accomack	3	1	0	0	James City	2	1	0	0
Albemarle	3	1	1	0	King and Queen	1	1	0	0
Alleghany	1	1	1	0	Lancaster	3	1	0	0
Amherst	1	2	0	0	Lee	1	1	0	0
Arlington	0	0	2	1	Loudoun	3	2	0	0
Augusta	4	2	0	0	Montgomery	1	1	2	0
Botetourt	1	2	0	0	Nansemond	3	0	1	0
Buckingham	4	0	0	0	Northumberland	1	0	1	0
Caroline	2	1	0	0	Nottoway	2	2	0	0
Chesterfield	1	1	0	0	Orange	0	0	2	1
Clarke	3	2	0	0	Page	0	0	2	0
Culpeper	2	2	0	0	Patrick	3	0	0	0
Dickenson	2	0	0	0	Prince William	3	1	1	0
Dinwiddie	1	4	0	0	Roanoke	1	1	2	0
Fairfax	0	2	3	0	Rockingham	1	1	2	0
Fluvanna	1	1	1	0	Smyth	3	0	1	0
Franklin	4	0	0	0	Southampton	5	0	0	0
Giles	3	1	1	0	Spotsylvania	2	1	0	0
Gloucester	2	0	0	0	Surry	1	1	1	0
Greene	1	0	0	0	Tazewell	1	0	1	0
Halifax	6	0	1	0	Warren	2	3	0	0
Hanover	2	1	0	0	Washington	8	1	0	0
Henrico	0	3	1	0	Wythe	4	1	0	0
Highland	2	0	1	0	York	2	0	3	0
County totals	49	27	12	1	County totals	53	19	19	1

TABLE IX (continued)

City	Home County	Virginia	United States	Foreign
Alexandria	2	3	3	0
Bristol	2	1	1	0
Covington	0	2	1	0
Danville	1	1	2	0
Franklin	0	2	1	0
Fredericksburg	1	2	0	0
Harrisonburg	0	2	3	0
Lynchburg	3	2	4	0
Norfolk	3	2	1	0
Norton	0	2	0	1
Petersburg	0	1	1	0
Portsmouth	2	0	3	0
Richmond	1	0	0	0
Roanoke	2	2	1	0
Staunton	1	2	2	0
Waynesboro	0	1	2	0
Williamsburg	0	1	2	0
Winchester	3	2	2	0
City totals	21	28	29	1
Grand totals	123	74	70	2

<sup>a</sup>Does not include figure for one city respondent who failed to report this information.

TABLE X

## LENGTH OF SERVICE OF RESPONDING BOARD MEMBERS

County	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	County	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20
Accomack	2	1	1	0	0	James City	2	1	0	0	0
Albemarle	5	0	0	0	0	King and Queen	1	0	1	0	0
Alleghany	1	1	1	0	0	Lancaster	1	0	0	1	2
Amherst	2	1	0	0	0	Lee	0	1	1	0	0
Arlington	2	1	0	0	0	Loudoun	0	1	3	1	0
Augusta	3	2	0	0	1	Montgomery	1	2	0	1	0
Botetourt	0	2	1	0	0	Nansemond	1	0	1	1	1
Buckingham	1	1	0	2	0	Northumberland	0	2	0	0	0
Caroline	0	1	0	2	0	Nottoway	3	1	0	0	0
Chesterfield	0	0	1	0	1	Orange	1	1	1	0	0
Clarke	0	0	1	2	2	Page	0	1	1	0	0
Culpeper	2	1	1	0	0	Patrick	3	0	0	0	0
Dickenson	0	1	0	1	0	Prince William	1	1	1	1	1
Dinwiddie	2	0	1	2	0	Roanoke	1	1	1	0	1
Fairfax	4	1	0	0	0	Rockingham	2	1	0	1	0
Fluvanna	2	1	0	0	0	Smyth	1	1	1	1	0
Franklin	0	1	0	2	1	Southampton	0	2	1	2	0
Giles	1	1	1	1	1	Spotsylvania	1	1	0	0	1
Gloucester	0	1	1	0	0	Surry	0	1	1	0	1
Greene	0	0	1	0	0	Tazewell	1	1	0	0	0
Halifax	3	2	1	0	1	Warren	2	2	0	0	1
Hanover	1	1	1	0	0	Washington	2	4	2	1	0
Henrico	2	2	0	0	0	Wythe	4	0	1	0	0
Highland	1	0	0	1	1	York	5	0	0	0	0
County totals	34	22	12	13	8	County totals	33	25	16	10	8

TABLE X (continued)

City	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20
Alexandria	5	2	0	1	0
Bristol	4	0	0	0	0
Covington	0	3	0	0	0
Danville	2	0	2	0	0
Franklin	3	0	0	0	0
Fredericksburg	1	1	1	0	0
Harrisonburg	5	0	0	0	0
Lynchburg	6	2	1	0	0
Norfolk	2	4	0	0	0
Norton	2	0	0	1	0
Petersburg	1	0	0	1	0
Portsmouth	4	1	0	0	0
Richmond	1	0	0	0	0
Roanoke	4	1	0	0	0
Staunton	1	2	2	0	0
Waynesboro	4	0	0	0	0
Williamsburg	2	1	0	0	0
Winchester	4	1	0	2	0
City totals	51	18	6	5	0
Grand totals	118	65	34	28	16

study had served less than five years. An additional 30.1 per cent had served from 6 to 10 years.<sup>19</sup>

Among the county systems, length of service of school board members was generally longer than that in city systems. Only 36.5 per cent of the county respondents had served less than five years as compared to 63.8 per cent of the city members. County board members seemed to have had an advantage of experience on their local boards.

### III. SUMMARY

The typical local Virginia school board member was between the ages of 41-60. He was married and had three children.

County board members were primarily employed either as business owners-managers-officials or farmers. Their city counterparts were business owners-managers-officials or professional individuals. These occupational patterns were much the same as those found by White in a national survey of local school board members.<sup>20</sup>

The majority (56.9 per cent) of responding board members were college graduates. In the national study White found that 48.3 per cent of his respondents had completed college.<sup>21</sup>

Generally, most (69.3 per cent) local school board members

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

in Virginia have served less than ten years. This figure was higher (83.5 per cent) among the national sample.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 32.



## CHAPTER IV

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Most research involving the social composition of local school board members has been limited to statistical information. Several examples were presented in the preceding chapter. In this study, however, board members were also asked to respond to various questions involving the extent of their community activities. Each respondent was given an opportunity to express his views concerning local cultural and recreational facilities and opportunities.

#### I. LIVING ACCOMODATIONS

Home ownership. Almost all (96.6 per cent) of the local board members owned their homes. Only a few trustees indicated that they rented their dwellings. Only three (city members) of the total 261 responding members indicated that they lived in an apartment.

According to Table XI, the number of years each board member had lived in his residence varied with each division. Of some significance, however, was the fact that the largest percentage of board members indicated having lived in their residence over 25 years. This was particularly true in Virginia counties where 31.5 per cent of the members were found in this category. Most city members (65.0 per cent) had lived less than 15 years in their residence.

The local school board member appeared to be generally well satisfied with his living arrangements. The degree of satisfaction

TABLE XI

## NUMBER OF YEARS IN RESIDENCE

County	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25	County	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25
Accomack	1	2	0	0	1	0	James City	1	1	0	0	0	1
Albemarle	0	2	0	2	0	1	King and Queen	0	0	1	0	0	1
Alleghany	0	0	0	3	0	0	Lancaster	0	0	1	0	2	1
Amherst	0	0	3	0	0	0	Lee	0	0	1	0	0	1
Arlington	0	0	1	1	0	1	Loudoun	0	1	0	2	0	2
Augusta	0	1	1	1	1	2	Montgomery	1	0	1	0	0	2
Botetourt	0	0	2	1	0	0	Nansemond	1	0	0	2	0	1
Buckingham	0	0	1	0	0	3	Northumberland	0	0	1	0	1	0
Caroline	1	0	0	0	1	1	Nottoway	0	1	2	0	0	1
Chesterfield	0	0	0	1	0	1	Orange	0	0	2	1	0	0
Clarke	0	1	0	1	0	3	Page	0	1	1	0	0	0
Culpeper	0	1	1	1	0	1	Patrick	1	1	0	1	0	0
Dickenson	0	1	0	0	0	1	Prince William	0	2	0	0	1	2
Dinwiddie	0	2	0	1	0	2	Roanoke	1	2	1	0	0	0
Fairfax	2	2	0	1	0	0	Rockingham	0	0	1	0	1	2
Fluvanna	1	1	0	0	0	1	Smyth	0	0	1	1	1	1
Franklin	0	0	0	1	1	2	Southampton	0	0	1	4	0	0
Giles	0	0	1	2	0	2	Spotsylvania	0	0	0	1	0	2
Gloucester	0	0	1	0	0	1	Surry	0	0	0	0	0	3
Greene	0	0	1	0	0	0	Tazewell	0	0	1	0	0	1
Halifax	0	1	1	2	0	3	Warren	1	0	1	1	0	2
Hanover	0	1	0	1	0	1	Washington	0	0	2	3	1	3
Henrico	0	0	0	2	2	0	Wythe	0	0	2	0	0	3
Highland	0	0	0	1	0	1	York	1	2	1	0	0	1
County totals	5	15	13	22	6	27	County totals	7	11	21	16	7	30

TABLE XI (continued)

City	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25
Alexandria	4	1	0	2	1	0
Bristol	1	1	0	1	1	0
Covington	0	1	1	1	0	0
Danville	0	1	1	2	0	0
Franklin	1	1	0	1	0	0
Fredericksburg	0	1	0	2	0	0
Harrisonburg	0	2	1	1	1	0
Lynchburg	1	3	0	4	0	1
Norfolk	2	1	1	1	0	1
Norton	1	1	1	0	0	0
Petersburg	0	0	1	0	1	0
Portsmouth	0	0	2	1	1	1
Richmond	0	1	0	0	0	0
Roanoke	1	2	1	1	0	0
Staunton	1	1	2	0	0	1
Waynesboro	1	2	1	0	0	0
Williamsburg	1	2	0	0	0	0
Winchester	0	2	3	0	1	1
City totals	14	23	15	17	6	5
Grand totals	26	49	49	55	19	62

<sup>a</sup>Does not include figure for one county respondent who failed to report this information.

was higher among county members (98.3 per cent) as compared with city members (93.8 per cent).

Improvements desired. Each board member was asked to list any improvements he desired in living and/or working arrangements. Their responses were grouped into various categories. For easy reference, the complete answers have been directly quoted in Appendix E.

Approximately 41.4 per cent of the county respondents failed to list any improvements and an additional 14.9 per cent indicated that no improvements were needed. Among improvements in living conditions desired by county board members, more leisure time was the one most frequently mentioned. Other groupings, in order of frequency of response, included home improvements, financial advancement, cultural improvements and companionship.

Among city board members the same general response was obtained. More leisure, home improvements, financial advancement and cultural enrichment were mentioned as living improvements most desired by the city trustees. Only 25.0 per cent of the city respondents failed to list any improvements while an additional 28.8 per cent replied that no improvements were desired in either category.

Working improvements desired by the county respondents seemed generally to indicate the problems of the small business owner or farmer. "Less Federal involvement in business" was one member's response. Generally, fewer government controls, professional growth, more dependable labor, better public understanding and more adequate

equipment appeared as answers to this inquiry. Almost the same pattern was found with the city trustees. Professional growth, more dependable labor and better equipment were among the major working improvements desired by city board members.

Cultural and recreational participation. When asked if they believed their communities offered sufficient cultural and recreational opportunities, 56.4 per cent of the county board members answered "no." An additional 33.7 per cent indicated "yes" while the remainder noted there was "room for improvement." Half of the city trustees believed their city offered the proper cultural and recreational opportunities. Another 41.2 per cent answered "no," and a few noted they believed improvement was needed.

Each respondent was requested to list the types of local recreation in which he participated. Among county respondents, 40.3 per cent failed to answer or listed "none." Of those members who did respond, however, the largest number named athletics. These sports included the active type, such as swimming, tennis, golf, hunting and fishing, and spectator sports. Although one member remarked "none at my age," several did indicate participating in other types of local recreation. In addition to athletics, club work, cultural recreation, gardening and hobbies were also mentioned.

Among city respondents 26.3 per cent failed to respond or listed "none" to this question. Athletics, both active and spectator, was the most popular type of recreation for city members. Cultural recreation and club work ranked second and third among the responses.

Gardening and hobbies were also listed.

## II. CLUB MEMBERSHIP

Each respondent was asked if he held membership in various types of clubs and organizations in his community. Their general response is reported in Table XII. For additional information, the exact response made by the board members for each organization grouping is located in Appendix F.

Civic groups. Of the responding county board members, 93.4 per cent were members of one or more civic groups in their communities. City board members held 97.5 per cent membership in various civic groups. The PTA was the largest group represented by the respondents. Over half (59.6 per cent) of the county members and 51.3 per cent of the city board members belonged to the PTA. Chamber of Commerce, Lions, Kiwanis, and Ruritan clubs were also memberships frequently listed by the respondents. In general, this suggests that local school board members were very active in civic organizations in their communities.

Volunteer groups. Approximately 43.1 per cent of county and 38.8 per cent of city board members participated in some phase of volunteer work. This investigator evidently failed to include many important volunteer groups on the questionnaire as the "other" category was most frequently mentioned. Of the groups mentioned, however, "volunteer firemen" and "Red Cross work" were strongly

TABLE XII

## MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNITY CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS

County	Civic		Volunteer		Church		Youth		Social		Fraternal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Accomack	4	0	3	1	3	1	4	0	1	3	4	0
Albemarle	4	1	1	4	2	3	1	4	3	2	1	4
Alleghany	3	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	2	1	1	2
Amherst	3	0	1	2	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	2
Arlington	3	0	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	0	0	3
Augusta	6	0	2	4	6	0	2	4	4	2	4	2
Botetourt	3	0	2	1	3	0	2	1	3	0	0	3
Buckingham	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	3	1	3	2	2
Caroline	3	0	2	1	2	1	0	3	1	2	1	2
Chesterfield	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1
Clarke	5	0	3	2	5	0	1	4	3	2	0	5
Culpeper	4	0	0	4	3	1	1	3	4	0	2	2
Dickenson	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
Dinwiddie	5	0	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	4	4	1
Fairfax	5	0	0	5	3	2	1	4	5	0	1	4
Fluvanna	3	0	2	1	3	0	1	2	0	3	1	2
Franklin	4	0	2	2	3	1	1	3	1	3	2	2
Giles	5	0	2	3	5	0	0	5	4	1	4	1
Gloucester	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	0
Greene	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Halifax	7	0	6	1	7	0	3	4	4	3	5	2
Hanover	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
Henrico	4	0	2	2	4	0	1	3	4	0	3	1
Highland	3	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2
County totals	85	4	39	50	72	17	30	59	53	36	42	47

TABLE XII (continued)

County	Civic		Volunteer		Church		Youth		Social		Fraternal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
James City	3	0	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3
King and Queen	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
Lancaster	4	0	4	0	4	0	3	1	3	1	1	3
Lee	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	1	1
Loudoun	5	0	2	3	5	0	0	5	3	2	2	3
Montgomery	3	1	1	3	4	0	2	2	3	1	0	4
Nansemond	4	0	2	2	4	0	2	2	2	2	3	1
Northumberland	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	2
Nottoway	3	1	1	3	4	0	2	2	3	1	3	1
Orange	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	0	3	0
Page	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	0
Patrick	3	0	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1
Prince William	4	1	4	1	5	0	3	2	4	1	3	2
Roanoke	4	0	1	3	3	1	0	4	3	1	3	1
Rockingham	4	0	2	2	4	0	3	1	2	2	1	3
Smyth	4	0	2	2	4	0	2	2	3	1	1	3
Southampton	5	0	3	2	5	0	1	4	3	2	0	5
Spotsylvania	2	1	2	1	3	0	2	1	1	2	1	2
Surry	3	0	1	2	2	1	0	3	0	3	2	1
Tazewell	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	2
Warren	4	1	1	4	5	0	2	3	2	3	2	3
Washington	8	1	4	5	8	1	5	4	6	3	4	5
Wythe	4	1	3	2	5	0	3	2	5	0	1	4
York	5	0	1	4	5	0	2	3	3	2	2	3
County totals	84	8	39	53	82	10	38	54	56	36	37	55



TABLE XII (continued)

City	Civic		Volunteer		Church		Youth		Social		Fraternal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Alexandria	8	0	5	3	6	2	6	2	8	0	3	5
Bristol	3	1	0	4	4	0	2	2	3	1	2	2
Covington	3	0	2	1	3	0	2	1	3	0	0	3
Danville	4	0	2	2	4	0	1	3	4	0	2	2
Franklin	3	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	3	0	1	2
Fredericksburg	3	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
Harrisonburg	4	1	2	3	5	0	3	2	2	3	3	2
Lynchburg	9	0	3	6	9	0	5	4	9	0	3	6
Norfolk	6	0	0	6	5	1	2	4	5	1	4	2
Norton	3	0	0	3	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	2
Petersburg	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	2
Portsmouth	5	0	2	3	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4
Richmond	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Roanoke	5	0	2	3	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1
Staunton	5	0	3	2	3	2	1	4	3	2	2	3
Waynesboro	4	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	0	2	2
Williamsburg	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2
Winchester	7	0	4	3	6	1	4	3	6	1	3	4
<b>City totals</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Grand totals</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>147</b>

emphasized, particularly among county members.

Church activities. Local board members participated in the church activities of their communities. Among county members 85.1 per cent belonged to or worked with a religious group. Almost the same was true with city school board members as 83.8 per cent indicated being active in a religious group. Membership in Sunday School classes was the largest single response. Men's brotherhoods were also frequently mentioned by both county and city respondents.

Youth groups. A number of school board members found time to work with local youth organizations. Among the generally older county members only 37.0 per cent spent any time with a youth group. Over half (52.5 per cent) of the younger city members, however, indicated they worked with various community youth organizations. Work with scouting groups was most often indicated by both county and city school board members.

Social organizations. County school board members indicated 60.2 per cent membership in community social organizations. City school board membership in social clubs amounted to 82.5 per cent. Of those members responding, country clubs and service clubs appeared to be the most popular type of membership among both county and city board members.

Fraternal groups. Fewer than half of the county board members (43.6 per cent) indicated being associated with a fraternal group

in their communities. Almost the same percentage (43.8 per cent) of city respondents noted they held membership in a fraternal group.

### III. LEADERSHIP

Generally, local Virginia school board members appeared very active in leadership positions of the clubs and organizations in which they were members. These leadership characteristics are reported in Table XIII. Only 21.5 per cent of the county and 16.3 per cent of the city board members failed to respond to this type of question.

Among the majority of members responding, it was found that 69.6 per cent of the county trustees had held an office in their organization. An additional 65.2 per cent indicated having served on a committee in their group or club. City members offered much the same response, as 72.5 per cent had held an office and 68.7 per cent had served their clubs as committeemen. In general, the local Virginia board members appeared to have spent considerable time leading the activities of their community organizations.

### IV. PROPOSED ADDITIONAL RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Approximately a third (38.7 per cent county and 27.5 per cent city) of the total respondents failed to respond when asked to suggest or recommend any additional recreational facilities to which they would lend their support. Many board members, however, took advantage of this opportunity and made noteworthy comments. Community centers

TABLE XIII

## ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING BOARD MEMBERS

County	Served on committee	Sponsored organ.	Held office	Oth-er	No ans.	County	Served on committee	Sponsored organ.	Held office	Oth-er	No ans.
Accomack	2	0	3	0	1	James City	2	0	3	0	0
Albemarle	2	1	2	0	3	King and Queen	1	0	2	0	0
Alleghany	3	3	3	0	0	Lancaster	3	1	3	0	0
Amherst	3	0	3	0	0	Lee	1	0	1	0	1
Arlington	1	0	1	0	1	Loudoun	4	0	4	0	1
Augusta	6	0	4	0	0	Montgomery	2	0	3	0	1
Botetourt	2	0	2	0	1	Nansemond	3	0	3	0	1
Buckingham	1	1	1	0	3	Northumberland	2	0	2	0	0
Caroline	2	1	2	0	1	Nottoway	2	0	3	0	1
Chesterfield	1	0	1	0	1	Orange	2	0	3	0	0
Clarke	4	0	4	0	1	Page	1	2	1	1	0
Culpeper	4	0	4	0	0	Patrick	2	1	3	1	0
Dickenson	0	0	0	0	2	Prince William	4	3	4	0	1
Dinwiddie	4	1	5	0	0	Roanoke	1	0	2	0	1
Fairfax	4	1	3	0	1	Rockingham	1	0	2	0	2
Fluvanna	2	1	0	0	0	Smyth	2	0	2	0	2
Franklin	1	0	1	0	3	Southampton	5	0	5	0	0
Giles	3	0	3	0	0	Spotsylvania	1	1	1	0	1
Gloucester	1	0	1	0	1	Surry	1	0	1	0	2
Greene	1	0	1	0	0	Tazewell	1	0	2	0	0
Halifax	6	0	6	0	1	Warren	2	2	3	0	2
Hanover	3	0	3	0	0	Washington	6	1	6	0	1
Henrico	3	0	3	0	1	Wythe	4	0	4	0	1
Highland	3	1	3	0	0	York	3	1	4	0	0
County totals	62	10	59	0	21	County totals	56	12	67	2	18

TABLE XIII (continued)

City	Served on committee	Sponsored an organization	Held office	Other	No answer
Alexandria	6	3	5	0	2
Bristol	2	1	2	1	1
Covington	2	0	0	0	1
Danville	4	1	4	0	0
Franklin	1	1	2	0	0
Fredericksburg	3	1	3	0	0
Harrisonburg	2	0	4	0	1
Lynchburg	6	2	7	0	1
Norfolk	3	0	3	0	3
Norton	2	0	3	0	0
Petersburg	2	0	2	0	0
Portsmouth	1	0	2	0	3
Richmond	1	0	0	0	0
Roanoke	5	1	5	0	0
Staunton	1	0	4	0	1
Waynesboro	4	4	5	0	0
Williamsburg	3	1	2	0	0
Winchester	7	1	5	0	0
City totals	55	16	58	1	13
Grand totals	173	38	184	3	52

<sup>a</sup>Several board members indicated work in more than one category.

for children and adults was the most frequently suggested improvement. These centers with swimming, athletic and playground facilities were supported by many school board members. The following activities, including both county and city response, were those most often mentioned: (1) any worthwhile, (2) any activities for youth, (3) cultural-theatre, (4) any activities for the aged, (5) outdoor areas, and (6) undecided.

Several board members stated that they would not support any, or that they saw no need to support any, additional facilities. One interesting comment, which appeared sincere, came from a county board member who stated, "I would like to do more for my community but milking cows takes too much of my time."

#### V. SUMMARY

The majority of local school board members were found to be satisfied with their living arrangements. Only a few did not own their homes. The majority, who were home owners, had lived in their residence over 15 years.

Over half of the respondents indicated that their community did not offer sufficient cultural and recreational opportunities. Many members did, however, indicate that they participated in local recreation. Athletics was the most frequently listed activity.

Civic club membership was most prevalent among the local school board members. Many members also held membership in volunteer, church, social, youth and fraternal groups. A large number of

respondents held leadership positions in their community organizations.

Many school board members indicated they would support additional recreational facilities in their communities. A community center for both children and adults was most often mentioned as needed.

## CHAPTER V

### PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS

The local Virginia school board member has thus far been examined in two important aspects of community life. Statistical information involving his personal background has been collected and presented, and the extent of his participation in community activities has been viewed.

Another, and perhaps more important, aspect of a local school board member's community life is the range of his personal associations. The need to study such associations is suggested by a remark made by a county school board member who said, "I would not have accepted school board membership if I had realized how adversely it would affect my personal relationships."

School board member response to the final section of the questionnaire which dealt with this aspect of their lives was not as large as it had been in the previous sections. Perhaps the personal type of questioning was responsible for this. Nevertheless, by using the response obtained, a fairly adequate description of the local school board member's personal associations can be obtained.

#### I. FRIENDS AND LEISURE ASSOCIATES

Confidential friends. Each responding board member was asked if he knew an individual with whom he could talk over matters he considered confidential. Among county respondents 88.4 per cent



indicated they did have such a friend. Only 4.5 per cent reported negative and a few board members failed to respond to this inquiry. Only a slight difference was observed among the city membership. From the responding cities 91.3 per cent reported that they had such a friend while 5.0 per cent indicated they did not.

Closest friends. Table XIV presents the school board member response to the question which asked him to indicate which listed group contained his closest friend. Many respondents noted more than one. Only a few failed to answer this question.

Most county board members appeared to favor their neighbors and business associates as their closest friends. Church associates were also often mentioned. Several county members stated they were undecided as to who was their closest friend.

City board members' responses differed only slightly from those of county members. Business associates ranked first followed closely by the "other" category with city respondents.

Leisure-time associations. Each respondent was asked to indicate with whom he preferred to spend his leisure time. Their response is reported in Table XV, pages 58 and 59.

Although a few county board members failed to respond to this question, the majority did, several noting more than one listed category. Neighbors were the most often listed leisure-time associates of county board members. The "other" category ranked second closely followed by church friends.

TABLE XIV

## CLOSEST FRIENDS OF RESPONDENTS

County	Board member	Neighbor	Church assoc.	Bus. assoc.	Other	Uncided	County	Board member	Neighbor	Church assoc.	Bus. assoc.	Other	Uncided
Accomack	0	2	1	3	0	0	James City	0	1	1	2	1	0
Albemarle	0	1	1	3	1	0	King and Queen	0	1	2	0	0	0
Alleghany	0	2	1	0	1	0	Lancaster	0	1	2	1	0	0
Amherst	2	3	2	3	0	0	Lee	0	0	0	1	0	0
Arlington	0	2	0	0	2	0	Loudoun	2	1	2	1	0	3
Augusta	1	2	2	3	0	0	Montgomery	0	1	0	2	0	1
Botetourt	0	1	0	1	0	1	Nansemond	1	0	2	0	0	0
Buckingham	0	3	1	2	0	0	Northumberland	0	2	0	0	0	0
Caroline	1	0	1	2	1	0	Nottoway	0	2	0	1	1	0
Chesterfield	0	0	1	0	1	1	Orange	0	2	1	1	0	1
Clarke	0	0	1	1	1	2	Page	0	1	0	1	2	0
Culpeper	1	4	2	2	0	0	Patrick	0	1	0	0	1	1
Dickenson	1	2	1	1	0	0	Prince William	1	0	3	0	1	0
Dinwiddie	0	4	2	1	0	0	Roanoke	0	1	1	2	2	0
Fairfax	1	1	0	2	1	0	Rockingham	1	2	0	2	2	0
Fluvanna	0	0	0	1	2	0	Smyth	0	2	0	1	1	0
Franklin	1	1	1	0	0	0	Southampton	0	3	1	1	0	0
Giles	2	2	2	2	1	0	Spotsylvania	1	1	3	2	0	0
Gloucester	1	0	1	2	0	0	Surry	0	1	1	0	1	0
Greene	0	1	0	0	0	0	Tazewell	0	0	0	1	0	1
Halifax	0	3	2	2	0	2	Warren	1	2	0	2	1	1
Hanover	0	1	2	1	1	0	Washington	4	5	2	4	1	0
Henrico	0	0	1	3	1	0	Wythe	0	2	1	2	3	0
Highland	1	1	0	1	0	0	York	0	1	2	2	0	1
County totals	12	36	25	36	13	6	County totals	11	33	24	29	17	9

TABLE XIV (continued)

City	Board member	Neighbor	Church associate	Business associate	Other	Undecided
Alexandria	2	3	2	3	2	1
Bristol	0	2	1	0	2	0
Covington	0	1	3	0	0	0
Danville	0	1	2	1	2	0
Franklin	1	1	1	0	0	1
Fredericksburg	0	0	0	0	1	2
Harrisonburg	0	1	1	3	1	1
Lynchburg	0	1	1	6	4	0
Norfolk	0	2	2	3	1	0
Norton	0	0	1	2	0	0
Petersburg	0	1	0	0	1	0
Portsmouth	0	0	1	1	2	0
Richmond	0	0	0	0	1	0
Roanoke	0	1	1	2	1	0
Staunton	1	2	0	2	2	0
Waynesboro	0	0	1	1	2	0
Williamsburg	0	1	1	1	1	0
Winchester	2	2	1	3	2	0
<b>City totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Grand totals</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>20</b>

<sup>a</sup>Several board members indicated having closest friends in more than one category.

TABLE XV

## LEISURE ASSOCIATES OF RESPONDENTS

County	Busi- ness assoc.	Neigh- bor	Church assoc.	Club mem- ber	Board mem- ber	Oth- er	County	Busi- ness assoc.	Neigh- bor	Church assoc.	Club mem- ber	Board mem- ber	Oth- er
Accomack	1	2	1	1	0	1	James City	2	1	0	1	0	1
Albemarle	0	3	1	1	0	1	King and Queen	1	1	2	1	0	0
Alleghany	0	1	2	1	0	1	Lancaster	1	3	2	2	0	0
Amherst	1	3	2	1	1	0	Lee	1	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington	0	2	0	0	0	2	Loudoun	1	3	3	2	1	1
Augusta	0	2	0	0	0	3	Montgomery	2	0	0	0	0	1
Botetourt	1	2	0	0	0	1	Nansemond	0	2	0	0	0	2
Buckingham	1	2	0	0	0	1	Northumberland	0	2	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	2	2	0	1	0	Nottoway	0	2	2	0	0	1
Chesterfield	0	1	0	0	0	1	Orange	3	3	2	2	0	1
Clarke	0	2	1	0	0	1	Page	0	1	0	1	0	1
Culpeper	1	4	0	1	0	1	Patrick	1	1	1	2	2	2
Dickenson	0	1	1	0	1	0	Prince William	0	1	2	1	2	3
Dinwiddie	0	3	1	1	0	1	Roanoke	0	1	1	1	0	2
Fairfax	0	1	0	1	0	3	Rockingham	0	1	1	1	0	2
Fluvanna	2	1	1	1	1	2	Smyth	0	3	1	0	1	0
Franklin	0	2	1	0	1	0	Southampton	0	5	0	0	1	0
Giles	4	2	1	0	0	1	Spotsylvania	0	1	2	1	1	1
Gloucester	0	1	1	0	0	0	Surry	0	1	1	0	0	0
Greene	0	1	1	1	0	0	Tazewell	1	0	0	2	0	1
Halifax	0	5	1	1	0	2	Warren	0	3	0	2	1	1
Hanover	0	1	1	1	0	1	Washington	1	3	2	1	2	5
Henrico	2	1	1	0	0	1	Wythe	1	3	2	1	0	3
Highland	1	1	1	1	1	0	York	1	2	3	1	1	1
County totals	16	46	20	12	6	24	County totals	16	43	27	22	12	29

TABLE XV (continued)

City	Business associate	Neighbor	Church associate	Club member	Board member	Other
Alexandria	1	1	0	0	1	6
Bristol	0	4	2	0	0	1
Covington	1	0	1	0	0	2
Danville	0	1	2	2	0	1
Franklin	1	1	1	0	0	1
Fredericksburg	0	0	1	0	0	2
Harrisonburg	2	3	1	1	0	2
Lynchburg	1	5	1	1	0	4
Norfolk	2	3	1	1	0	2
Norton	1	2	1	1	0	0
Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	2
Portsmouth	0	3	0	1	0	3
Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roanoke	2	1	2	1	1	2
Staunton	2	4	1	2	1	2
Waynesboro	2	1	2	1	0	3
Williamsburg	1	2	2	0	1	0
Winchester	1	3	2	1	1	2
<b>City totals</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Grand totals</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>88</b>

<sup>a</sup>Several board members indicated having leisure associates in more than one category.

Few differences were evident among city board members. Neighbors and other friends were most frequently listed as individuals with whom the city respondents preferred to spend their leisure time. Church and business friends, almost evenly divided, were also frequently mentioned.

Satisfaction with associations. Almost all of the responding school board members indicated the associations they held were satisfactory. Only 3.9 per cent of the county and 1.8 per cent of the city respondents said that such associations were unsatisfactory.

## II. DESIRED CHANGES IN PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Each respondent was also asked in what way, or ways, would he change the personal associations of his life. Almost half (49.2 per cent) of the county members and over a third (33.8 per cent) of the city members failed to answer this question. Generally, among those who did respond to this inquiry a large number of members (48.9 per cent county and 45.3 per cent city) indicated they would make no change.

However, some did mention ways in which they would alter this aspect of their life. More time to spend with and develop friends was the change most often desired by both county and city school board members. One county member typically summed up his colleagues' feelings when he stated, "I have too little time to develop any friends of more than a superficial relationship."

Many county and city board members also mentioned that their

associations were not broad enough. They indicated that a wider range of friends and associates was desirable. Numerous other changes were suggested by some respondents. The complete response to this question has been summarized in Appendix I.

### III. SUMMARY

Most responding school board members have very close personal relationships. Neighbors and business associates appeared to be the closest friendships held by the respondents, while neighbors, business friends and church associates were the most mentioned leisure-time associates. A large majority of local school board members found their personal associations satisfactory. Although most board members did not indicate any desired changes in their personal associations, some did feel they needed more time to develop their friendships.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

An attempt has been made to investigate and evaluate some of the many social characteristics of the individuals who make up local school board membership. A general summary, conclusions and certain recommendations for additional research are presented in this chapter.

#### I. GENERAL SUMMARY

Introductory background. The major source used to obtain the reported information was the questionnaire, compiled by the investigator after research in this field. This questionnaire attempted to obtain data involving the social characteristics of the responding school board members. Distribution was made to approximately one half of the local school board members in Virginia. School board member response was very encouraging. Almost three fourths of those surveyed returned a completed questionnaire.

The various counties and cities included in the survey were selected on the basis of size and geographic location. Area economy and education were also considered as factors when selection was finally made.

General characteristics. The majority of local Virginia school board members were found to be between the ages of 41 and 60. The oldest board members were among the county divisions. Very few



board members were single, and none included in this survey indicated being separated or divorced. Generally, both county and city board members belonged to medium-sized family units with each having an average of three children.

Most county respondents were either business owners-managers-officials or farmers. Their city counterparts were primarily business owners-managers-officials and professional people. A survey of local school board members across the country revealed similar information.<sup>23</sup>

The occupation of housewife was held by the majority of both county and city board members' spouses. Many, however, did work mostly in the professional category.

The four major Protestant denominations, Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal and Presbyterian, were the religious affiliations held by most respondents.

Slightly over half of the respondents held at least a Bachelor's degree from a college or university. Many had completed varying amounts of graduate work. A very noticeable educational difference was observed among county and city school board members. City members had completed more formal education than had their county counterparts. The educational level of local Virginia school board members, including county and city respondents, was higher than the national average.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Alpheus L. White, Local School Boards: Organization and Practices, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bulletin No. 8 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), pp. 24-26.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 18.

Native Virginians dominated service on local school boards. Many were found to be life-long residents of the divisions they served. This was especially true among county school boards.

The majority (69.3 per cent) of respondents had less than ten years service on their local boards. Even within this group there was a large percentage (44.8) who had less than five years service. Generally, service was found to be longer on county school boards. The local Virginia school board member had more experience than those surveyed by White. In White's study 83.5 per cent had less than ten years experience and 53.4 per cent had served under five years.<sup>25</sup>

Community participation. The majority of local school board members owned their homes. A considerable number of respondents, primarily from the counties, indicated having lived in their present home more than 25 years.

Many responding board members indicated desirable improvements in their living and/or working arrangements. Among living improvements desired were: (1) more leisure time, (2) home improvements, and (3) cultural enrichment. No noticeable differences were evident between county and city members. Working improvements were also desired by both county and city respondents. Less Federal control, more dependable labor, and public understanding were the most frequently mentioned.

Most of the respondents did not believe their communities

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., pp. 32-33.

offered sufficient cultural and recreational opportunities. Many school board members did, however, indicate they participated in local cultural and recreational activities. These included athletics, club work, cultural events, gardening and hobbies. A number of school board members recommended additional recreational facilities for their communities. Community centers were the most frequently mentioned additional needed facilities.

The majority of responding school board members held membership in various clubs and organizations in their communities. Membership in civic groups accounted for the largest percentage of respondents. Representation in volunteer, church, youth, social and fraternal organizations was also reported by responding school board members. Leadership characteristics were observed among respondents as many indicated serving their group or club in some official capacity.

Personal associations. The majority of school board members indicated having an association with someone whom they could talk over confidential matters. Neighbors and business associates were the sources of closest friends for both county and city board members. Leisure associates of the respondents were generally their neighbors and other friends. Practically all of the responding board members noted that they were satisfied with their personal associations. Many, however, indicated desiring some type of change in this aspect of their lives. More time to spend with and develop friends was most often mentioned as a desired change.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

Limitations. That there were many limitations in a study of this type has been acknowledged. Questionnaire composition, data desired and the tabulation of data were among some of these limitations. However, with such a large response and the enthusiasm of those responding, a fairly good description of the local Virginia school board member was obtained.

Profile of local board member. The local school board member was found to be a middle-aged family man with three children. There was a difference noted between county and city board members. Generally, city school board membership consisted of younger individuals. This might lead one to believe that many county school board policies are based on more mature judgement, as county members are typically older.

More women were found on city school boards. Although no evidence could be found to determine the reason for this situation, it would appear that perhaps the availability of women for board membership in cities is greater than that in counties.

Business owners-managers-officials, farmers and professional people dominated both the county and city school boards surveyed. Persons from these occupation groupings would seem to be well qualified for school board service. A noticeable absence of sales and skilled individuals was found.

The responding board members appeared to be well educated

as a group. There was, however, a wide difference found between the number of county and city board members who had completed college. Many more city board members had graduated from an institution of higher learning. City members, therefore, might be considered more aware and better qualified to deal with the many problems faced in education.

The majority of responding board members were native Virginians. Only a small percentage were from outside the state. Locally, this situation appears sound as control of education should rest with local citizens.

Community activities. The majority of respondents were home owners. This should provide incentive for each individual board member to strive to make the local school system of the highest quality. He has a personal interest in having the best possible school system.

Most school board members were found to be very active in group and club membership in their community. Such activities should be very helpful to most members. Many are leaders of their community organizations and should thus be able to promote cooperation and support for education from their groups.

Many of the respondents noted that additional recreational facilities were needed in their communities. A community center to serve both children and adults was most frequently mentioned. Support for such facilities reveals that many members are sincerely interested in the growth of their communities. These interested individuals

should serve the best interests of local education through their school board membership.

Personal relationships. Generally, responding school board members appeared to have good personal relations in their communities. Such relationships are extremely important to board members as each member must have support from local citizens to fulfill the obligations of his office.

Many respondents, however, indicated needing more time to develop more personal friendships. This could, perhaps, be an indication that some school board members are being forced into too active participation in other areas of community life, leaving this very important aspect neglected.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL STUDIES

Almost any additional study in this field would be a worthwhile activity. Local school boards have so many different characteristics that ample opportunities exist for research. White suggests several school board problems mentioned by respondents to his national survey. Among some of these were school board policy, board-superintendent relationships, orientation and inservice training, board organization and board size.<sup>26</sup> This investigator believes additional research would be effective in the following areas.

---

<sup>26</sup>White, op. cit., pp. 81-84.

School board - administration relationships. Many school divisions are faced with the problem of unstable school board - administration relationships. Although many boards may have established guidelines, the need exists to distinguish between school board and administration responsibilities. Personal experience has revealed that when such responsibilities are not clearly defined, confusion and misunderstanding sometimes are the result. Further study might introduce useful information on this problem. Such information would be particularly valuable to local school boards who have experienced this difficulty and are now seeking a solution.

Selection and qualifications of local school board members.

The method of selecting school board members and their qualifications are two areas that would provide interesting and worthwhile research. One important question that might be answered is: Which method of selection, the elective or appointive, is most desirable for a school system? An important question regarding school board members' qualifications might also be answered in additional study. Who should establish qualifications--state legislatures, state school board associations, or state education associations? A study of this type should provide interesting and helpful information to those concerned with this aspect of education.

Compensation of school board members. The compensation received by local board members is another area that should provide interesting additional research. Two questions that would need to

be answered in a study of this area are: (1) Who sets the rate of compensation? and (2) Why are such pay scales different in many localities? Besides salaries, remuneration for other expenses of local board members could also be included in such an investigation. In general, the entire fiscal characteristics of school board membership could be evaluated.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cosby, Frank A. "The Study of Certain Socio-metric Aspects of Hanover County School Teachers". Unpublished Bachelor's thesis, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia, 1961.

Economic Data Summaries. Reports prepared by the Industrial Development and Planning Commission. Richmond: The Governor's Office, 1964-1966.

Personal interview with Mr. A. Erwin Hackney, Commonwealth Attorney, Luray, Virginia, June 26, 1967.

State Board of Education. Annual Report. Report prepared by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Richmond: State Board of Education, 1965.

State Board of Education. Virginia School Laws. A bulletin prepared by the State Board of Education. Richmond: The Michie Company, 1963.

White, Alpheus L. Local School Boards: Organization and Practices. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Bulletin No. 8. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Whitney, Frederick L. The Elements of Research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.

## APPENDICES

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Age Group: Below 30 ( ) 31-40 ( ) 41-50 ( ) 51-60 ( ) 61-70 ( )
2. Sex \_\_\_\_\_
3. Marital Status: Single ( ) Married ( ) Separated ( ) Divorced ( ) Widowed ( )
4. Number of children \_\_\_\_\_
5. Ages of children \_\_\_\_\_
6. Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Spouse's occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Church preference: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Education: (Circle highest year completed) High School 1 2 3 4  
College 1 2 3 4 Graduate 1 2 Degree(s) held \_\_\_\_\_
10. Place of birth: \_\_\_\_\_
11. Do you own or rent your dwelling? \_\_\_\_\_  
House ( ) Apartment ( ) Other \_\_\_\_\_
12. Number of years in present residence: \_\_\_\_\_
13. In general, are you satisfied with your living arrangements? \_\_\_\_\_
14. What improvements do you desire in your living, working conditions? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
15. Is this your first term as board member? \_\_\_\_\_  
How many years have you served? \_\_\_\_\_

II. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

1. Do you think your area offers sufficient cultural and recreational opportunities?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What types of local recreation do you participate in regularly?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Are you a member of any professional groups or clubs?  
Check participation: PTA ( ) Chamber of Commerce ( ) Lions ( ) Kiwanis ( )  
Ruritan ( ) Womens Clubs ( ) Business Clubs ( )  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you belong to any volunteer community organizations?  
Rescue Squad ( ) Fireman ( ) Civil Defense ( ) Red Cross ( )  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you take part in the Church activities of your community?  
Youth groups ( ) Sunday School ( ) Ladies' Circles ( ) Men's Brotherhoods ( )  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you work with any youth groups in your community?  
Scouts ( ) Dance Clubs ( ) Reading Clubs ( ) Athletic Clubs ( )  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you belong to any social clubs in your community? \_\_\_\_\_  
Country Club ( ) Bridge Club ( ) Garden Club ( ) Service Club ( )  
Civic Club ( ) Other \_\_\_\_\_
8. Are you a member of any fraternal group? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Have you, in recent years: Served on a committee in your club ( )  
Sponsored an organization ( ) Held office in your group or club ( )  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
10. What additional recreational facilities would you support? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

III. PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS

1. Do you have a person in your community with whom you can talk over matters that you consider confidential? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Whom, other than a member of your family, do you consider to be your closest friend?  
Board member ( ) Neighbor ( ) Church Associate ( ) Business Associate ( )  
Other ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ Undecided ( )
3. With whom do you prefer to spend your leisure time? Business Associate ( )  
Neighbors ( ) Church Associates ( ) Club Member ( ) Board Member ( )  
Other ( ) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you consider the associations you have with your friends to be satisfactory? \_\_\_\_\_
5. In what way would you change this aspect of your life if you could? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

IV. PLEASE USE BACK OF QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.

APPENDIX B. ACCOMPANYING EXPLANATORY LETTER

1933 Atleo Road  
Mechanicsville, Virginia  
February 7, 1966

Dear

I am a graduate student in education at the University of Richmond and am currently writing a thesis to complete my Master's degree. The topic of this thesis is "The Social Composition of Selected School Boards in Virginia". This project has the approval of, and is being directed by, Dr. Edward F. Overton, Chairman of the Department of Education at the University.

A study of this kind has long been needed in Virginia. School board members have a serious responsibility in their community. The public is often unaware of these responsibilities and is sometimes critical of the policy decisions made by their boards. This study will seek to determine the social make-up of individuals that serve on local school boards. It is believed that this will contribute to a better understanding of our school boards and of their varied reactions on school matters.

You can be of assistance in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. I am interested in obtaining a composite picture of school board membership; therefore, you need not identify yourself when responding. If convenient, I should like to have your reply by February 17.

A brief summary of the completed study will be mailed to your division superintendent at a later date if he so requests. Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Frank A. Cosby

APPENDIX C. FOLLOW-UP POSTAL CARD

1933 Atlee Road  
Mechanicsville, Va.  
February 17, 1966

Dear

I should like to call your attention to the questionnaire I mailed you several days ago. You will remember the results of this survey will be used as the basis of my graduate thesis in education at the University of Richmond.

I need the information requested in order to obtain a valid study. If you have overlooked answering this questionnaire, perhaps you would assist me by supplying the information at this time.

Very truly yours,

Frank A. Cosby

APPENDIX D. LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENT

1933 Atlee Road  
Mechanicsville, Virginia  
February 7, 1966

Dear

I am a graduate student in education at the University of Richmond and am currently writing a thesis to complete my Master's degree. The title of this thesis is "The Social Composition of Selected School Boards in Virginia". This project is being directed by Dr. Edward F. Overton, Chairman of the Department of Education at the University.

A study of this kind has long been needed in Virginia. School board members have a serious responsibility in their community. The public is often unaware of these responsibilities and is sometimes critical of the policy decisions made by their boards. This study will seek to determine the social make-up of individuals that serve on local school boards. It is believed that this will contribute to a better understanding of our school boards and of their varied reactions on school matters.

The enclosed questionnaire has been mailed to members of your board. Their response to this questionnaire will be used as the basis of this study. Any assistance you may be able to give me by urging members of your board to reply will be sincerely appreciated.

Any remarks or suggestions concerning this project will be welcomed by the writer. A brief summary of the completed study will be mailed to you at a later date if you so request.

Very truly yours,

Frank A. Cosby

## APPENDIX E. IMPROVEMENTS DESIRED BY RESPONDENTS

In answer to question 14, Part I. What improvements do you desire in your living-working arrangements?

COUNTY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. More time with family (1)  | 32. Too many meetings                                  |
| 2. Less Federal involvement in business                                     | 33. New home   |
| 3. Enough money to provide school tuitions                                  | 34. Less Federal regulations                           |
| 4. Steady growth (1)  | 35. Less pressure and more time with family            |
| 5. More time for recreation   | 36. To continue to improve my position and earnings    |
| 6. Professional growth  | 37. Retirement   |
| 7. More pay and shorter hours   | 38. Problems inherent to business                      |
| 8. Freedom from Federal control   | 39. Better schools                                     |
| 9. Closer professional working arrangements                                 | 40. Less hours at work and more with hobbies           |
| 10. More reliable labor   | 41. Planning a new home                                |
| 11. More of everything  | 42. More clerical help                                 |
| 12. More leisure time (4)   | 43. Remodel residence                                  |
| 13. Advancement   | 44. Keep up with modern farming methods                |
| 14. More occupational and recreational opportunity                          | 45. Travel   |
| 15. Less government regulations   | 46. Better understanding between producer and consumer |
| 16. Better competitive situation  | 47. Have lady companion share my home                  |
| 17. New school building   | 48. Slower pace  |
| 18. No Sunday work  | 49. Community cooperation                              |
| 19. Prestige and economic status  | 50. Less work and shorter hours                        |
| 20. Larger income   | 51. Better economic opportunities                      |
| 21. Fairer prices for farm products   | 52. Shorter hours for merchants                        |
| 22. Less socialism  | 53. Better civic government                            |
| 23. Better labor  | 54. Additional space                                   |
| 24. Higher standard of living   |  |
| 25. Less work and more money  |  |
| 26. Additional room   |  |
| 27. Swimming pool   |  |
| 28. None, other than those which can be accomplished through my own efforts |  |
| 29. More modern equipment   |  |
| 30. Rambler type house so I can take life easy                              |  |
| 31. More time for golf  |  |



## CITY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

1. More leisure (2)
2. Travel
3. More time with husband
4. More money (1)
5. Cleaner air, streams and parks
6. Better hospital facilities
7. More room (1)
8. Spend more time with family (4)
9. Standard of living to rise in accordance with career growth
10. Larger home
11. Shorter hours
12. Slow down pace as life is becoming too impersonal
13. Better office facilities
14. More office space
15. Better salary
16. More modern research facilities
17. Build home
18. Very happy
19. More space
20. More qualified help
21. More outside privacy

APPENDIX F. CLUB MEMBERSHIP OF RESPONDENTS

CIVIC

Club	County members	City members	Total members
PTA	108	41	149
Chamber of Commerce	53	40	93
Lions	27	14	41
Kiwanis	10	16	26
Ruritan	62	3	65
Womens	8	8	16
Business	28	14	42
Other	63	44	107

VOLUNTEER

Organization	County members	City members	Total members
Rescue Squad	5	2	7
Fireman	24	1	25
Civil Defense	12	0	12
Red Cross	36	7	43
Other	30	26	56

CHURCH

Activities	County members	City members	Total members
Youth groups	23	6	29
Sunday School	107	41	148
Ladies' Circles	11	12	23
Men's Brotherhoods	47	22	69
Other	69	32	101

YOUTH

Groups	County members	City members	Total members
Scouts	25	29	54
Dance Clubs	5	6	11
Reading Clubs	0	0	0
Athletic Clubs	29	7	36
Other	18	9	27

SOCIAL

Club	County members	City members	Total members
Country	49	14	63
Bridge	22	14	36
Garden	6	6	12
Service	32	21	53
Civic	39	24	63
Other	19	17	36

## APPENDIX G. RECREATIONAL PARTICIPATION OF RESPONDENTS

In answer to question 2, Part II. What types of local recreation do you participate in regularly?

COUNTY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Hunting (27)           | 21. Bowling (4)  |
| 2. Fishing (21)           | 22. Auto trips   |
| 3. Boating (8)            | 23. Softball (1)   |
| 4. Horseback riding (2)   | 24. None at my age                                       |
| 5. Golf (28)              | 25. None available. I go outside my area for recreation. |
| 6. Cycling                | 26. Dancing  |
| 7. Polo                   | 27. Church socials                                       |
| 8. Swimming (19)          | 28. Civic and club activities                            |
| 9. Tennis (5)             | 29. Water skiing   |
| 10. Spectator sports (20) | 30. Weekly visits to my farm                             |
| 11. School activities (2) | 31. Church organized                                     |
| 12. Camping (1)           | 32. Photography (1)                                      |
| 13. Reading (1)           | 33. Travel   |
| 14. Bridge (9)            | 34. Athletics  |
| 15. Gardening (5)         | 35. Meetings   |
| 16. Theatre (3)           | 36. Outdoor recreation                                   |
| 17. Picnicking            | 37. Concerts   |
| 18. Flying                | 38. Movies   |
| 19. Games                 |  |
| 20. Square dances (1)     |  |

CITY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

- |                          |                             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Spectator sports (41) | 10. Bridge (2)              |
| 2. Civic                 | 11. Singing                 |
| 3. Arts                  | 12. Camping                 |
| 4. Gardening (2)         | 13. Flying (2)              |
| 5. Golf (6)              | 14. Square dancing (1)      |
| 6. Reading (2)           | 15. Walking                 |
| 7. Dancing               | 16. Do-it-yourself projects |
| 8. Concerts              | 17. Hiking                  |
| 9. Theatre               |                             |

APPENDIX H. ADDITIONAL RECREATIONAL FACILITIES RESPONDENTS WOULD SUPPORT

In answer to question 10, Part II. What additional recreational facilities would you support?

COUNTY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

1. Any worthwhile (13)
2. Development of lakes
3. Theatre group
4. Playgrounds (7)
5. Community center with country club facilities
6. More for elderly
7. More camp sites (2)
8. Parks (7)
9. Hunting preserve
10. Supervised summer program
11. Golf course (2)
12. County recreation on the fair ground
13. Swimming (9)
14. Clarke county is well organized and there is no need for additional recreational facilities.
15. Improvement in surrounding area
16. Tennis courts (3)
17. Community ball field
18. Community center (11)
19. A good musical club
20. Supervised recreation for the youth groups (2)
21. Little League
22. Those necessary to promote a good summer recreation
23. Need more recreation for young people
24. Increased use of school facilities by youths and adults
25. I would do more for my community but milking cows takes too much of my time.
26. Whatever are needed and can be supported by the community
27. Library (3)
28. A civic center for Negroes
29. I don't have time to support any.
30. Teen canteens
31. At present a county wide recreation program is being developed and I will be working in that.
32. Organized men's garden club
33. More public lands for outdoor recreation
34. Those for young people
35. Lake and boating facilities
36. Reading courses and hobbies for the retired
37. Better sports programs in high school
38. Bowling
39. Boat racing
40. Boys' club
41. Use of school facilities for summer adult and youth activities
42. Sports activities

## CITY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

1. Tennis (9)
2. Golf course (2)
3. Swimming (4)
4. Parks (7)
5. Youth building (4)
6. Family picnic areas (1)
7. Supervised play areas
8. Camping
9. Teen programs (4)
10. Don't know
11. Playground (1)
12. Revival of minor league  
baseball
13. Civic auditorium (2)
14. Outdoor ice skating rink (1)
15. Any (1)
16. Youth dances
17. YWCA AND YMCA
18. More highly specialized
19. Water safety
20. Theatre group
21. Drama for young people
22. For older folks
23. Recreational center for  
retired
24. Gym facilities
25. Undecided
26. Plays
27. City recreation program
28. Improved city park

APPENDIX I. DESIRED CHANGES IN PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS BY RESPONDENTS

In answer to question 5, Part III. In what way would you change this aspect of your life if you could?

COUNTY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

1. Be less critical of others
2. Spend more time with friends
3. Have more real friends
4. More time (4)
5. Cut down on the seemingly foolish forms that are sent thru the mail such as this one
6. None (34)
7. Have too little time to develop friends of more than superficial relationship
8. It would be nice to have more hours in each day.
9. Bring in more professional people
10. Be a better neighbor
11. More time to enjoy the friends I have
12. Spend more time in social rather than business activities
13. Wouldn't care to
14. Larger income
15. I need more time for personal associations.
16. Try to get more education while young
17. I would have more time to mingle with friends and associates.
18. Not broad enough
19. I would not have accepted board membership if I had realized how it would adversely affect personal relationships.
20. Increase circle of friends
21. I would make living conditions better for the community.
22. Not in any way
23. I only wish to stay well and be able to continue my services to the community and operate the farm I own.
24. Be able to see more of them oftener
25. I would like more time for family and socializing.
26. More time to visit neighbors
27. School board members have no leisure time.
28. I have many friends and acquaintances.
29. Like to have more time for associations
30. I don't have enough time and if I had it to do again I would go into practice with another doctor or doctors.
31. More time for home projects
32. Improve my education
33. No complaints
34. Happy
35. I have very little leisure time at present.
36. I enjoy leisure time with any in the suggested groups.
37. Be able to give more time to friends
38. Have recently begun to curtail my outside activities for more time with family
39. Better arranging of schedules and read more
40. None, my business and community activity consume most of my time.
41. See friends more frequently
42. No way unless I could do more for my friends.
43. Have more time to help others in community

44. More closer friends
45. Cut out a little of the gossip especially among women--hopeless case
46. Do more for neighbors
47. Too late in life to change
48. Better education and more degree teachers
49. More education
50. Closest friends live elsewhere, wish to be closer to them
51. Satisfactory
52. More time for community services

CITY RESPONSE (number in parentheses indicates identical responses)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Satisfactory  | 21. Would like to have had a college education, because of this I have missed many opportunities |
| 2. More time with friends  |  |
| 3. No change (1)   |  |
| 4. More education to broaden one's associations  |  |
| 5. More time to visit  |  |
| 6. Give more of myself and receive less  |  |
| 7. Make increased effort to build closer relationships   |  |
| 8. More time (3)   |  |
| 9. Be a better friend  |  |
| 10. Life becoming too personal   |  |
| 11. Not much time to socialize   |  |
| 12. None   |  |
| 13. More time to spend with friends who stimulate my thinking  |  |
| 14. More time with family and friends  |  |
| 15. Physician is not allowed much in way of social life.   |  |
| 16. More hours in day  |  |
| 17. More time to cultivate new friends   |  |
| 18. Would like interpersonal relationships to be more meaningful--too often they are too hurried and superficial |  |
| 19. Slow down pace   |  |
| 20. Widen group of friends   |  |

## APPENDIX J. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

In answer to Part IV. Use back of questionnaire for additional comments.

COUNTY RESPONSE (several lengthy responses have been condensed)

1. To be an active and informed school board member requires much more time than is spent attending meetings. It requires so much time I must limit my other activities.
2. I find it stimulating and helpful to spend time in University teaching. This keeps me from meddling in areas of school administration which rightly are in the jurisdiction of professional educators employed by the school board. Board members should maintain their policy-making and decision-making roles and not attempt to run the schools in areas that should be under the professional staff responsibility.
3. Have become completely disgruntled and discouraged by the unlimited demands made on one's time after he first succumbs to a sense of civic responsibility. Of course this reaction might be attributed to advancing years.
4. My week is full--6 days at the bank and church on Sunday morning.
5. I am very much interested in the affairs of our community, county and state. I take great interest in our schools. I have almost lived with our county schools, as my father was a member of the school board for 24 years and since he resigned I have been a member for 26 years. My motto--Live a good clean Christian life which I have tried to do all my life. By doing this I have been able to set a good example for our young people.
6. Having answered the questions I realize that my social life seems a little thin--at least on paper. My regular job is very demanding and my school board work is too. Yesterday, a Monday for example, I left the house at 8:15 a. m. and got home at 11:40 p. m. Too many days like this leave me little time for social activities.
7. Am resigning as school board member this month after having served 22½ years and have not missed a meeting or been late in attending but one time due to helping a neighbor get out of a snow drift in his car.
8. I have been active in all civic activities in my county and community. Now that I am over seventy, I am not quite as active as at one time. I am still interested in anything for the betterment of our county and the children in it. We need better educational facilities and more industries in the county. So many of our young people are leaving because there is no opportunity for employment.
9. I have served longer on board than anyone has ever served.



- I served as chairman for 12 years and am still on board after suffering heart attack two years ago. My activity has had to be curtailed.
10. I enjoy the fellowship and association with other board members very much, but because of distance we have few social contacts and even less business contacts.
  11. Had difficulty answering questions 2 and 3 in section III because of many very close friends.
  12. I believe the public's largest problems are: (a) Lack of information, (b) Not wanting to be informed, and (c) Refusing to accept the importance of an education for our children.
  13. I am very much interested in the affairs of my community, but not to the extent that I ignore the state, national and worldly affairs. I read widely and am interested in the world at large. In other words, I'm not a hide housed provincial.
  14. This board member comes from Surry County and, no doubt, you are familiar with some of our problems here. First, and foremost, if feasible I should like to see our children back in public school. This problem has taken many of our young families from the county to other areas, leaving the older and childless families here . . . . . I would like to see my neighbors and friends have the opportunity to take advantage of extension courses offered in business management, hobbies for older citizens, reading, art, etc. . . . .

CITY RESPONSE (several lengthy responses have been condensed)

1. School board members should be elected by the people--not by council and supervisors.
2. Your questionnaire may contribute to better understanding of composition of school boards, but you must allow of course for this observation that the reaction of any seasoned, responsible member will be tempered by experience, innate objectivity, character of administrative personnel, especially the superintendent, among other things . . . . .
3. Full time job
4. This is a most poorly worded, non-sensual questionnaire.
5. Community college became a reality two years ago--now being operated by VPI. Having a small part in this development was an inspiring experience. I feel that we as Americans and Christians need to remember our heritage and not put too much stock in material things. We are where we are today as a result of much sacrifice on the part of many and we fail to remember and be thankful for our blessings.
6. I enjoy life, people and changing times.
7. I am not a graduate psychologist and are you one? Each person and each association calls for a different reaction and I trust that I improve and learn as I grow older. I think section III is like asking if you approve of God and motherhood. How can you evaluate them without knowing them personally?

8. In view of the title of your thesis--wonder why you didn't get a sounding on the educational experience, background and interest of your sample school board population. For example, I wonder how many people view the school board as a political stepping stone rather than an end in itself?

## VITA

The investigator, Frank Alton Cosby, was born on October 27, 1939, in Hanover County, Virginia. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. William A. Cosby of Mechanicsville, Virginia. Two brothers, William A., Jr. and Edwin T., live in Richmond, Virginia.

After completing his early education in the Hanover County public schools, the writer entered Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia. The Bachelor of Arts in Sociology was earned in June of 1961. Summer school work in graduate education was then pursued at the University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia. The investigator is presently a candidate for the Master of Science in Education at the University.

The writer's past experience has been varied. High school and elementary teaching positions and an elementary principalship were held in Spotsylvania, Prince William and Southampton counties. Other experience included three years as manager of McLean Trucking Company in Hickory, North Carolina. The investigator is presently the Director of ESEA for the Page County Schools, Luray, Virginia.

Past professional memberships have included the Virginia Education Association and the National Education Association. Civic memberships have included the Hickory Jaycees. Presently the writer is a member of the Luray Rotary Club.

The writer and his wife, the former Miss Mary Page Burden of Richmond, Virginia, reside in Luray, Virginia. One son, Michael Glen, is seventeen months old.