

1936

A study of the personal and professional qualifications of school trustees in Indiana

Rhessa Routh
Indiana State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds>

Recommended Citation

Routh, Rhessa, "A study of the personal and professional qualifications of school trustees in Indiana" (1936). *All-Inclusive List of Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 3071.
<https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds/3071>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Sycamore Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in All-Inclusive List of Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Sycamore Scholars. For more information, please contact dana.swinford@indstate.edu.

235-
A STUDY OF THE PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS
OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES IN INDIANA

by

Rhessa Routh

Contributions of the Graduate School
Indiana State Teachers College
Number 235

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree
In Education

1936

INDIANA STATE
NORMAL LIBRARY

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to all individuals who have contributed to the success of this research. She is especially indebted to Dr. J. R. Shannon for suggesting the problem and for his valuable counsel and consideration as chairman of the committee. This student is grateful to Mr. E. E. Ramsey for the use of his name and kindly cooperation in permitting the questionnaires to be returned to him. To Mr. C. M. Morgan, the writer is indebted for his time and constructive criticism on the grammatical context of this thesis. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. O. G. Jamison and Mr. E. L. Abell for their contributions to the success of this study.

Special appreciation is expressed to all of the school superintendents in Indiana who cooperated so generously in making this study possible.

R. A. R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Origin of Topic.....	1
Scope of the Study.....	3
Statement of Problems.....	3
Procedure used in Solving Problems.....	4
Validity of the Questionnaire as a Scientific Method of Research.....	6
Mailing the Questionnaires.....	7
II. TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES AND THEIR QUALIFICATIONS.....	8
Description of Questionnaire.....	8
Presentation of Data.....	9
Personal Data.....	9
Age and Sex.....	9
Education.....	10
Occupation.....	11
Outstanding Single Traits of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees.	15
Other Personal Characteristics of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees.....	17
Professional Data.....	20

CHAPTER	PAGE
General Data.....	25
III. CITY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR	
QUALIFICATIONS.....	29
Similar Studies.....	29
Description of Questionnaire.....	31
Presentation of Data.....	31
Personal Data.....	31
Age and Sex.....	31
Education.....	32
Occupation.....	34
Outstanding Traits.....	39
Other Personal Traits.....	41
Professional Data.....	44
General Data.....	49
IV. TOWN SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR	
QUALIFICATIONS.....	55
Description of Questionnaire.....	55
Presentation of Data.....	56
Personal Data.....	56
Age and Sex.....	56
Education.....	56
Occupation.....	58
Outstanding Traits.....	62
Other Personal Characteristics.....	63

CHAPTER	PAGE
Professional Data.....	66
General Data.....	71
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	75
Solution to Problems.....	75
What Personal and Professional Traits Should be Found in the Most Desirable Township Trustee.....	75
What Personal and Professional Traits are Found in the Least Desirable Township Trustee.....	76
What Personal and Professional Traits Should be Found in the Most Desirable City School Board Member.....	78
What Personal and Professional Traits are Found in the Least Desirable City School Board Member.....	79
What Personal and Professional Traits Should be Found in the Most Desirable Town School Board Member.....	80
What Personal and Professional Traits are Found in the Least Desirable Town School Board Member.....	81
General Comparative Conclusions.....	82
The Halo of General Estimate.....	83

CHAPTER	PAGE
Suggestions for Further Research.....	85
VI. APPENDIX.....	86
Bibliography.....	86
Introductory Letter Accompanying Question- naire Sent to School Superintendents.....	87
The Questionnaire Sent to County Superintendents in Indiana.....	88
The Questionnaire Sent to Town and City Superintendents in Indiana.....	92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Level of Education Research by Best and Poorest Township Trustees.....	10
II. Occupational Distribution of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees.....	12
III. Most Outstanding Single Traits of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees.....	16
IV. Other Personal Characteristics Found Most Often in the Best and Poorest Township Trustees...	18
V. Professional qualities of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees.....	21
VI. Additional Traits Aiding in Classification of Township Trustees as "Best".....	26
VII. Additional Traits Aiding in Classification of Township Trustees as "Poorest".....	27
VIII. Level of Education Reached by Best and Poorest City School Board Members.....	33
IX. Occupational Distribution of the Best and Poorest City School Board Members.....	35
X. Most Outstanding Single Traits of the Best and Poorest City School Board Members.....	40
XI. Other Personal Traits of the Best and Poorest City School Board Members.....	42

TABLE

PAGE

XII.	Professional Qualities of the Best and Poorest City School Board Members.....	45
XIII.	Additional Traits Aiding in Classification of City School Board Members as "Best".....	51
XIV.	Additional Traits Aiding in Classification of City School Board Members as "Poorest".....	53
XV.	Level of Education Reached by Best and Poorest Town School Board Members.....	57
XVI.	Occupational Distribution of the Best and Poorest Town School Board Members.....	59
XVII.	Most Outstanding Single Traits of the Best and Poorest Town School Board Members.....	63
XVIII.	Other Personal Characteristics of the Best and Poorest Town School Board Members.....	65
XIX.	Professional Qualities of the Best and Poorest Town School Board Members.....	67
XX.	Additional Traits Aiding in the Classification of Town School Board Members as "Best".....	72
XXI.	Additional Traits Aiding in the Classification of Town School Board Members as "Poorest"....	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. ORIGIN OF TOPIC

A survey of the field of professional literature reveals many dogmatic statements concerning those personal and professional qualities necessary to make a most desirable school trustee.¹ These statements are purely the results of arm-chair meditation and are not, therefore, based upon scientific investigation. For instance, in speaking of school board members Mr. Hines states very conclusively that there is very little which the "average, refined, sensitive woman" can do as a board member without "interfering with the actual working of the schools."² An equally positive assertion is made by William E. Chancellor when he says that "men of large affairs," physicians, and college graduates usually make good board members, and that young men, newspapermen, men

¹ The term "school trustee" is used to mean city and town school board members and township trustees.

² L. N. Hines, "The Ideal School Board Member from the Superintendent's Point of View." Proceedings, N. E. A., 1911.

in subordinate business positions and women usually make poor board members.³ Such an authority in the field of school administration as Dr. Cubberley lists very dogmatically the traits and qualifications necessary in a good school board member.⁴ Such statements as those just cited provoke the question: "How do these authorities know what characteristics make up a good school board member?" A second question then arises: "If a scientific investigation were carried on to determine what traits are necessary to make a good school trustee, would the conclusions reached agree with the conclusions drawn from 'arm-chair meditations' by the authorities mentioned?" These were the questions raised by Dr. J. R. Shannon in a class in Public School Administration in which the writer of this paper was present. Motivated by Dr. Shannon's suggestions and her own growing interest in the field, the writer undertook to find out by scientific investigation just what qualities do make desirable school trustees.

³ William E. Chancellor, Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision.

⁴ Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public School Administration, pp. 211-212.

II. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Geographically this study was confined to Indiana. Within the school organization of the state, it included three types of school trustees. In the first place, it included a study of the township trustees in Indiana, their traits and qualifications. The trustees are elected in each township and bear approximately the same relation to the township schools and their administration as do the township boards of three to five members in other states. In the second place, this study considered the city school board members in Indiana cities, and in the third place, the town school board members in Indiana towns. The division between town and city was based upon the division made in the Indiana School Director for the current year. Since other cities and towns in the United States have school boards in their school organizations, the data and conclusions drawn in this study concerning the qualifications of city and town school board members may be easily comparable to other cities and towns in other states.

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS

It is hoped that the data used in this study will enable the writer to answer specifically the following questions:

1. What personal and professional traits should be found in the most desirable township trustee?
2. What personal and professional traits are found in the least desirable township trustee?
3. What personal and professional traits should be found in the most desirable city school board members?
4. What personal and professional traits are found in the least desirable city school board members?
5. What personal and professional traits should be found in the most desirable town school board members?
6. What personal and professional traits are found in the least desirable town school board members?

IV. PROCEDURE USED IN SOLVING PROBLEMS

In the absence of an all-knowing power to reveal the qualities necessary to make a good school trustee, dependence was placed upon the knowledge possessed by those school administrators, who have been most closely associated with the school trustees in the past. Experience from this close business and professional association should enable the school superintendents to aid in the defining of those traits necessary in a most desirable school trustee. One man's experience will not be given too great a credence.

Several men's experiences, all tending toward a common conclusion, may be said to be scientifically reliable. The writer attempted to obtain such data by sending questionnaires to the county, city, and town superintendents in Indiana.

Items used in the questionnaires were, for the most part, based upon the desirable and undesirable traits of school board members listed by E. P. Cubberley in his book on Public School Administration.⁵

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part was headed "Best" and asked the superintendent to think of the most desirable school trustee with whom he had ever worked and respond to the twenty-seven items that followed in light of that individual's characteristics. The first ten of these items concerned personal traits and the remainder of the twenty-seven items concerned the professional traits of the school trustee. At the end of part one of the questionnaire a space was left wherein the superintendent could state additional facts relative to the individual whom he considered the best or most desirable trustee.

The second part of the questionnaire was headed "Poorest" and was identical in every respect to the first part except that the superintendent was asked to call to mind the least desirable school trustee with

⁵Ibid., pp. 211-212.

whom he had ever worked and respond to the twenty-seven items relative to this individual's characteristics. This part also provided opportunity at the end for further comment upon the individual considered least desirable.

V. VALIDITY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS A SCIENTIFIC METHOD OF RESEARCH

Much has been said about the validity of the questionnaire as a method of scientific research. It must be admitted that the questionnaire method, like other methods of research, has some very definite limitations, but, if it is "rightly used, it is a proper and indeed an inevitable means of securing information."⁶ Mr. A. T. Wylie, Educational Specialist in New York City, after checking closely on the answers given by pupils to a questionnaire, draws the following conclusions concerning the questionnaire method of research:⁷ (1) The answers of any one individual are not to be given too great credence. (2) The answers of a number of individuals taken together are, however, subject to the well-known laws of averages and errors and so tend to correct one another that the net total result has considerable validity and is entitled to consideration.

⁶Carter V. Good, How to Do Research in Education, p.134

⁷Andrew Tennant Wylie, "To What Extent May We Rely upon the Answers to a School Questionnaire?" in The Journal of Educational Method, Vol. VI., p.257

Believing that the questionnaire is the only valid instrument that could be used in carrying on a study of this nature, the writer feels justified in presenting the data collected by this method.

VI. MAILING THE QUESTIONNAIRES

On October 30, 1935, two hundred and fifty-one questionnaires were mailed to all of the school superintendents in Indiana as they were listed in the Indiana School Directory. Of this number, ninety-two went to county superintendents, ninety-four to city superintendents, and sixty-five to town superintendents.

The response from these superintendents was most gratifying. Of the total number (251) sent, one hundred eighty-eight, or 75 per cent, were returned. Sixty-nine of the 92, or 75 per cent of the county superintendents, responded; seventy-seven of the ninety-four city superintendents, or 81.91 per cent, responded; and forty-three of the sixty-five town superintendents, or 66.15 per cent, responded to the questionnaire.

CHAPTER II

TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES AND THEIR QUALIFICATIONS

To obtain data concerning the qualifications of township trustees, questionnaires were sent to the county superintendents, since these administrators were most closely associated with township trustees and were, therefore, more familiar with their qualifications.

I. DESCRIPTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire consisted of two major parts. The first major part, headed "Best," was subdivided into two minor parts. The first of these two subdivisions was titled "Personal Data" and considered items one to ten inclusive. The purpose of these items was to define those personal traits that are essential to the success of a most desirable trustee. The second subdivision was titled "Professional Data" and included items eleven to twenty-seven. These items were designed to reveal those professional traits most necessary in a desirable township trustee. In answering the first major portion of the questionnaire, the county superintendent was asked to cooperate by calling to mind the best township trustee with whom he had ever worked and to respond to the items relative to this individual's characteristics. At

the end of part one a space was left wherein the superintendent could state any additional facts relative to the individual whom he considered the best or most desirable township trustee.

The second major part of the questionnaire was headed "Poorest" and asked the county superintendent to think of the poorest township trustee with whom he had ever worked and to respond to the items relative to that individual's characteristics. The items and subdivisions in the second part were identical in every respect to the items and subdivisions described above. The second part also provided opportunity at the end for further comment upon the individual considered least desirable.

On October 30, 1935, a questionnaire was mailed to each of the 92 county superintendents in the state. Of this number (92) 69, or 75 per cent, responded to the first major portion of the questionnaire; 68, or 73 per cent, responded to the second major division.

II. PRESENTATION OF DATA

A. PERSONAL DATA

1. Age and Sex. All of the township trustees considered either best or poorest by the county superintendents were men. Item one on the questionnaire asked the approximate age of the individual being considered when he took the office of township trustee and the approximate age when he left it. A computation showed

that the mean or average age of the best township trustees when taking office was 41.72 years; the average age when leaving office was found to be 48.68 years. The average or mean age at which the poorest township trustee took office was found to be 48.85 years; the average of the poorest when leaving was found to be 54.43 years. It is interesting to note that the best township trustees held office 7.11 years, while the poorest held office 4.62 years--a difference in length of tenure of 2.49 years.

2. Education. It is generally conceded that an education is necessary to success. If this be true, township trustees are no exception. The following table gives the level of education reached by the representative best and poorest trustees in Indiana.

TABLE I

LEVEL OF EDUCATION REACHED BY THE BEST
AND POOREST TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

Amount of Education	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
None	0	0	4	5.88
Elementary School or less	25	36.23	54	79.41
High School or less	29	42.03	6	8.82
College or less	15	21.74	4	5.88
Total	69	100.00	68	99.99

From this table it is seen that less than one-half (42.03 per cent) of the township trustees considered best had done any work in high school. A few over one third (36.23 per cent) had an elementary education or less. The fact that the least desirable trustees were poorly educated is very obvious. Over three fourths (79.41 per cent) of these poorest had only an elementary education or less; four (5 per cent) of the poorest trustees had no education at all. The same number had had some college education.

These data show conclusively that even the best of the township trustees in Indiana are none too well educated, since over three fourths of them have never reached beyond high school level and a few less than one half of these have never reached high school. Of the poorest township trustees, only 14 per cent have reached high school or above. It would be interesting to know into what educational category the greater per cent of the township trustees now in office would fall.

3. Occupation. Item Number 3 asked the county superintendents to state the occupation of the best or poorest township trustee at the time this trustee assumed office. The purpose of this question was to determine the occupational group or groups which furnish the greater number of our township trustees for the administration of the schools. An attempt was made to use the occupational classification used by the 1930 U. S. Bureau of Census.

TABLE II

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE BEST
AND POOREST TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

Occupation	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
I. Agriculture				
A. Farmer	47	68.12	45	66.18
B. Gardener	0	0	1	1.47
Total	47	68.12	46	67.65
II. Business				
A. Contractor	0	0	1	1.47
B. Druggist	1	1.45	0	0
C. Grain Dealer	2	2.90	0	0
D. Groceryman	0	0	1	1.47
E. Local Business	2	2.90	0	0
F. Merchant	4	5.80	0	0
G. Sawmill Operator	0	0	1	1.47
H. Tile Maker	0	0	1	1.47
I. Insurance Agent	2	2.90	1	1.47
J. Stock Buyer	0	0	1	1.47
K. Salesman	0	0	2	2.94
Total	11	15.95	8	11.76
III. Trades				
A. Barber	1	1.45	0	0
B. Carpenter	1	1.45	0	0

TABLE II (Continued)

C. Printer	1	1.45	0	0
D. Telegraph Operator	1	1.45	1	1.47
Total	4	5.80	1	1.47

IV. Laborer

A. Day Laborer	1	1.45	4	5.88
B. Coal Miner	0	0	1	1.47
C. Section hand on R.R.	0	0	1	1.47
D. Shop	0	0	1	1.47
E. Trucker	0	0	1	1.47
Total	1	1.45	8	11.76

V. Professional

A. Teacher	2	2.90	1	1.47
B. Veterinary S.	2	2.90	0	0
Total	4	5.80	1	1.47

VI. No Occupation

A. Jack of all Trades	0	0	1	1.47
B. Nothing Definite	0	0	1	1.47
C. Loafer	0	0	1	1.47
D. Blank	0	0	1	1.47
Total	0	0	4	5.88

TABLE II (Continued)

VII: Unclassified				
A. Township Assessor	1	1.45	0	0
B. Factory Foreman	1	1.45	0	0
Total	2	2.90	0	0

However, this classification was rejected for the reason that it failed to draw sharp enough distinctions within classes or groups to suit the investigator's present needs. The classification used in presenting the data in Table II is the writer's own and was made with the thought of giving the best possible interpretation of the data gathered. The numbers in the frequency columns in the table represent the actual number of times a given occupation was mentioned. The number in the percentage columns represent the per cent of the total returns from county superintendents that reported individuals engaged in any one occupation.

The conclusion that the most of the best and poorest township trustees are engaged in agricultural pursuits is a very obvious one, since 68 per cent of both the best and poorest belong to the farmer groups. This situation is easily understood when we realize that the number of the rural townships which naturally draw their officials from the predominate industry--agriculture--is so much larger than the urban townships which have a more varied number

of occupations from which to choose.

Business men comprise the next largest group represented. They also furnish the next most desirable group of trustees--15 per cent plus of the total. Trades and professions each furnish 5 per cent plus of the most desirable trustees and 1 per cent of the least desirable. The laborer group furnished only 1 per cent of the most desirable and 11 per cent plus of the least desirable. Those trustees considered under "no occupation" were found to contribute nothing for which they could be rated as "best" while they furnished 12 per cent of the "poorest". Every occupational group considered in Table II, with the exception of the laborer group, contributed more desirable trustees than undesirable ones.

4. Outstanding Single Traits of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees. Item Number 4 asked that the superintendent indicate with a check any traits listed that were most outstanding in the individual he was considering. Table III was compiled from the answers received to this item.

This table indicates that honesty was checked as the most outstanding trait in both the best and poorest township trustees considered. It is significant, however, to compare the frequencies and percentages as they are in the table with what they might have been. Sixty-six of a possible 69, or 95 per cent plus, of the best were honest while only 26 of a possible 68, or 38 per cent, of the poorest were indicated as being honest. It is interesting

TABLE III
MOST OUTSTANDING SINGLE TRAITS OF THE
BEST AND POOREST TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

Trait	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
Honesty	66	95.65	26	38.24
Cooperativeness	62	89.82	11	16.18
Progressiveness	51	73.91	6	8.82
Intelligence	47	68.12	8	11.76
Courtesy	45	65.22	18	26.47
Tact	44	63.77	11	16.18
Temperance	41	59.42	17	25.00
Cleanliness	39	56.52	22	32.35
Initiative	34	49.28	9	13.24
None indicated	1	1.45	18	26.47

to note and compare the traits appearing most frequently on the "best" and "poorest" sections of the questionnaire. Evidently it is not so necessary that a trustee be clean, temperate, and have initiative if he is honest, cooperative, progressive, and intelligent. This statement is supported by further evidence when the traits ranked as most outstanding in the poorer trustees are considered. Here, with the exception of "honesty" which ranked high in both cases, the order is quite reversed. Cleanliness, courtesy, and temperance were the most outstanding, while cooperativeness, initiative, and intelligence were least

outstanding. It is significant, too, to compare the frequencies of the highest ranking traits in the "poorest" category with the total frequencies they might have had. This comparison reveals that all of the traits, with the exception of "honesty", have percentages of less than one third. This means that approximately two thirds of the trustees considered "poorest" had none of these traits to any outstanding degree.

5. Other Personal Characteristics of the Best and Poorest Township Trustees. Items 5 to 10 inclusive in the two major portions of the questionnaire were intended to obtain other personal facts not brought out in the items already considered. Table IV summarizes the answers received to these items.

Item Number 3, presented in Table II, of this thesis concerned the occupations of trustees before taking office. Item Number 5, presented in Table IV, was a follow-up question to Number 3 designed to find out whether or not the individual continued his occupation after he assumed the duties of his office. The data show that 86 per cent plus of the best trustees continued their original occupations after taking office and that 73 per cent plus of the poorest trustees did likewise. This would seem to indicate one of two things: either the duties of a township trustee are not of a nature in most cases to warrant a man's devoting full time to it, or the compensation for the duties demanded by the office are insufficient to maintain a high living standard.

TABLE IV

OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS FOUND MOST OFTEN
IN THE BEST AND POOREST TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

	Ans.	Best		Poorest	
		F	%	F	%
5. Did the individual continue this occupation after taking office?	Yes	60	86.96	50	73.53
	No	7	10.14	17	25.00
	Y & N	2	2.90	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47
6. Judging from the individual's own wealth and standing in the community, did he manage his own personal affairs successfully?	Yes	66	95.65	29	42.65
	No	2	2.90	38	55.88
	Y & N	1	1.45	1	1.47
	Bl	0	0	0	0
7. Was he affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight, or talk unnecessarily about his own accomplishments?	Yes	4	5.80	41	60.29
	No	65	94.20	27	39.71
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	0	0
8. Could he accept success without vainglory and defeat without becoming embittered?	Yes	62	89.85	15	22.06
	No	5	7.25	52	76.47
	Y & N	2	2.90	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47
9. Was he alert and able to get things done?	Yes	67	97.10	17	25.00
	No	2	2.90	49	72.06
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	2	2.94
10. Did he have children in school during his term in office?	Yes	38	55.07	35	51.47
	No	31	43.93	32	47.06
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47

The data for the next two items (6 and 7) reveal that the best township trustees are successful in the handling of their own personal affairs and are not affected by the desire to stand in the community limelight. Ninety-five per cent plus of the best were successful in managing their own personal business while 55 per cent plus of the poorest unsuccessful in handling their personal affairs. Ninety-four per cent of the best trustees were not affected by the desire to stand in the community limelight while considerably over one half (60 per cent) of the poorest were so affected.

The percentages computed for Item 8 indicate that by far the greater number (89 per cent) of the most desirable township trustees could accept success without becoming vainglorious and that over three fourths (76.47 per cent) of the poorest trustees became boastful of success and embittered if defeated. Item 9 shows conclusively that good trustees, to the extent of 97.17 per cent, are alert and able to accomplish maximally.

Item 10 was based on an assumption that the writer has so often heard expressed, namely, that township trustees with children in school will be more interested in the school and will render the greater services because of that interest. No very definite conclusion can be drawn from the data presented by Item 10, since the percentages for the two groups are so similar.

B. PROFESSIONAL DATA

The second minor division of the questionnaire included Items 11 to 27 and was designed to obtain data concerning the professional characteristics of the best and poorest township trustees. Table V presents the data obtained.

The data collected for Items 11 and 12 will warrant the conclusion that the best township trustees (92 per cent) do not practice nepotism and (65 per cent) are free from political influences while 69 per cent of the poorest trustees do practice nepotism and 91 per cent are influenced from political sources.

Items 13 and 14 show that 92 per cent plus of the best trustees were free from denominational and fraternal influences, but the data also show that almost three fourths of the poorest trustees were also free from these influences. The conclusion can be drawn then that the majority of township trustees, both desirable and undesirable, are free from denominational and fraternal influences.

That the ability to think independently of others is a most essential trait is very obvious since, all of the best (100 per cent) township trustees have that ability and over fifty per cent (52 per cent) of the poorest ones do not. Closely related to this item is the ability to resist pressure as considered in Item sixteen. Here the same conclusion can be drawn. The best trustees are far more able to resist outside pressure than are the poorest ones.

TABLE V
PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES OF THE BEST AND
POOREST TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

	Ans	Best		Poorest	
		F	%	F	%
11. Individual practice nepotism?	Yes	4	5.80	47	69.12
	No	64	92.75	20	29.41
	Y & N	1	1.45	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47
12. Free from political influences?	Yes	45	65.22	6	8.82
	No	21	30.43	62	91.18
	Y & N	3	4.35	0	0
	Bl	0	0	0	0
13. Free from denonination- al influences?	Yes	64	92.75	49	72.06
	No	4	5.80	18	26.47
	Y & N	1	1.45	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47
14. Free from fraternal influences?	Yes	64	92.75	50	73.53
	No	3	4.35	16	23.53
	Y & N	2	2.90	0	0
	Bl	0	0	2	2.94
15. Could he think for himself?	Yes	69	100	27	39.71
	No	0	0	36	52.94
	Y & N	0	0	3	4.41
	Bl	0	0	2	2.94
16. Could he resist pressure?	Yes	68	98.55	20	29.41
	No	1	1.45	46	67.65
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	2	2.94
17. Explain reasons for his actions?	Yes	69	100	13	19.12
	No	0	0	54	79.41
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47

TABLE V (Continued)

18. Did you consider him a radical individual?	Yes	1	1.45	22	32.35
	No	67	97.10	42	61.76
	Y & N	1	1.45	1	1.47
	Bl	0	0	3	4.41
19. Was he conservative?	Yes	34	49.28	34	50.00
	No	24	34.78	22	32.35
	Y & N	8	11.59	3	4.41
	Bl	3	4.35	9	13.23
20. Was he liberal?	Yes	47	68.12	15	22.06
	No	8	11.59	37	54.41
	Y & N	6	8.70	1	1.47
	Bl	8	11.59	15	22.06
21. Save time and transact business with efficiency?	Yes	67	97.10	10	14.71
	No	2	2.90	55	80.88
	Y & N	0	0	2	2.94
	Bl	0	0	1	1.47
22. Show any initiative in sponsoring community projects?	Yes	58	84.06	17	25.00
	No	11	15.94	47	69.12
	Y & N	0	0	2	2.94
	Bl	0	0	2	2.94
23. Did he always consider the welfare of the school?	Yes	63	91.30	5	7.35
	No	4	5.80	62	91.18
	Y & N	1	1.45	0	0
	Bl	1	1.45	1	1.47
24. Did he show any great interest in community problems?	Yes	62	89.86	12	17.65
	No	7	10.14	53	77.94
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	3	4.41
25. Contribute to moral and intellectual life of community?	Yes	65	94.20	2	2.94
	No	1	1.45	64	94.12
	Y & N	1	1.45	1	1.47
	Bl	2	2.90	1	1.47

TABLE V (Continued)

26.	Consider a proposition thoroughly before giving his opinion?	Yes	68	98.55	15	22.06
		No	1	1.45	50	73.53
		Y & N	0	0	1	1.47
		Bl	0	0	2	2.94
27.	"Rubber-stamp" the superintendent?	Yes	26	37.68	25	36.76
		No	42	60.87	41	60.29
		Y & N	1	1.45	1	1.47
		Bl	0	0	1	1.47

Item 17 points to the fact that a good trustee is able to explain reasons for his actions which implies that his actions are well considered and reasonable.

Items 18, 19, and 20 were written to ascertain whether or not the best township trustees are radical, conservative, or liberal in their attitudes. The data show that close to 70 per cent (68.12 per cent) of the best trustees were liberal in their views and that over 50 per cent (54.41 per cent) of the poorest were illiberal. The data show emphatically that the best township trustees are not radical and that approximately 50 per cent of both the best and poorest are conservative.

The data for Items 21 to 25 can be summarized in the following statement: it is emphatically true that the best township trustees have a sense of time efficiency, and willing sponsors of community projects, always according to the returns have the welfare of the school uppermost in mind, and show great interest in community problems. The data show also that over three fourths of the poorest trustees do not

possess a time sense, do not sponsor community projects, do not always consider the welfare of the schools, and do not show any great interest in community problems.

The response to Item 25 indicates that the best township trustees contribute something to the moral tone and intellectual life of the community. Ninety-four per cent of the best trustees did contribute to the moral and intellectual tone of the community and 94 per cent of the poorest did not.

The data for Item 26 indicate that 98 per cent of the most desirable trustees always consider carefully a proposition made by the superintendent before giving an opinion. Of the poorest trustees, 75 per cent plus expressed opinion on propositions made by the superintendent without giving careful consideration.

The following conclusion may be drawn from the data presented relative to item twenty-seven: approximately 60 per cent of both the best and poorest township trustees never consented to a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it. The data show that approximately 38 per cent of both groups did consent to a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it. This may be explained in two ways: either the trustees hoped to gain favor with the superintendent by consenting to a proposition favored by him, or they recognized him as an authority on certain matters with which they were unfamiliar.

C. GENERAL DATA

At the end of each major part of the questionnaire the following request was made: "In a brief statement give any additional material why you consider this individual you have been thinking of the most (or least) desirable you have ever known." The responses to this request were in varied forms and treated many experiences and traits. A total of 38 comments were made. Twenty-three of the 38 added material concerning the most desirable township trustee, and 36 of the 38 added further comment upon the individual considered least desirable. The investigator attempted to translate these responses into certain common terms. These terms, together with the number of times they were used in translation, and also their percentages appear in Table VI. Some comments contained several statements, each one of which could be translated under a different heading. This accounts for the fact that the total frequencies do not equal the number of comments given in each major portion of the questionnaire.

Table VI shows that the most outstanding trait mentioned in addition to those considered in the formal part of the questionnaire was "respect for authority". What is meant by this term can best be explained by the following quotation taken from one of the questionnaires: "He yielded to the superintendent in matters in which he felt himself less informed."

"Social mindedness" was placed second in importance. This term is interpreted to mean "public minded" or in the

TABLE VI
ADDITIONAL TRAITS AIDING IN CLASSIFICATION
OF TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES AS "BEST"

Trait	Frequency
Respect for Authority	8
Social-Mindedness	7
Broad-Mindedness	6
Common Sense	6
Experience	3
Vision	3

words of one of the questionnaire answers: "Felt he owed the community a service."

The next two traits, broad-mindedness and common sense, are of equal importance since both appeared six times. These two traits were relatively easy to translate since many superintendents merely listed the terms "broad-mindedness" and "common-sense" in their answer.

The last two items, experience and vision, each had a frequency of three. Of the three people considered best because of experience, two had been teachers and the third had been an attendance officer. The term vision was translated to mean the ability to see ahead and anticipate situations.

Since one classification could not be made to fit the responses obtained on both the best and poorest individuals

TABLE VII

ADDITIONAL TRAITS AIDING IN CLASSIFICATION
OF TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES AS "POOREST"

Trait	Frequency
Self-Centered	7
Money-Minded	7
Unworthy use of leisure	5
Easily Influenced	4
Poor Judgment	3
Narrow-Mindedness	2
Deceitfulness	2
Careless	1
Unclassified	5

It is significant that the trait "self-centered" ranks high in this table since its opposite, "social mindedness", ranked high in Table VI. A typical response, translated to mean self-centered, was: "Self-centered--would oppose anything unless he initiated it. Had the idea that he knew more than any one else."

An equally undesirable trait is that of "money-mindedness." This term can best be explained in the words of one of the county superintendents: "This individual thought more in terms of dollars and cents than the educational advancement of his schools."

The second highest ranking trait contributing to the making of an undesirable trustee is "unworthy use of leisure."

Here the typical answer concerned the individual frequenting pool rooms, "beer joints" and the like.

The trait "easily influenced" was translated from such answers as: "He allowed too much dictation", or "influenced by high-pressure salesmen."

"Poor judgment" was the actual term used by three county superintendents in their description of the most undesirable township trustee with whom they had ever worked.

The next two terms, "narrow-mindedness" and "deceitfulness", were derived from some such statement as this: "He was narrow; did not trust his employees; talked about his friends; belittled his teachers."

It is unfortunate that so many responses had to be classed under the heading "unclassified" but it was beyond the power of this writer to know just how to translate such a statement as this: "He was the abortive by-product of a community brain-storm." This and other statements of similar character make-up the unclassified section.

CHAPTER III

CITY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR QUALIFICATIONS

I. SIMILAR STUDIES

It is always interesting when conducting a research to note other studies of a similar and related nature. For this reason certain studies will be considered in connection with the subject of this chapter and frequent reference will be made to them throughout the chapter.

Three rather significant studies similar to this one have been made. The first of these was made by C. H. Hoel on "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members in Ohio".¹ Mr. Hoel states that his purpose is: "to determine the fitness of the member (school board member) as shown in the amount of school training, success in business life, interests in the community, and in the public schools, and in service as board members".² The procedure in Mr. Hoel's study was similar to the one used in this one. Questionnaires were sent to the superintendents of the various school administrative units in Ohio. These included city, exempted

¹ C. H. Hoel, "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members in Ohio." American School Journal. Vol. 75. December, 1927. p. 39

² Ibid., p. 39

village, the county, the local village, and the rural districts that come under county organization. The conclusions drawn in Hoel's study will be considered in this chapter in connection with the conclusions drawn from the data presented in this writer's study.

A second study that may be related to this one being undertaken by this writer was conducted by George G. Struble of the School of Education, Kansas University.³ Mr. Struble states his problem in the form of a question: "What type of person, with reference to vocation, age, family, length of service on the board, and teaching experience, make the best school board members?"⁴ To obtain material, Mr. Struble sent a questionnaire to the city superintendents of 275 cities selected at random over various parts of the United States. The conclusions reached by Mr. Struble will be considered in their relation to the conclusions reached by this writer.

A third study conducted by J. F. Hines, Superintendent of Schools, Plankinton, South Dakota, attempted to ascertain the "composition and training of school board members in twenty different independent school districts."⁵ Mr. Hines says he does not attempt to prove any point but merely to gather some facts which might be of interest to school people generally.

³ George G. Struble, "A Study of School Board Personnel." American School Board Journal. Vol. 65. October, 1922.

⁴ Ibid., p. 48

⁵ J. F. Hines, "Qualifications of School Board Members." American School Board Journal. Vol. 77. August, 1928. p. 38

II. DESCRIPTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

In the absence of an all-knowing power to reveal the qualities necessary to make a good city school board member, dependence was placed upon the knowledge possessed by those city school superintendents, who have been most closely associated with school board members. The investigator sought this knowledge by a questionnaire, which differed from that sent to the county superintendents only in the fact that it was printed on white paper. It consisted, as did the other, of two major parts: "Best and Poorest"; each major part was subdivided into two minor parts--"Personal Data" and "Professional Data." A copy of this questionnaire and the letter that accompanied it will be found in the appendix.

On October 30, 1935, a copy of this questionnaire was mailed to each of the 94 city superintendents listed in the Indiana School Directory for the current year. Of this number (94), 77, or 81.91 per cent, responded to the first major portion of the questionnaire, and 75, or 79.79 per cent, responded to the second major portion of the questionnaire.

III. PRESENTATION OF DATA

A. PERSONAL DATA

1. Age and Sex. George G. Struble⁶ in his "Study of School Board Personnel," found that the median age of school board members was 48.38 years. From his data Mr. Struble draws the conclusion that the maximum of efficiency of board members is reached between the fortieth and fiftieth year. This student found the mean age at which the best board

members took office to be 43.27 years and 51.576 years when leaving. The poorest board members were found to take office at the mean age of 48.081 years, and to leave the office at the average of 53.043. It is interesting to note that the average length of office tenure for the most desirable city school board members was found to be 8.31 years; for the least desirable city school board members the office tenure was found to be 4.96 years.

Of the total number (77) of individuals considered "best" city school board members only 3 were women. Of the 73 individuals reported as "poorest", 5 were women. Thus 3.89 per cent of the best were women and 6.85 per cent of the poorest were women. Of course, too few women were considered to warrant the drawing of any definite conclusion concerning the relative desirability of men and women on the school board.

2. Education. Item Number 2 asked the city superintendent to check the level of education reached by the individual he was considering. Table VIII shows the results obtained for this item. The frequency column is absolute, being the actual number of times a certain level of education was checked. The percentage column shows the per cent of the total number answering the item that checked a certain educational level.

The data indicate that 77 per cent plus of the most desirable city school board members have had some college training; 16 per cent plus have had some high school training. On the other hand, most of the least desirable ones

TABLE VIII

LEVEL OF EDUCATION REACHED BY THE BEST
AND POOREST CITY SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS

Amount of Education	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
None	0	0	1	1.33
Elementary School or Less	4	5.19	32	42.67
High School or Less	13	16.88	19	25.33
College or Less	60	77.92	23	30.67

(42 per cent) had only an elementary school education or less; one fourth, or 25 per cent, reached high school. Thus almost 70 per cent (42 plus 25 equals 67 per cent) of the poorest never reached college. The data presented in Chapter II concerning the level of education reached by township trustees showed that that group of school administrators had never reached beyond high school in the "best" group and most of the poorest ones had never reached beyond elementary school. C. H. Hoel, in his study of school board members in Ohio, found the average amount of training for the city school board members to be 12.72 years.⁷ Of the eighty city school board men considered in the study conducted by J. F. Hines, 31 per cent were high school graduates, 29 per cent were eighth

⁷Hoel, op. cit., p. 39

and which were the same as those of the township trustees.

⁸Hines, op. cit., p. 31

grade graduates, 21 per cent were college graduates, and 19 per cent had never reached the eighth grade level.⁸

3. Occupation. Item Number 3 asked the city superintendents to state the occupation of the best or poorest city school board member at the time this individual assumed office. The purpose of this question was to determine the occupational group or groups which furnish the greater number of our city school board members for the administration of the schools. The classification used in Table IX is the same one used in Chapter II, page 12, with the exception of two additional groups: the clerical group, and the managerial and executive group. The numbers in the frequency column in the table represent the actual number of times a given occupation was mentioned. The number in the percentage columns represent the per cent of the total returns from city school superintendents that reported individuals engaged in any one occupation.

It is noted from the data that the business group furnish the most of the best city school board members. The professions furnish the next largest per cent (32.48 per cent) of the best. It is significant that the professional group also furnish the greatest number of poorer board members, while the business group, furnishing most of the best, ranks second in its contribution of the least desirable city school board members. It is interesting to note that the business and professional groups furnish 74.06 per cent of the most desirable school board members and 57.65 per cent of the least desirable ones.

⁸ Hines, op. cit., p. 38

TABLE IX

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE
BEST AND POOREST CITY SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

Occupation	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
I. Agriculture				
A. Farmer	1	1.30	5	6.67
B. Retired Farmer	0	0	3	4.00
Total	1	1.30	8	10.67
II. Business				
A. Insurance	3	3.90	1	1.33
B. Druggist	4	5.20	0	0
C. Merchant	6	7.79	3	4.00
D. Business Man	7	9.09	4	5.33
E. Real Estate	1	1.30	2	2.67
F. Hardware Salesman	2	2.60	1	1.33
G. Undertaker	1	1.30	0	0
H. Grain Dealer	1	1.30	0	0
I. Manufacturing	4	5.20	2	2.67
J. Broker	1	1.30	0	0
K. Lumber Business	1	1.30	0	0
L. Contractor	1	1.30	1	1.33
M. Coal Mine Operator	0	0	1	1.33
N. Miller	0	0	1	1.33

TABLE IX (Continued)

O. Salesman	0	0	3	4.00
P. Capitalist	0	0	1	1.33
Total	32	41.58	20	26.65

III. Trade

A. Painter	1	1.30	1	1.33
B. Carpenter	0	0	1	1.33
Total	1	1.30	2	2.67

IV. Laborer

A. Laborer	0	0	1	1.33
Total	0	0	1	1.33

V. Professional

A. Lawyer	7	9.09	5	6.67
B. Doctor	7	9.09	8	10.67
C. Dentist	0	0	1	1.33
D. Banker	4	5.20	4	5.33
E. Retired Banker	0	0	1	1.33
F. Professional	1	1.30	2	2.67
G. Teacher	1	1.30	2	2.67
H. Electrical Engineer	1	1.30	0	0
I. Engineer	1	1.30	0	0
J. Editor	1	1.30	0	0
K. Social Service	1	1.30	0	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

L. Architect	1	1.30	0	0
M. Chemist	0	0	1	1.33
Total	25	32.48	24	31.00

VI. Clerical

A. Office Clerk	1	1.30	0	0
B. Ass't Cashier in Bank	1	1.30	0	0
C. Treas. in Glass factory	1	1.30	0	0
D. Clerk	0	0	1	1.33
E. Bookkeeper	0	0	1	1.33
Total	3	3.90	2	2.66

VII. Managerial & Executive

A. Mgr. Public Utilities	1	1.30	0	0
B. Mgr. Power Corporation	1	1.30	0	0
C. President of Stone Co.	1	1.30	0	0
D. President of Bank	1	1.30	0	0
E. Superintendent of Industry	2	2.60	0	0
F. Mgr. of Ind. Produce Co.	1	1.30	0	0
G. Mgr. of factory	1	1.30	1	1.33
H. Factory Executive	1	1.30	0	0
I. Pres. Mfg. Concern	1	1.30	0	0
J. Mgr. Mfg. Plant	2	2.60	0	0
K. Owner of Industry	0	0	1	1.33

TABLE IX (Continued)

L. Sec'y in Industry	0	0	1	1.33
Total	13	15.90	3	3.99
VIII. Unclassified				
A. "None of Your Business"	0	0	1	1.33
B. Housewife	2	2.60	4	5.33
C. Federal Position	0	0	1	1.33
D. Mill Foreman	0	0	1	1.33
E. Mail Clerk	0	0	1	1.33
F. Clubs & Politics	0	0	1	1.33
G. Carriage Manufacturer	0	0	2	2.67
H. No Occupation	0	0	1	1.33
I. Blank	1	1.30	3	3.99
Total	3	3.90	15	19.94

The managerial and executive group follows by contributing approximately 16 per cent of the "best" and 4 per cent of the "poorest".

The agricultural group furnish a fraction over 1 per cent of the "best", and 10.67 per cent of the "poorest". It is difficult to draw any definite conclusions concerning the trade, labor, and clerical groups since so few cases were reported belonging to these groups.

G. H. Hoel draws a conclusion similar to the one that can be drawn in this study, namely, that business men comprise

the larger per cent of city school board members.⁹

George G. Struble concludes that the professions rank fairly high, at least in comparison with the merchants, who formed the largest group in his study. Mr. Struble's term "merchants" includes almost the same type of persons as were listed under the "business" heading in this student's study.¹⁰

4. Outstanding Traits. In Item 4 of the questionnaire the city superintendent was asked to check the trait or traits listed that he found most outstanding in the individual he was considering. Table X indicates the results. The numbers in the frequency column are absolute and indicate the actual number of times a certain trait was checked.

The percentage column shows the per cent of times a trait was checked in relation to the total number of times it might have been checked.

It is interesting to note the almost complete reversal of the rank of traits for the best and poorest city school board members. Cleanliness, honesty, courtesy, temperance, and initiative rank high among the poorest board members; intelligence, honesty, cooperativeness, progressiveness, and tact rank highest among the most desirable city school board members considered. A comparison of the percentages should be made. It is noted that the trait intelligence was checked as most outstanding on 85 per cent plus of the questionnaires. Now note that the trait ranked highest on the "poorest"

⁹Hoel, op. cit., p. 40

¹⁰Struble, op. cit., p. 48

TABLE X

MOST OUTSTANDING SINGLE TRAITS OF THE
BEST AND POOREST CITY SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

Trait	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
Intelligence	66	85.71	16	21.33
Honesty	65	84.42	24	32.00
Cooperativeness	64	85.12	9	12.00
Progressiveness	56	72.73	9	12.00
Tact	47	61.04	5	6.67
Courtesy	43	55.84	24	32.00
Initiative	38	49.35	16	21.33
Cleanliness	36	46.75	31	41.33
Temperance	36	46.75	25	33.33
None Indicated	3	3.90	18	24.00

section of the questionnaire (cleanliness) was checked only 41 per cent of the seventy-five times it might have been checked (frequency of 75 equals 100 per cent). This difference in the percentages is maintained consistently for all of the traits except "cleanliness." These differences in percentages would indicate that over one half of the poorest trustees had none, or at most had only one, of the traits to any outstanding degree.

5. Other Personal Traits. Items 5 to 10, inclusive, in the questionnaire took into account other personal characteristics not already considered in the foregoing data. To answer these items, the superintendents were asked to check their answers either "yes" or "no" in the spaces provided on the right side of the questionnaire. Most of the answers, received were checked in one of the two spaces provided. However, some were checked both "yes" and "no" in answer to the same question. These the writer has taken care of under the heading in the table as "Y & N." Some answers were checked either "yes" or "no" and then qualified by a written statement. These, too, were tabulated under the "Y & N" heading. A fourth heading, "Bl" was made to indicate those questions for which no answer was checked.

The data recorded for Item 5 show that it makes no difference in the success or failure of an individual as a board member whether or not he continues his occupation after being elected to the board.

It is also true that over one half of both the "best" and "poorest" city school board members manage their own personal affairs successfully. It must be noted, however, that a much larger per cent of the "best" (98.70 per cent) school board members are able to manage their affairs than are the "poorest" ones, who manage successfully to the extent of 54.67 per cent--a difference of 43 per cent. In the study conducted by C. H. Hoel¹¹ the superintendents were asked to rate the success of each member in his own business

¹¹ Hoel, op. cit., p.40

TABLE XI

OTHER PERSONAL TRAITS OF THE BEST
AND POOREST CITY SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS

Personal Trait	Ans	Best		Poorest	
		F	%	F	%
5. Continue occupation while in office?	Yes	76	98.70	67	89.33
	No	1	1.30	5	6.67
	Y & N	0	0.	0	0.
	Bl	0	0.	3	4.00
6. Manage personal affairs successfully?	Yes	76	98.70	41	54.67
	No	1	1.30	30	40.00
	Y & N	0	0	1	1.33
	Bl	0	0	3	4.00
7. Boastful of his accomplishments?	Yes	2	2.60	55	73.33
	No	74	96.10	18	24.00
	Y & N	1	1.30	1	1.33
	Bl	0	0	1	1.33
8. Accept success and defeat gracefully?	Yes	73	94.81	14	18.67
	No	4	5.20	58	77.33
	Y & N	0	0	1	1.33
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
9. Alert and able to accomplish?	Yes	77	100.00	27	36.00
	No	0	0	46	61.33
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
10. Children in school during office tenure?	Yes	50	64.94	41	54.67
	No	25	32.47	33	44.00
	Y & N	2	2.60	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.33

or occupation as being excellent, good, fair, or poor. Ninety-three per cent of the city school board members were rated as good or excellent; seven per cent of the city school board members were rated as being poor or fair. The data presented by C. H. Hoel's study support the conclusion presented by this investigator, that 98 per cent of the most desirable city school board members are successful in managing their own personal affairs.

Item 7 indicates that 96 per cent of the best board members were not affected by the desire to stand in the community limelight or talk unnecessarily about their own accomplishments. Seventy-three per cent of the poorest board members were so affected.

A good school board member can accept success without becoming vainglorious and can accept defeat without becoming embittered. The data for Item 8 show that this is true with 94 per cent plus of the individuals considered as most desirable and untrue with 77 per cent of the poorest board members considered.

The best city school board members are alert and able to accomplish maximally in 100 per cent of the cases considered. Sixty-one per cent of the least desirable board members were neither alert nor able to accomplish.

Item 10 considered whether or not the school board member had children in school during his board service. The data show that 64 per cent plus of the best board members had children in school during their office tenure, and 54 per cent plus of the poorest, likewise, had children in school. C. H. Hoel found that 74 per cent of all city school board

members, considered in his study, had children in school. Of the number rated as most valuable members of boards, 80 per cent had children in school; while, of the number rated being least valuable, only 67 per cent had children in school.¹²

II. PROFESSIONAL DATA

Items 11 to 27 attempted to define those professional traits necessary in the most desirable school board member. The terms used in Table XII and their interpretations are identical with the terms and interpretations given in connection with Table XI of this thesis.

The data for Item 11 show that 96 per cent of the most desirable school board members do not practice nepotism, while 56 per cent of the poorest ones do. From this the conclusion may be drawn that the best school board members do not practice nepotism.

As for freedom from political influence, considered in Item 12, it was found that 90 per cent plus of the most desirable city school board members are free from political influence, while 88 per cent of the poorest are not.

Of the best city school board members, 97 and 92 per cent respectively are free from denominational and fraternal influences. Among the poorest board members, 56 per cent and 55 per cent plus are likewise free from these influences. On the other hand, 42 per cent plus and

¹² Hoel, op. cit., p. 40

TABLE XII
PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES OF THE BEST
AND POOREST CITY SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

Professional Trait	Ans	Best		Poorest	
		F	%	F	%
11. Individual practice nepotism?	Yes	2	2.60	42	56.00
	No	74	96.10	30	40.00
	Y & N	0	0	1	1.33
	Bl	1	1.30	2	2.67
12. Free from political influences?	Yes	70	90.91	7	9.33
	No	6	7.79	66	88.00
	Y & N	1	1.30	0	0
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
13. Free from denominational influences?	Yes	75	97.40	42	56.00
	No	1	1.30	32	42.67
	Y & N	1	1.30	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.33
14. Free from Fraternal influences?	Yes	71	92.21	41	54.67
	No	6	9.79	31	41.33
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	3	4.00
15. Think for himself?	Yes	77	100.00	44	58.67
	No	0	0	25	33.33
	Y & N	0	0	2	2.67
	Bl	0	0	4	5.33
16. Resist pressure?	Yes	68	88.31	18	24.00
	No	2	2.60	54	72.00
	Y & N	6	7.79	2	2.67
	Bl	1	1.30	1	1.33
17. Explain reason for his actions?	Yes	76	98.70	26	34.67
	No	0	0	45	60.00
	Y & N	1	1.30	3	4.00
	Bl	0	0	1	1.33

TABLE XII (Continued)

18. Was he a radical?	Yes	2	2.60	27	36.00
	No	74	96.10	40	53.33
	Y & N	0	0	1	1.33
	Bl	1	1.30	7	9.33
19. Was he a conservative?	Yes	39	50.65	33	44.00
	No	22	28.57	21	28.00
	Y & N	4	5.19	6	8.00
	Bl	12	15.58	15	20.00
20. Was he liberal?	Yes	48	62.34	16	21.33
	No	13	16.88	35	46.67
	Y & N	11	14.29	6	8.00
	Bl	5	6.49	18	24.00
21. Good time sense for business efficiency?	Yes	73	94.81	30	40.00
	No	2	2.60	42	56.00
	Y & N	2	2.60	1	1.33
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
22. Show initiative in sponsoring community projects?	Yes	70	90.91	23	30.67
	No	5	6.49	48	64.00
	Y & N	2	2.60	2	2.67
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
23. Always consider welfare of schools?	Yes	75	97.40	4	5.33
	No	2	2.60	68	90.67
	Y & N	0	0	1	1.33
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
24. Interested in community problems?	Yes	72	93.51	25	33.33
	No	2	2.60	47	62.67
	Y & N	3	3.90	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	1.33
25. Contribute to moral and intellectual life of community?	Yes	72	93.51	5	6.67
	No	1	1.30	65	86.67
	Y & N	1	1.30	3	4.00
	Bl	3	3.90	2	2.67

TABLE XII (Continued)

26. Consider proposition before giving opinion?	Yes	74	96.10	21	28.00
	No	0	0	49	65.33
	Y & N	3	3.90	3	4.00
	Bl	0	0	2	2.67
27. "Rubber-stamp" superintendents?	Yes	28	36.36	28	37.33
	No	43	55.84	39	52.00
	Y & N	6	7.79	5	6.67
	Bl	0	0	3	4.00

41 per cent, respectively, are not free from denominational and fraternal influences.

All good city school board members are able to think for themselves. The data show that 58 per cent plus of the poorest are able to think for themselves while 33 per cent of the same group are not. Closely connected to the item just considered is Item 16 concerning the school board member's ability to resist pressure. The data indicate that 88 per cent of the most desirable city school board members could resist pressure, while 72 per cent of the poorest ones could not.

Item 17 indicates that 98 per cent plus of the best city school board members could explain reasons for their actions, while 60 per cent of the poorest ones could not.

The next three items (18, 19, and 20) were designed to find whether the best city school board members were radical, conservative, or liberal. This may be answered from the data presented: that the best city school board members are not radical, 50 per cent plus of them are conservative, and 62 per

cent are liberal in their views. Likewise, it may be said that the poorest board members considered are neither radical nor liberal, but are conservative. Account must be taken of the fact that considerable uncertainty was expressed in that 20 per cent of the city superintendents left Item 19, concerning the conservatism of the individual, unanswered; 24 per cent left Item 20, concerning the liberality of the "poorest" individual, unanswered.

Ninety-four per cent of the most desirable school board members had a time sense that enabled them to conduct business with efficiency. Over one half (56 per cent) had no such time sense for business efficiency.

By far the most of the "best" city school board members (90 per cent plus) show initiative in sponsoring community projects and are interested in community problems. On the other hand, it is seen that approximately 63 per cent of the least desirable are neither sponsors of community projects nor are they interested in community problems.

The data for Item 23 indicates that good city school board members consider the welfare of the schools in 97 per cent of the cases. Ninety per cent plus of the "poorest" board members do not always consider the welfare of the schools. The percentages in this item show that an individual's attitude toward the school and school policies is a large factor in determining the success or failure of that individual as a school board member.

Approximately 94 per cent of the city superintendents answered that the "best" individual they were considering

contributed to the moral and intellectual tone of the community. An almost equally high percentage (86 per cent) reported the individual they were considering "poorest" did not contribute to the moral and intellectual tone of the community.

In accordance with the answers received to Item 26, it may be concluded that the larger percentage of the most desirable school board members consider a proposition, submitted by the superintendent, thoroughly before voicing an opinion. The answers received to the same item concerning the "poorest" board member indicate that 65 per cent of this group do not thoroughly consider a proposition before giving an opinion.

In Item 27, the data show that almost 56 per cent (55.84 per cent) of the best city school board members did not consent to a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it. Likewise, 52 per cent of the "poorest" school board members did not consent to a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it. Thirty-seven per cent in case of both the "best" and "poorest" school board members were indicated to have supported a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it.

III. GENERAL DATA

To provide an opportunity to city superintendents for further expression concerning the individual they were considering either "best" or "poorest", a space was left at the end of each major part of the questionnaire wherein the superintendent could write any further comment he might consider

necessary. A total of 42 city superintendents added comments; 38 commented on the "best" city school board member and 39 commented on the "poorest" city school board members. These comments related various experience and mentioned a number of traits not heretofore considered. An attempt was made by the investigator to work out a common language into which the comments could be translated. These terms, together with the number of times they were used in translation will be found in Table XIII. Some comments contained several statements, each one of which could be translated under a different heading. This accounts for the fact that the total frequencies do not equal the number of comments given in each major portion of the questionnaire.

The trait "respect for authority" appeared nine times on the "best" portion of the questionnaire. A typical statement that was tabulated under this heading was: "Left professional matters to the superintendent."

Seven of the superintendents rated the individual they were considering as "broad minded." Five were said to have "good judgment." These terms are the exact ones used in the city superintendents comments.

The term "common sense" and "courage in his convictions" each have a frequency of 4. The statement "common sense" occurred several times in the actual statements of the superintendents. One city superintendent said the individual he was considering was "positive"; another said "he finished what he undertook"; a third statement "courage in his convictions" was used as a heading in the Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
 ADDITIONAL TRAITS AIDING IN THE
 CLASSIFICATION OF CITY
 SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
 AS "BEST"

Additional Trait	Best Frequency
Respect for Authority	9
Broadminded	7
Good Judgment	5
Common Sense	4
Courage in his Convictions	4
Experienced	3
Vision	3
Loyalty	3
Frankness	2
Christian	2
Duplicate	9

The next two traits, experience and vision were derived from such statements as these: "acquainted with school affairs," or "had breadth of vision." Each of these traits have frequencies of 3. The term "loyalty" was derived from statements similar to this one: "always supported his principals, teachers, and superintendent." This trait seems relatively unimportant since only two of the comments were translated in relation to it.

Two city superintendents added that the individuals they were considering "best" were "frank." Two other added that the individuals they were considering as most desirable were "Christian Gentlemen."

Much duplication occurred in the comments. For instance, the comment may have stated: "He always considered the welfare of the schools" or "She could think for herself." Since provision had already been made for a response to such items in the formal part of the questionnaire, these found in the added comments were grouped under the heading "duplicate."

Since one classification could not be made to fit the responses obtained on both the "best" and "poorest" individuals considered, Table XIV was made to care for the responses given concerning the "poorest" city school board members.

The data indicate that a self-centered individual makes a poor city school board member. Seventeen of the added comments concerning the least desirable city school board members rated the individual as "self-centered." A typical answer interpreted to mean "self-centered" may be quoted: "Tried to be the whole show."

Nine superintendents regarded the individual they were considering "poorest" as a "busybody." Such descriptive phrases as these were tabulated under the head busybody: "trouble maker," "gossip," "gave out information to teachers and other people before action was taken."

The third ranking trait in the additional comments was that of "lack of common sense." Under this heading is tabulated such comments as these: "no common sense," "no sense of value," and "poor judgment."

TABLE XIV

ADDITIONAL TRAITS AIDING IN THE CLASSIFICATION
OF CITY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AS
"POOREST"

Additional Traits	Poorest
	Frequency
Self-centered	17
Busybody	9
Lack of Common Sense	8
Deceitful	5
Undependable	3
Prejudiced	3
Narrow	2
Immoral	1
Too Critical	1
Duplicate	5

Individuals said to be "two-faced," to be "inconsistent," or "deceitful" were classified under the heading "deceitful." Five such individuals were found to be deceitful.

In to the classification "undependable" fall such statements as this: "His position was never certain." Three individuals were found to be "undependable." Likewise, three individuals were found to be prejudiced.

Two individuals were said to be "narrow." This term is best explained by this quotation taken from one of the questionnaires: "narrow in educational experience and interest."

The terms "immoral" and "too critical" each appeared once in the tabulation.

Many statements were made that duplicated something already considered in the formal section of the questionnaire. These were tabulated under the heading "duplicate" and are arranged in Table XIV under this heading. Five such duplications occurred.

CHAPTER IV.

TOWN SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR QUALIFICATIONS

The Indiana School Directory for the current year (1936) divides the school superintendents into three groups: the county superintendents, the city superintendents, and the town superintendents. It was to this latter group, the town superintendents, that questionnaires were sent to obtain data concerning town school board members.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaires sent to the town superintendents were identical in every respect to those sent to the city superintendents with the exception of a small identification mark known only to this writer. A copy of this questionnaire sent to city and town superintendents with the accompanying letter is to be found in the appendix.

On October 30, 1935, questionnaires were mailed to the 65 town superintendents listed in the Indiana School Directory. Of the total number sent (65), 43, or 66.15 per cent, responded to the first major portion of the questionnaire; 42 or 64.47 per cent, responded to the second major division of the questionnaire.

II. PRESENTATION OF DATA

A. PERSONAL DATA

1. Age and Sex. Of the 43 town school board members considered most desirable only 1 woman, or 2.33 per cent of the total, was considered. Of the 42 "poorest" town school board members considered, all, with the exception of 2, or 4.65 per cent, were men. Too few women were considered to warrant the drawing of any definite conclusion concerning the relative desirability of men and women as town school board members.

A computation showed that the mean or average age of the "best" town school board members when taking office was 41.30 years; the mean age when leaving was 50.57 years. A similar computation indicated the mean age, at which the "poorest" town school board members assumed office, to be 46.15 years; the mean age when leaving office was found to be 51.29 years.

It was also found that the "best" town school board members had an average tenure of 8.35 years; the "poorest" maintained their positions on the school board for a period of 5.05 years. It is encouraging to note that the most desirable town school board member holds his office on the average of 3.30 years longer than the least desirable one.

2. Education. Item 2 in the questionnaire asked the town superintendent to check the level of education reached

by the "best" and "poorest" town school board members he was considering. Table XV indicates the results. The numbers in the frequency column are absolute, being the actual number of times a given level of education was checked. The numbers in the percentage column represent the per cent of times a given educational level was checked in relation to the number of times it might have been checked.

TABLE XV
LEVEL OF EDUCATION REACHED BY BEST
AND POOREST TOWN SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

Level of Education	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
None	0	0	0	0
Elementary School or Less	4	9.30	24	57.14
High School or Less	16	37.21	8	19.05
College or Less	23	53.49	10	23.81

The data indicate that 53.49 per cent of the "best" town school board members had some college training; a still larger per cent of the "poorest," 57.14 per cent, had only elementary training. Thirty-seven per cent of the most desirable have had high school training; only 19.05 per cent of the least desirable had attended high school. It is to be remembered that the data here presented represent

two extremes--the "best" and the "poorest." Since the data show that over one-half of the "best" and "poorest," respectively, have received some college and elementary school education, might it not, therefore, be concluded that the majority of town school board members are recipients of a twelfth grade education or less?

3. Occupation. It was noted in Chapter II that the larger percentage of township trustees were engaged in agriculture; Chapter III pointed out that the most of the city school board members were business men. It is the purpose of this present section to determine the occupational group or groups from which the greater number of the most desirable and least desirable town school board members have come. Table XVI presents, in summary, the results obtained in answer to Item 3 of the questionnaire which asked the superintendent to write the occupation held by the individual he was considering before that individual assumed his position on the town school board.

Table XVI reveals that the occupational distribution of the town school board members was similar to that of the city school board members. In Indiana towns, it is found that the business group furnishes the larger percentage of the "best" town school board members, and the professional group furnishes the second largest percentage. It is interesting and significant to note that while the professional group furnish the next largest number of most desirable town school board members, it furnishes the largest number of the least desirable town school board members. The

TABLE XVI

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE BEST AND
POOREST TOWN SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Occupation	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
I. Agriculture				
A. Farmer	4	9.32	9	21.43
Total	4	9.32	9	21.43
II. Business				
A. Druggist	2	4.65	0	0
B. Lumber Business	1	2.33	0	0
C. Merchant	6	13.95	3	7.14
D. Manufacturer	3	6.97	0	0
E. Insurance Agent	1	2.33	0	0
F. Coal and Feed Dealer	1	2.33	0	0
G. Grain Dealer	1	2.33	0	0
H. Poultry Dealer	1	2.33	0	0
I. Business Man	0	0	2	4.76
J. Salesman	0	0	1	2.38
K. Garage Operator	0	0	2	4.76
L. Oil Dealer	0	0	1	2.38
M. Meat Market	0	0	1	2.38
N. Groceryman	0	0	1	2.38
O. Saloon Keeper	0	0	1	2.38
Total	16	37.31	12	28.56

TABLE XVI (Continued)

III. Professional

A. Physician	2	4.65	3	7.14
B. Dentist	1	2.33	1	2.38
C. Telegrapher	1	2.33	1	2.38
D. Editor	1	2.33	0	0
E. Lawyer	4	9.32	2	4.76
F. Banker	1	2.33	4	9.52
G. Electrician	0	0	1	2.38
H. Minister	0	0	1	2.38
Total	10	23.29	13	30.94

IV. Managerial and Executive

A. Superintendent of Chair Factory	1	2.33	0	0
B. Superintendent of Mining	1	2.33	0	0
C. Industrial Executive	1	2.33	0	0
D. Manager of Flour Mill	1	2.33	0	0
E. Superintendent of Factory	1	2.33	0	0
F. Foreman in Factory	0	0	1	2.38
Total	5	11.65	1	2.38

V. Trades

A. Miller	1	2.33	0	0
B. Carpenter	0	0	1	2.38
Total	1	2.33	1	2.38

TABLE XVI (Continued)

VI. Clerical				
A. Assistant Bank Cashier	3	6.99	0	0
B. Secretary of Furniture Manufacturer	1	2.33	0	0
C. Bookkeeper	0	0	1	2.38
Total	4	9.32	1	2.38
VII. Unclassified				
A. Housewife	1	2.33	2	4.76
B. State Building Inspector	1	2.33	0	0
C. Mail Clerk	0	0	1	2.38
D. None	1	2.33	0	0
E. Blank	0	0	2	4.76
Total	3	6.99	5	11.90

agricultural group furnish 21.43 per cent of the least desirable board members. It may be concluded from the data presented in this study, that the following occupational groups, in ranking order, furnish the most of the most desirable town school board members: business groups, professional, managerial and executive, clerical (9.32%), and agricultural (9.32%). The following occupations in ranking order furnish the least desirable town school board members: professional group, business group, and the agricultural group. It would be unfair to

attach too great an importance on a low percentage in some of these groups, since so few cases were considered that belonged to that particular group. For instance, in the trade group, only two individuals were considered-- one "best" and one "poorest." The data, in this instance, are insufficient to warrant the drawing of a definite conclusion concerning the desirability of tradesmen as town school board members.

4. Outstanding traits. Item 4 of the questionnaire requested the superintendent to indicate by a check any of the traits listed that he considered most outstanding in the school board member under consideration. Nine traits were listed immediately following the request. Table XVII presents a summary of the data given by the town superintendents in answer to this request.

From the data presented in Table XVII, it is noted that honesty, cooperativeness, progressiveness, intelligence, and tact are the five most outstanding traits in the most desirable town school board members. Honesty, temperance, cleanliness, courtesy, and initiative are the five most outstanding traits in the least desirable town school board members. A closer examination of the percentages shows that 28 per cent of the "poorest" had no traits indicated as being most outstanding. Honesty, which ranked highest among the traits of the "poorest" town board members, had a percentage of 42.82. This percentage would indicate that this trait was not outstanding in over one half (57.14 per cent) of the town school board members. If

TABLE XVII

MOST OUTSTANDING SINGLE TRAITS OF THE BEST
AND POOREST TOWN SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Trait	Best		Poorest	
	F	%	F	%
Honesty	39	90.70	18	42.86
Cooperativeness	38	88.37	5	11.90
Progressiveness	36	83.72	5	11.90
Intelligence	33	76.74	11	26.19
Tact	29	67.44	3	7.14
Cleanliness	27	62.79	17	40.48
Initiative	27	62.79	6	14.29
Courtesy	25	58.14	11	26.19
Temperance	24	55.81	18	42.86
None Indicated	0	0	12	28.57

this is true concerning the most outstanding traits of the "poorest" town school board members, it is even more clearly emphasized when some of the lesser outstanding traits are considered. For instance, tact was the most outstanding trait in only 7.14 per cent of the cases. This means that in 92.86 per cent of the "poorest" individuals the characteristic of tactfulness is not outstanding to any marked degree.

5. Other Personal Characteristics. Items 5 to 10 were designed to bring out other personal characteristics necessary to a most desirable town school board member not heretofore considered. Table XVIII summarizes the answers to the items.

To answer the items, the town superintendents were asked to check the answer "yes" or "no". Most of the items were answered in the manner requested but some had both the "yes" and "no" answers checked. These were tabulated under the heading "Y & N." Other town superintendents checked either "yes" or "no" and then made a statement to qualify their answers. These, too, were tabulated under the "Y & N" heading. Some items were not checked at all. These were tabulated under the heading "Bl."

The data presented in Table XVIII indicate that 97.67 per cent of the "best" and 90.48 per cent of the "poorest" town school board members continue their occupations after becoming members of the town school boards.

Ninety-five per cent of the most desirable town school board members are successful in managing their own personal affairs. Almost 60 per cent of the "poorest" ones are likewise successful in the management of their personal affairs.

Item 7 shows that 95 per cent of the "best" town board members are neither affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight nor boastful of their own accomplishments. Closely related to this item is item number eight. The data indicate that 93 per cent of the most desirable town school board members can accept success without becoming vainglorious and defeat without becoming embittered.

All (100 per cent) of the best town school board members are able to accomplish with efficiency. On the other hand the "poorest" board members, to the extent of 71.43 per cent, are not alert and able to accomplish.

TABLE XVIII
OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
BEST AND POOREST TOWN SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

Personal Trait	Best			Poorest	
	Ans	F	%	F	%
5. Continue occupation while in office?	Yes	42	97.67	38	90.48
	No	1	2.33	3	7.14
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	2.38
6. Manage personal affairs successfully?	Yes	41	95.35	25	59.52
	No	2	4.65	17	40.48
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	0	0
7. Boastful of his accomplishments?	Yes	1	2.33	29	69.05
	No	41	95.35	14	30.95
	Y & N	1	2.33	0	0
	Bl	0	0	0	0
8. Accept success and defeat gracefully?	Yes	40	93.02	9	21.43
	No	3	6.97	31	73.81
	Y & N	0	0	2	4.76
	Bl	0	0	0	0
9. Alert and able to accomplish?	Yes	43	100	11	26.19
	No	0	0	30	71.43
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	2.38
10. Children in school during office tenure?	Yes	34	79.07	18	42.86
	No	9	20.93	24	57.14
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	0	0

Item 10, considering whether or not the individual had children in school during his office tenure, indicates that 79.07 per cent of the best town school board members do have children in school while 58.14 per cent of the "poorest" do not.

B. PROFESSIONAL DATA

To scientifically ascertain those professional qualities necessary in a good town school member, Items 11 to 27 were made. The answers to these items were tabulated under the headings: "Yes, No, Y & N," and "Bl." These headings are to be interpreted in the same manner in which the headings were interpreted in Table XVIII.

The data for Item 11 indicate that 93.02 per cent of the best town school board members do not practice nepotism. On the other hand, 52.38 per cent of the poorest board members do practice nepotism.

Item 12 considered whether or not the individual being considered was free from political influences. It was found that 83.37 per cent of the best were free from political influence, while 79.19 per cent of the poorest were not free from such influence.

Items 13 and 14 were designed to ascertain whether or not the best town school board members were free from denominational and fraternal influences. The data reveal that the majority of both the "best" and "poorest" board members are free from these influences, although approximately 30 per cent more of the best are free from denominational and fraternal influences than are the poorest ones.

TABLE XIX
PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES OF THE BEST
AND POOREST TOWN SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

Professional Traits	Ans	Best		Poorest	
		F	%	F	%
11. Individual practice nepotism?	Yes	2	4.65	22	52.38
	No	40	93.02	18	42.86
	Y & N	0	0	1	2.38
	Bl	1	2.33	1	2.38
12. Free from political influences?	Yes	38	88.37	8	19.05
	No	3	6.98	32	76.19
	Y & N	2	4.65	1	2.38
	Bl	0	0	1	2.38
13. Free from denominational influences?	Yes	41	95.35	25	59.52
	No	1	2.33	16	38.09
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	1	2.33	1	2.38
14. Free from fraternal influences?	Yes	40	93.02	27	64.29
	No	1	2.33	15	35.71
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	2	4.65	0	0
15. Think for himself?	Yes	43	100.00	21	50.00
	No	0	0	19	45.24
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	2	4.76
16. Resist pressure?	Yes	43	100.00	7	16.67
	No	0	0	32	76.19
	Y & N	0	0	1	2.38
	Bl	0	0	2	4.76

TABLE XIX (Continued)

17. Explain reasons for his actions?	Yes	42	97.67	9	21.43
	No	0	0	29	69.05
	Y & N	0	0	2	4.76
	Bl	1	2.33	2	4.76
18. Was he a radical?	Yes	0	0	16	38.10
	No	42	97.67	23	54.76
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	1	2.33	3	7.14
19. Was he a conservative?	Yes	16	37.21	23	54.76
	No	18	41.86	11	26.19
	Y & N	6	13.95	4	9.52
	Bl	3	6.98	4	9.52
20. Was he liberal?	Yes	31	72.09	4	9.52
	No	3	6.98	29	69.05
	Y & N	7	16.28	2	4.76
	Bl	2	4.65	7	16.76
21. Good time sense for business efficiency?	Yes	41	95.35	13	30.95
	No	1	2.33	29	69.05
	Y & N	1	2.33	0	0
	Bl	0	0	0	0
22. Show initiative in sponsoring community projects?	Yes	39	90.70	16	38.10
	No	2	4.65	24	57.14
	Y & N	1	2.33	2	4.76
	Bl	1	2.33	0	0
23. Always consider welfare of schools?	Yes	43	100.00	6	14.29
	No	0	0	35	83.33
	Y & N	0	0	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	2.38
24. Interested in Community problems?	Yes	40	93.02	17	40.48
	No	2	4.65	24	57.14
	Y & N	1	2.33	0	0
	Bl	0	0	1	2.38

TABLE XIX (Continued)

25. Contribute to moral and intellectual tone of community?	Yes	41	95.35	4	9.52
	No	0	0	37	88.10
	Y & N	1	2.33	0	0
	B1	1	2.33	1	2.38
26. Consider proposition before giving opinion?	Yes	41	95.35	10	23.10
	No	0	0	28	66.67
	Y & N	1	2.33	4	9.52
	B1	1	2.33	0	0
27. "Rubber-stamp" superintendent?	Yes	12	27.91	11	26.19
	No	27	62.79	31	73.81
	Y & N	3	6.98	0	0
	B1	1	2.33	0	0

One hundred per cent of the best town school board members are able to think for themselves. Likewise, 50 per cent of the poorest are able to think for themselves. However, it is significant that 45.24 per cent of the poorest do not possess such ability.

Closely related to the ability to think independently of others is the power to resist pressure. It is shown by the data presented for Item 16 that all (100 per cent) of the best town school board members can resist pressure while 76.19 per cent of the poorest ones cannot.

Data for Item 17 shows that 99.67 per cent of the most desirable board members could explain reasons for their actions. Sixty-nine per cent of the poorest could not.

Items 18, 19, and 20 were designed to ascertain whether or not the best town school board members were radical, conservative, or liberal in their views. The data show that

97.67 per cent of the best are not radical, 41.86 per cent are conservative, and 72.09 per cent are liberal. On the other hand, 54.76 per cent of the poorest individuals considered are not radical, 54.76 per cent are conservative, and 69.05 per cent are not liberal. The conclusion is that most of the best town school board members are liberal; most of the poorest are conservative.

Ninety-five per cent of the most desirable town school board members have a good enough time sense to enable them to transact business with efficiency.

The data for Item 22 indicate that 90.70 per cent of the most desirable town school board members show some initiative in sponsoring community projects, while 57.14 per cent of the "poorest" ones do not show such initiative. Item 24, in close relation with this item, indicates that 95.02 per cent of the most desirable town school board members are interested in community problems. On the other hand, 57.14 per cent of the poorest are not interested in community problems.

Item 23 shows that all (100 per cent) of the most desirable town school board members consider the welfare of the schools. Eighty-three per cent of the least desirable did not always keep the best interests of the school uppermost in mind.

Item 25 may be considered as somewhat of a summary item. The data show that 95.35 per cent of the best town school board members contributed to the moral and intellectual tone of the community. Eighty-eight per cent of the poorest made no such contribution.

Item 26 indicates that 95.36 per cent of the best town school board members considered a proposition thoroughly before voicing an opinion. Sixty-six plus per cent of the least desirable board members did not consider a proposition thoroughly before giving opinions.

The last item in the professional group found that 62.79 per cent of the "best" town school board members never consented to a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it. The fact that a still larger percentage, 73.81 per cent, of the "poorest" never consented to a proposition just because they thought the superintendent favored it, is rather unexpected when considered in relation to the data recorded in Chapters II and III.

C. GENERAL DATA

The town school superintendents were invited to add any further comment they might have concerning the individual they were considering. Nineteen of the 43 town superintendents added comments on one or both major parts of the questionnaire. This made a total of 34 single comments in the 19 questionnaires. Of this number (19), 17 added comments concerning the "best" individual being considered. The same number, 17, added comments concerning the "poorest" individual being considered. These comments related various experiences and added traits not already considered in this thesis. An attempt was made by this student to translate these comments into a common language. Table XX presents the data obtained after the comments had been reduced to common terms.

TABLE XX

ADDITIONAL TRAITS AIDING IN THE CLASSIFICATION
OF TOWN SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AS "BEST"

Added Trait	Best F
Respect for Authority	4
Unselfish	4
Dependable	2
Business Integrity	2
A worker	2
Experienced	1
Good Judgment	1
Patience	1
Consistent Church Member	1
Duplication	3

The wide variation in the comments made caused considerable difficulty in classification. The results, shown in Table XX, show 9 added traits, each one of which has only a relatively small number of frequencies.

As noted in Table XX, the traits that were mentioned most frequently were "respect for authority" and "unselfish," each with a frequency of four. A typical answer tabulated under the heading, "respect for authority," was: "Had a sane idea of the superintendent's relations to a school system and did not infringe upon him." Statements classified under "unselfish" were similar to "Sacrificed personal interests for public good."

The next three traits, "dependable," "business integrity," and "a worker," are all exact quotations from the town superintendent's answers. Each one of these traits appeared twice.

Each of the next four traits (experienced, good judgment, patience, and consistent church member) appeared once and the terms used are exact quotations from the questionnaire answers.

Three town superintendents added that the individual they were considering "always considered the welfare of the school." This characteristic was taken care of in item 23 of the formal questionnaire and treated here under the heading "duplication."

An attempt was made to translate the comments made on the "poorest" town school board members. Table XXI indicated the results.

It is interesting to note that the trait "self-centered" was mentioned most frequently in connection with the "poorest" town school board members. Its opposite, "unselfish," was one of the most outstanding traits considered in connection with the most desirable town school board members. A typical example of the kind of statements tabulated under the heading "self-centered" may be quoted "He desired personal recognition."

A statement such as this: "Listened too much to outsiders" was tabulated under the heading "easily influenced." This trait appeared four times in the total number of comments made concerning the least desirable town school board members.

✓

TABLE XXI

ADDITIONAL TRAITS AIDING IN THE CLASSIFICATION
OF TOWN SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AS "POOREST"

Added Trait	Poorest
	F
Self-centered	6
Easily Influenced	4
Narrow	3
Deceitful	2
Unclassified	2
Duplication	2

Statements indicating that an individual was narrow-minded, had no experience or vision were tabulated under the heading "narrow." Three of the town superintendents adding comments concerning the "poorest" board member indicated the trait "narrow."

Two superintendents stated that the individuals they were considering were "deceitful."

Under the heading "unclassified" came such general statements as "incapable." This study assumes that the "poorest" board members are incapable. This writer's main purpose is to find out why these individuals are incapable or "poorest."

Two superintendents stated that the individuals they were considering were dishonest. Since this trait had already been considered in the formal part of the questionnaire, these statements were classified under the heading "duplication."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Certain data have been presented in Chapters II, III, and IV. These data have been presented in table form with interpretations accompanying each table. It is the purpose of this final chapter to interpret these data in their relation to the problems outlined in Chapter I, page 3, of this thesis.

I. SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS

1. What personal and professional traits should be found in the most desirable township trustees?

The most desirable township trustee was found to be between 44 and 48 years of age, to have attained at least part of a high school education, and had the following traits outstanding: honesty, cooperativeness, progressiveness, and intelligence. Sixty-eight per cent of the best township trustees are engaged in agriculture; another 15 per cent are engaged in business. Eighty-six plus per cent of these "best" township trustees continued their occupation after taking office. Ninety-five per cent are successful in the managing of their own personal affairs. An equal percentage are not affected by the desire to stand in the community limelight. Good township trustees are able to accept victory or defeat with equanimity and able to accomplish maximally. There

is a slight tendency for those trustees with children in school to be better trustees than those who have no children.

In regard to professional traits, good township trustees are free from nepotistic practices, political, denominational, and fraternal influences. They possess the ability to resist pressure, explain reasons for their actions, and are for the most part liberal in their views. The most desirable township trustees have a sense of time efficiency, are willing sponsors of community problems, always have the welfare of the schools uppermost in mind, show great interest in community problems, and contribute to the moral and intellectual tone of the community. The best township trustees always consider a proposition thoroughly before voicing an opinion; approximately 60 per cent never consented to a proposition just because the superintendent favored it.

The general data compiled from the additional comments indicate that respect for professional authority, social-mindedness, broad-mindedness, and common sense are also present in the best township trustees.

2. What personal and professional traits are found in the least desirable township trustees?

The solution to the second problem was to be found in the data compiled in Chapter II concerning the poorest township trustees. These poorest individuals were found to be between 50 and 57 years of age, to possess only

an elementary education, are engaged mostly in agriculture, and are outstanding, to a limited degree only, in the following traits: honesty, cleanliness, courtesy, and temperance. Seventy-three per cent continued their occupation after taking office. Over one half were unsuccessful in managing their own personal affairs and were affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight. Over three fourths of the "poorest" township trustees became boastful of success and embittered if defeated.

Consideration of the professional traits common in the least desirable township trustee showed that the poorest trustees practice nepotism, and are influenced from political sources. They are unable to think for themselves, cannot resist outside pressure, cannot explain reasons for their actions, and are conservative in their views. Over three fourths of the least desirable township trustees do not possess a time sense, do not sponsor community projects, do not always consider the welfare of the schools, and do not show any great interest in community problems. Seventy-three per cent of these individuals considered rendered judgment on a proposition before thoroughly considering it.

The traits added most frequently in the general data section were: self-centered, money-minded, unworthy use of leisure, and easily influenced.

3. What personal and professional traits should be found in the most desirable city school board member?

The data in Chapter III indicate that the most desirable city school board members are from 43 to 51 years of age, have attained a college education, are engaged, for the most part, in business pursuits with the professional group furnishing the next largest number of "best" city school board members. The most desirable city school board members have intelligence, honesty, cooperativeness, progressiveness, and tact to an outstanding degree. Ninety-eight per cent of the best board members are able to manage their own personal affairs successfully. Good city school board members can accept success and defeat with equanimity, are not boastful nor affected with a desire to stand in the community limelight. They are alert and able to accomplish. The data show that the most desirable school board members have children in office during office tenure. This conclusion is supported by C. L. Hoel's study.

The data concerning the professional traits of the best city school board members indicate that the most desirable do not practice nepotism, are free from political, fraternal, and denominational influences. They are able to think for themselves, resist pressure, give reasons for their answers, and are liberal in their views. By far the most of the best city school board members have a time sense that aids in business efficiency,

are willing sponsors of community projects, show interest in community problems, always consider the welfare of the school, and contribute to the intellectual and moral tone of the community. The "best" city school board members consider a proposition carefully before voicing an opinion. Almost 56 per cent of the individuals considered "best" would not consent to a proposition just because they knew it was favored by the superintendent of schools.

The general data reveal that city superintendents believe that a good city school board member should have respect for authority, broadness of mind, good judgment, and common sense.

4. What personal and professional traits are found in the least desirable city school board members?

The poorest city school board members are from 48 to 53 years of age at the time of their tenure, the majority have received no more than an elementary school education. Although the business group furnishes a larger number of city school board members than any other occupational group, the professions furnish the most of the least desirable city school board members. To a limited degree these board members have the following outstanding traits: cleanliness, temperance, honesty, and courtesy. Slightly over one half of these individuals are able to manage their own personal affairs successfully. They desire community recognition. They can neither accept

success or failure gracefully nor are they alert and able to accomplish maximally. Fifty-four per cent had children in school during their tenure of office.

The data gathered concerning the professional traits possessed by these least desirable board members show that these individuals practice nepotism, and are influenced from political sources. Fifty-eight per cent are able to think for themselves. Nearly three fourths cannot resist outside pressure nor explain reasons for their actions. The poorest school board members are conservative in their attitudes. They have no time sense to aid in business efficiency, no initiative in sponsoring community projects, nor interest in community problems, they do not always consider the welfare of the schools and do not contribute fundamentally to the moral and intellectual tone of the community. They are prone to give "snap" judgment on an issue before giving it adequate consideration. Over one half of these poorest individuals would not consent to a proposition just because they knew the superintendent favored it.

To a limited degree, the following traits were found outstanding: self-centered, a busybody, lack of common sense, and deceitful.

5. What personal and professional traits should be found in the most desirable town school board members?

Chapter IV presents the data gathered concerning the best and poorest town school board members. A consideration of the most desirable reveals the age in

years to be 41 to 50 years. Most of the best received some college education with a large per cent reaching high school. The business group furnishes the greater number of the best town school board members; the professions furnish the second largest number. The most outstanding single traits among these individuals are: honesty, cooperativeness, progressiveness, and intelligence. The most desirable town school board members are able to manage their own personal affairs successfully. They are not boastful of their accomplishments and can accept success and defeat with equanimity. They are alert and able to accomplish maximally. In the case of town school board members is the clearest indication that members with children in school are better board members, since 79 per cent of those considered "best" did have children in school during office tenure and 57 per cent of the "poorest" did not.

In regard to the professional traits possessed by the "best" town school board members it is found that these individuals do not practice nepotism and are free from political, denominational and fraternal influences. They are able to think for themselves, resist pressure, explain reasons for their actions, and are, for the most part liberal in their views. The most desirable town school board members have a good time sense to enable them to transact business with dispatch. They have initiative in sponsoring community projects, interest in

community problems, the best interests of the school uppermost in mind, and contribute to the moral and intellectual tone of the community. The good town school board member considers thoroughly a proposition made before voicing an opinion. More of the poorest town school board members refuse to consent to a proposition just because the superintendent favored it than did the "best" ones.

In the general data the traits "respect for authority" and "unselfishness" ranked highest. Good town school board members, then, respect professional authority and are willing to sacrifice personal gain to the good of the school.

6. What personal and professional traits are found in the least desirable town school board members?

The poorest town school board members, as concluded from the data in this study, are from 46 to 51 years of age, have been recipients of only an elementary education or less, and are engaged, for the most part, in a profession and business. To a limited degree they have the following traits outstanding: temperance, honesty, cleanliness, and courtesy. They continue their occupation after taking office, manage their own personal affairs successfully (to the extent of 60 per cent), cannot accept success and defeat with equanimity, and are not alert and able to accomplish. Over one half of

the poorest town school board members do not have children in school during office tenure.

In a consideration of the professional traits possessed by the least desirable town school board members, it was found that they were not free from nepotistic and political influences but relatively free from fraternal and denominational influences. Almost one half of the "poorest" board members do not possess the ability to think for themselves, and over three fourths of them are not able to resist pressure or explain reasons for their actions. The poorest town school board members are conservative in their views. They do not possess an efficient time sense, do not show initiative in sponsoring community projects, show no interest in community problems, do not always consider the welfare of the schools, and contribute nothing to the moral and intellectual tone of the community. The least desirable town school members voice opinions on a proposition before giving it a thorough consideration. They also show rather a sharp tendency to consent to a proposition just because the superintendent favors it.

In the general data section it was found that the traits "self-centered" and "easily influenced" were most frequently mentioned in relation to the poorest town school board member.

II. GENERAL COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS

1. School trustees, including township trustees,

town and city school board members, reach their maximum age efficiency in the late forties. The fifties show a decline in efficiency.

2. High school is the minimum level of education for school trustees.

3. Agricultural, business, and professional occupations are the main sources of the school trustees considered in this study.

4. The most desirable school trustees are honest, cooperative, progressive, and intelligent.

5. In most cases, the presence of children in school during a school trustees' term of office, has no very marked effect upon the relative desirability of that individual as a school trustee.

6. The best school trustees are liberal in their views.

7. The most desirable school trustees do not practice nepotism and are free from political influences.

8. All school trustees are free from denominational and fraternal influences.

9. The most desirable school trustees are public minded.

10. Few school trustees ever consent to a proposition just because they know a superintendent favors it.

III. THE "HALO OF GENERAL ESTIMATE"

Before any attempt is made to relate this halo of general estimate to this study, an understanding of its

meaning must be made clear. This writer found references to it in two sources. F. M. Symonds¹ defines the halo effect as "the tendency for judgment of specific traits to be influenced by the general impression of the person or thing being rated." Reference to the application of the halo effect was found in a study conducted by F. B. Knight.² A quotation from Mr. Knight's discussion will further interpret the meaning of the "halo effect."

"To make this still clearer, let us assume that a person likes a certain picture. If this like is strong enough, it will not vary from what ever point of view the picture may appear. Let it stand on the right of the person; he will still like it. Let him see the picture from the left; he will still like it. The total effect being pleasing, it will not be hard to rationalize his thinking so that the background, the middle, and the foreground will all appear to be well-painted. The detail will be correct or overlooked, and the main features will be good or easily condoned. We can very well term this process the spreading of a halo of general effect to all particular parts."

¹P. M. Symonds, Measurement in Secondary Education. p. 348.

²F. B. Knight, Qualities Related to Success In Teaching. p.52.

This halo of general estimate might well have entered into this writer's study. Perhaps the school superintendents had certain impressions in toto of the individuals they considered for purposes of this study. Their answers to the specific questions asked in the questionnaire may have been given on basis of general impression. Looking at a school trustee from the aspect of his most outstanding traits, his personal, or professional traits, the general estimate will still be present and will be the basis upon which judgment is found. No measure of its effect has been found.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While making this study, certain questions have arisen which this student presents here with the hope that these suggestions may be worthy of further research.

1. A study of the comparative merits of a school system administered as a township unit and one administered as a county unit.

2. Do the majority of the school trustees in Indiana belong to the "best" or "poorest" classification according to the traits considered in this study?

3. What personal and professional qualities are desirable in a superintendent as a school administrator?

CHAPTER VI

I. APPENDIX

A. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chancellor, William E., Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1904.
- Cubberley, Elwood P., Public School Administration. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929.
- Good, Carter V., How to Do Research in Education. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1928.
- Hines, J. F., "Qualifications of School Board Members," in American School Board Journal. Vol. 77, August, 1928.
- Hines, L. N., "The Ideal School Board Member from the Superintendent's Point of View." Proceedings, N. E. A., 1911.
- Hoel, C. H., "Traits and Qualifications of School Board Members in Ohio," in American School Board Journal. Vol. 75, December, 1927.
- Knight, F. B., Qualities Related to Success in Teaching. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. 1922.
- Struble, George G., "A Study of School Board Personnel," in American School Board Journal. Vol. 65, October, 1922.
- Symonds, P. M., Measurement in Secondary Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927.
- Wylie, Andrew T., "To What Extent May We Rely upon the Answers to a School Questionnaire?" in Journal of Educational Method, Vol. 2.

B. INTRODUCTORY LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE
SENT TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

INDIANA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
Terre Haute, Indiana

Graduate Division

October 30, 1935.

As a successful administrator you know that cooperation within the administrative system of any school is very necessary to that school system's well-being.

In the course of your experience in the schools you have, undoubtedly, worked with school trustees of two types: first, those who made worthy contribution to the school community, and second, those who made no worthy contribution to the school. Just what kind of a person was this first individual? What traits or characteristics made him an asset to the school system? Likewise, what traits or characteristics made this second individual a liability to the school system?

To answer these questions we must rely on the judgment of those successful superintendents who have been most closely associated with these individuals.

Please cooperate with us in making this study a reliable one by checking the enclosed questionnaire carefully and returning it in the enclosed envelope.

Yours truly,

E. E. Ramsey
J. R. Shannon
E. L. Abell
C. M. Morgan
O. G. Jamison

C.. QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS

BEST

Professional literature contains certain dogmatic statements about the qualifications of township trustees. These statements are not based upon scientific investigation. We are seeking to find scientifically just what attributes are desirable in men holding this office. To accomplish our purpose we are seeking to find out what traits you consider desirable in a good township trustee. Your cooperation is necessary to help set up these standards.

Please cooperate with us by calling to mind the best township trustee you have ever worked with and answer the following questions in light of his characteristics.

Personal Data

1. What was the approximate age of the individual when he first took office? _____ Approximate age when leaving? _____ Sex? _____

2. Amount of education? (Check one)
Common School _____ High School _____ College _____

3. Occupation before taking office? _____

4. Please indicate by a check the following traits that you consider most outstanding in the township trustee:

Cleanliness	Tact	Progressiveness
Temperance	Initiative	
Honesty	Cooperativeness	
Courtesy	Intelligence	

Please indicate by a check mark (✓) the answers to the following questions:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
5. Did the individual continue this occupation after taking office? _____	()	()

6. Judging from the individual's own wealth and standing in the community, did he manage his own personal affairs successfully? _____	()	()
---	-----	-----

7. Was he affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight, or talk unnecessarily about his own accomplishments? _____	()	()
--	-----	-----

- | | Yes | No |
|--|-----|-----|
| 8. Could he accept success without vain-glory and defeat without becoming embittered?_____ | () | () |
| 9. Was he alert and able to get things done?_____ | () | () |
| 10. Did he have children in school during his term in office?_____ | () | () |

PROFESSIONAL DATA

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 11. Did the individual practice nepotism?_____ | () | () |
| 12. Was he free from political influences?_____ | () | () |
| 13. Was he free from denominational influences?_____ | () | () |
| 14. Was he free from fraternal influences?_____ | () | () |
| 15. Could he think for himself?_____ | () | () |
| 16. Could he resist pressure?_____ | () | () |
| 17. Could he explain reasons for his actions?_____ | () | () |
| 18. Did you consider the individual a radical?_____ | () | () |
| 19. Was he conservative?_____ | () | () |
| 20. Was he liberal?_____ | () | () |
| 21. Did he have a good time-sense to enable him to save time and transact business with efficiency?_____ | () | () |
| 22. Did he show any initiative of his own in sponsoring community projects?_____ | () | () |
| 23. Did he show any great interest in community problems?_____ | () | () |
| 24. Did he always consider the welfare of the school?_____ | () | () |
| 25. Do you believe that the labors of this individual contributed to conditions which have resulted in a better moral tone in the community and a quickened intellectual life for all?_____ | () | () |
| 26. When a proposition was made by you did he consider it thoroughly before giving his opinion?_____ | () | () |
| 27. Do you think he ever consented to a proposition just because he knew you favored it?_____ | () | () |

In a brief statement give any additional material why you consider this individual you have been thinking of the best you have ever known.

FOOREST

In similar manner call to mind the least desirable township trustee you have ever worked with and answer the following questions in light of his characteristics:

Personal Data

1. What was the approximate age of the individual when he first took office? _____ Approximate age when leaving? _____ Sex? _____

2. Amount of education? (Check one)
Common School
High School
College

3. Occupation before taking office? _____

4. Please indicate by a check the following traits that you consider most outstanding in the township trustee:

Cleanliness	Tact	Progressiveness
Temperance	Initiative	
Honesty	Cooperativeness	
Courtesy	Intelligence	

Please indicate by a check mark (✓) the answers to the following questions:

	Yes	No
5. Did the individual continue this occupation after taking office? _____	()	()
6. Judging from the individual's own wealth and standing in the community, did he manage his own personal affairs successfully? _____	()	()
7. Was he affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight, or talk unnecessarily about his own accomplishments? _____	()	()
8. Could he accept success without vainglory and defeat without becoming embittered? _____	()	()

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----|-----|
| 9. Was he alert and able to get things done?_ | () | () |
| 10. Did he have children in school during his term in office? | () | () |

PROFESSIONAL DATA

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 11. Did the individual practice nepotism?_____ | () | () |
| 12. Was he free from political influences?_____ | () | () |
| 13. Was he free from denominational influences? | () | () |
| 14. Was he free from fraternal influences?_____ | () | () |
| 15. Could he think for himself?_____ | () | () |
| 16. Could he resist pressure?_____ | () | () |
| 17. Could he explain reasons for his actions?__ | () | () |
| 18. Did you consider the individual a radical?_ | () | () |
| 19. Was he conservative?_____ | () | () |
| 20. Was he liberal?_____ | () | () |
| 21. Did he have a good time-sense to enable him to save time and transact business with efficiency?_ | () | () |
| 22. Did he show any initiative of his own in sponsoring community projects?_____ | () | () |
| 23. Did he always consider the welfare of the school?_____ | () | () |
| 24. Did he show any great interest in community problems?_____ | () | () |
| 25. Do you believe that the labors of this individual contributed to conditions which have resulted in a better moral tone in the community and a quickened intellectual life for all?_____ | () | () |
| 26. When a proposition was made by you did he consider it thoroughly before giving his opinion?__ | () | () |
| 27. Do you think he ever consented to a proposition just because he knew you favored it?_____ | () | () |

In a brief statement give any additional material why you consider this individual you have been thinking of the least desirable you have ever known.

D. QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO TOWN AND CITY SUPERINTENDENTS

BEST

Professional literature contains certain dogmatic statements about the qualifications of city school board members. These statements are not based upon scientific investigation. We are seeking to find scientifically just what attributes are desirable in men holding this office. To accomplish our purpose we are seeking to find out what traits you consider desirable in a good board member. Your cooperation is necessary to help set up these standards.

Please cooperate with us by calling to mind the best board member you have ever worked with and answer the following questions in light of his characteristics.

Personal Data

1. What was the approximate age of the individual when he first took office? _____ Approximate age when leaving? _____ Sex? _____

2. Amount of education? (Check one)
Common School _____ High School _____ College _____

3. Occupation before taking office? _____

4. Please indicate by a check the following traits that you consider most outstanding in the school board member:

Cleanliness	Tact	Progressiveness
Temperance	Initiative	
Honesty	Cooperativeness	
Courtesy	Intelligence	

Please indicate by a check mark (✓) the answers to the following questions:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
--	------------	-----------

5. Did the individual continue this occupation after taking office? _____ () ()

6. Judging from the individual's own wealth and standing in the community, did he manage his own personal affairs successfully? _____ () ()

7. Was he affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight, or talk unnecessarily about his own accomplishments? _____ () ()

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----|-----|
| 8. Could he accept success without vainglory and defeat without becoming embittered?_____ | () | () |
| 9. Was he alert and able to get things done?__ | () | () |
| 10. Did he have children in school during his term in office?_____ | () | () |

PROFESSIONAL DATA

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 11. Did the individual practice nepotism?_____ | () | () |
| 12. Was he free from political influences?_____ | () | () |
| 13. Was he free from denominational influences?_____ | () | () |
| 14. Was he free from fraternal influences?_____ | () | () |
| 15. Could he think for himself?_____ | () | () |
| 16. Could he resist pressure?_____ | () | () |
| 17. Could he explain reasons for his actions?__ | () | () |
| 18. Did you consider the individual a radical?_ | () | () |
| 19. Was he conservative?_____ | () | () |
| 20. Was he liberal?_____ | () | () |
| 21. Did he have a good time-sense to enable him to save time and transact business with efficiency?_ | () | () |
| 22. Did he show any initiative of his own in sponsoring community projects?_____ | () | () |
| 23. Did he always consider the welfare of the school?_____ | () | () |
| 24. Did he show any great interest in community problems?_____ | () | () |
| 25. Do you believe that the labors of this individual contributed to conditions which have resulted in a better moral tone in the community and a quickened intellectual life for all?_____ | () | () |
| 26. When a proposition was made by you did he consider it thoroughly before giving his opinion?__ | () | () |
| 27. Do you think he ever consented to a proposition just because he knew you favored it?_____ | () | () |

In a brief statement give any additional material why you consider this individual you have been thinking of the best you have ever known.

POOREST

In similar manner call to mind the least desirable board member you have ever worked with and answer the following questions in light of his characteristics:

Personal Data

1. What was the approximate age of the individual when he first took office? _____ Approximate age when leaving? _____ Sex? _____
2. Amount of education? (Check one)
Common School _____ High School _____ College _____
3. Occupation before taking office? _____

4. Please indicate by a check the following traits that you consider most outstanding in the board members:

Cleanliness	Tact	Progressiveness
Temperance	Initiative	
Honesty	Cooperativeness	
Courtesy	Intelligence	

Please indicate by a check mark (✓) the answers to the following questions: Yes No

5. Did the individual continue this occupation () () after taking office?
6. Judging from the individual's own wealth and standing in the community, did he manage his own personal affairs successfully? () ()
7. Was he affected by a desire to stand in the community limelight, or talk unnecessarily about his own accomplishments? () ()
8. Could he accept success without vainglory and defeat without becoming embittered? () ()
9. Was he alert and able to get things done? () ()
10. Did he have children in school during his term in office? () ()

PROFESSIONAL DATA

- | | Yes | No |
|--|-----|-----|
| 11. Did the individual practice nepotism?_____ | () | () |
| 12. Was he free from political influences?_____ | () | () |
| 13. Was he free from denominational influences?_____ | () | () |
| 14. Was he free from fraternal influences?_____ | () | () |
| 15. Could he think for himself?_____ | () | () |
| 16. Could he resist pressure?_____ | () | () |
| 17. Could he explain reasons for his actions?_____ | () | () |
| 18. Did you consider the individual a radical?_____ | () | () |
| 19. Was he conservative?_____ | () | () |
| 20. Was he liberal?_____ | () | () |
| 21. Did he have a good time-sense to enable him to
save time and transact business with efficiency?_____ | () | () |
| 22. Did he show any initiative of his own in
sponsoring community projects?_____ | () | () |
| 23. Did he always consider the welfare of the
school?_____ | () | () |
| 24. Did he show any great interest in community
problems?_____ | () | () |
| 25. Do you believe that the labors of this in-
dividual contributed to conditions which have resulted
in a better moral tone in the community and a quickened
intellectual life for all?_____ | () | () |
| 26. When a proposition was made by you did he con-
sider it thoroughly before giving his opinion?_____ | () | () |
| 27. Do you think he ever consented to a propo-
sition just because he knew you favored it?_____ | () | () |

In a brief statement give any additional material
why you consider this individual you have been thinking
of the least desirable you have ever known.

INDIANA STATE
NORMAL LIBRARY