INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Personality type and effectiveness of board members in
Nebraska school districts

Jones, David Lynn, Ed.D.

The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1992

PERSONALITY TYPE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF BOARD MEMBERS

IN NEBRASKA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

by

David L. Jones

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Interdepartmental Area of Administration,
Curriculum and Instruction

Under the Supervision of Professors Robert O'Reilly and Ward Sybouts

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 1992

DISSERTATION TITLE

Personality Type and Effectiveness of Board Members in

Nebraska School Districts

BY

David Lynn Jones

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED   DATE

_____   _10/19/92_
Signature

Dr. Robert O'Reilly
Typed Name

_____   _10/19/92_
Signature

Dr. Ward Sybouts
Typed Name

_____   _10/19/92_
Signature

Dr. Fred Wendel
Typed Name

_____   _____
Signature

Dr. Richard Blake
Typed Name

_____   _____
Signature

Typed Name

_____   _____
Signature

Typed Name

GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

PERSONALITY TYPE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF BOARD MEMBERS

IN NEBRASKA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

David L. Jones, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 1992

Advisors: Robert O'Reilly and Ward Sybouts

The purpose in this study was to compare measured personality types generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator of perceived effective school board members in Nebraska Class II and Class III public school districts. The population for the study was limited to Class II and Class III public school districts in which the same superintendent had been retained for at least five years. One hundred eighty (180) school districts matched the requirement for participation, and all 180 districts were surveyed.

The design of the study was survey research. First, superintendents were asked to rate board members using an effectiveness rating scale. From the superintendent's rating scale, one board member emerged as the most effective member on that board. The board member identified as effective was placed in the population of effective board members. The second step was to survey the population of effective board members. The effective board members were sent a two-part survey. In part one of the survey, demographic data were collected, and the second part of the survey was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Demographic data were analyzed by the use of means, medians, modes, and standard deviations. The 16 personality types generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator were a result of preference from four dichotomies that make up the profile. The binomial test was used to

ascertain whether or not there were any statistical significant differences among the personality profiles of the effective board members.

Significant findings of the study were:

1. More effective school board members in the State of Nebraska were Introverts than Extroverts.

2. A predominant number of effective school board members had a Sensing personality rather than an Intuitive personality.

3. More effective school board members were found to have a Thinking personality profile rather than a Feeling personality profile.

4. More effective school board members had a Judgment personality than a Perception personality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

As the focus of the American society on public education continues, increased attention has been devoted to the men and women who serve on boards of education. Board members have a great responsibility entrusted to them. Elected or appointed to positions on boards, they are often thrust into positions of responsibility with little or no training or understanding of their roles. Within the group setting, certain individuals will be more effective than others. If this assumption is accepted, conceivably board members could be ranked, within the board, as to their effectiveness. The personality types of board members rated as effective by superintendents, controlling for experience variables, are compared in this study.

A number of topics have been addressed in literature reviews in which the board was considered as a group. The list of topics included: profiles of boards of education, board-administrator relationships, board-teacher relationships, policy formation, inservice training, collective bargaining, politics and boards of education, planning, and evaluation. This list has also been covered in journal articles; in addition, current issues, observations by individuals, surveys of public attitudes, reviews of court findings, and ideas on how to be a better board member have also been addressed.

A large number of studies have roots in theories from social psychology relating to small groups. Examples of small-group research

include: Eulau's (1969) study of city councils; Fenno's (1962) study of congressional committees; and Cannon and Jaros' (1970) study of state supreme courts. Using experimental procedures, students of group dynamics found the following variables tended to contribute to group cohesion: agreement on norms and goals, democratic leadership, and similarity in background (Shepherd, 1964). In addition, cohesion appeared to contribute positively to the following variables: productivity, satisfaction, conformity, and cooperation (Cartwright, 1968). Jennings and Zeigler (1970), noting the relatively few number of studies concerning boards of education at that time, turned to social psychology theories on small groups. They examined school board decisions that had great potential consequence, which Blanchard (1975) had cited when he examined the conflict and cohesion in Kentucky school boards.

As the inroads were paved for research on boards of education, the body of research on boards of education grew. Yet, relatively few studies have focused on individual board members. The most notable research about individual board members has been in the field of decision making (Brown, Newman, & Rivers, 1985; Newman, Bull, Brown, & Rivers, 1986; Pflum & Brown, 1984). Dimensions of decision making were explored utilizing conflict models (Janis & Mann, 1977) and social process decision-making models (Vroom & Jago, 1974).

The study adds to the body of research about individual board members. While there are a number of descriptive studies about board members, in only a few studies has experience been compared to the effectiveness of a board member. The comparison of the personality profile

and effectiveness of a board member appears to be new, as evidenced by the lack of such information in the review of the literature.

The significance of this study will be that it adds to a body of research that has been given relatively little attention. From the viewpoint of a practicing school administrator, the information should be of interest to superintendents and board members. Future researchers may want to examine the personality profiles of superintendents as compared to the personality profiles of board members, and how those profiles impinge upon effectiveness.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose for conducting this study was to compare measured personality types of perceived effective school board members in Nebraska Class II and III public school districts. Experience was treated as the control variable. The demographic data collected that reflected experience included: sex, age, marital status, formal education attained, years of service on the board, occupation, children who were students in school, type of school children attended, professional organization membership, community involvement, and board offices held. Personality type was obtained using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, which indicated preferences regarding: sensing v. intuition, thinking v. feeling, extroversion v. introversion, and judgment v. perception.

The dependent variable, effectiveness, was measured by using an instrument developed by Troester (1963). Effectiveness was measured by the superintendent's perception of the board members' willingness to: (1)

consider all sides of an issue; (2) seek advice of the superintendent; (3) consider needs of the school first; (4) have board objectives as principal concern; (5) recognize authority of board as whole; (6) have concern for school faculty; (7) desire improvement; (8) consider effect of board actions on total program; (9) strive for close relationship with superintendent; and (10) strive for sound board policies.

Research Question

How do sixteen personality types, as identified by the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator, compare to effectiveness of a board member, controlling for experience variables?

Definition of Terms

Boards of education or school boards. The board of education (school board) is the governing unit of a public school district. The authority to govern schools is delegated to school boards by the state legislature (Rebore, 1984).

Effectiveness of a board member. Effectiveness of a board member was determined by a rating form developed for use by a superintendent (Troester, 1963).

Personality profile terms (Briggs & Myers, 1957):

Extroversion. Person's preference for the outer world of people and things.

Feeling. Feeling takes into account anything that matters or is important to the individual or other people and is decided on the basis of personal values.

Introversion. Person's preference for the inner world of concepts and ideas.

Intuition. Shows meanings and relationships and possibilities that are beyond the reach of senses. Intuition is especially useful for seeing what might be done about a situation.

Judging. Person's preference to live in a planned, decided, orderly way, wanting to regulate life and control it.

Perceiving. Person's preference for dealing with the outer world by living in flexible, spontaneous way, wanting to understand life and adapt to it.

Sensing. The eyes and ears and other senses tell one what is actually there and actually happening. Sensing is especially useful for gathering the facts of the situation.

Thinking. Thinking predicts the logical results of any particular action that may be taken.

School board members. School board members are those individuals elected or appointed to serve on boards of education. Board members, as individuals, exercise no authority outside a legally constituted meeting (Rebore, 1984).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. There are board members who are more effective than some of their colleagues, but who are less effective in the work of the board. Further, a superintendent rating of individual board members on ten characteristics of effectiveness can result in identification of effective board members.

2. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was answered honestly by participating board members, accurately reflecting the personality profiles of these board members.

3. The public school districts participating in the study were representative of the school board governance population of the schools in the State of Nebraska.

Delimitations and Limitations

For this study, the population was confined to members of existing boards of education of Class II and Class III public schools in the State of Nebraska. Class II and Class III schools in the State of Nebraska are school districts in which elementary and high school grades are maintained under the direction of a single board of education. Class II school districts have populations of 1,000 or less, and Class III school districts have populations of 1,000 to 100,000. The study concentrated on sixteen personality types identified by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) compared to the effectiveness of a board member. Thus, the meaning of the personality factor was limited to the personality types identified by the MBTI.

The effectiveness rating questionnaire was completed by the superintendent who had worked at least five years in a given district. Possibly, the rater's selection of effectiveness could have been biased from an administrative point of view. However, the researcher felt confidentiality for all involved could be best insured with this design.

Survey research has weaknesses, many of which are statistically controlled; however these weaknesses cannot be ignored. According to Nunnery and Kimbrough (1971), examples of possible disadvantages of mailed questionnaires include:

1. Results from mailed questionnaires are often quite low.

2. Directions and questions may be misunderstood.

3. Respondents may be reluctant to reply to questionnaires.

4. The opportunity to gauge intensity of respondents' opinions is limited.

5. The measurement of what exists versus manipulation of the variable in a controlled experiment results in greater speculation regarding findings.

Finally, there was only a modest theoretical base for this study. Research regarding individual board members was limited; Troester's rating instrument did not appear again in the review of literature. In most studies, boards were examined as a whole, or demographic data associated with board memberships were examined. The sensitive nature of this study lends insight into the reasons why this is a relatively new area for study. That characteristic, alone, seemed sufficient justification to pursue the research.

Significance of the Study

While the board of education as a group has been addressed in a large number of studies, individual board members have been addressed in relatively few studies. This study should stimulate subsequent researchers to study other variables that influence effectiveness of a board member and boards of education. Further research modeled upon this study might involve a comparison of superintendents' personality profiles and the ratings given their board members, or a study which examines the personality profile of all board members.

This study should be of interest to superintendents and board members. The comparison of experience and personality to effectiveness could provide insight for both groups and should bode well for the effectiveness of public school districts.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Development of Boards of Education

The earliest teaching was carried on in families and homes, with parents and older siblings filling the teachers' roles. The home schools were eventually supplanted by dame schools, in which a group of children gathered in a private home to receive instruction in the three R's and religion. From such beginnings, the American public elementary schools were developed (Ashby, 1968). Many present-day basic features of public education originated in the New England colonies. As early as 1642, the need was seen by members of the Massachusetts General Court to insure that all citizens were taught to read and write. Under a law enacted by that court, parents could be fined for failing to teach children. The law was not enforced, and, as a result, the Massachusetts Law of 1647 was enacted. Every town was required to provide a common school:

> 1. ... every town having fifty householders should at once appoint a teacher of reading and writing, and provide for his wages in such manner as the town might determine; and
>
> 2. ... every town having one hundred householders must provide a [Latin] grammar school to fit youths for the university, under a penalty for failure to do so. (Cubberly, 1934, p. 18)

Policies of administrative matters were determined either in town meetings or by selectmen of the town who performed both legislative and

administrative functions for the schools. Schools had been made a function of town government.

Direct control by town government soon became impractical as enrollments increased, teacher numbers swelled, public interest grew, and non-school problems of local governments increased. The selectmen attempted to cope with these developments by appointing temporary committees to handle the finances and administration of the schools.

In 1721, a permanent committee on school visitations was appointed in Boston (Reeves, 1954). The committee, originally an agency of the selectmen, was later given separate legal status. Similar committees, but without legal status, were appointed elsewhere in response to perceptions that, in growing American colonies, there was a need for organization. The extent of control of that era by local school boards was described in the twenty-fourth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators (1949):

> Of necessity, the school committee selected the teacher, gave
> him his license, and supervised his work to great detail.
> The school committee visited classes, heard the children
> read and spell, questioned them about their work, and
> examined the writing and ciphering books. If they were not
> pleased with the school, they told the teacher how to
> discipline his pupils and perhaps, how to conduct his classes.
> (p. 10)

As colonies grew following the Revolutionary War and became states, this type of local control and function paved the way for the eventual appearance of principalships and superintendencies for the administrative functions of public schools. The board of education, as it is referred to today, came to oversee the general operation of the district, establish policy,

and levy taxes. The legal responsibility for today's public education lies in the hands of the individual states, and the legislatures discharge that responsibility.

The authority of the state to create and govern public schools is embodied in state constitutions and exercised through state legislatures. The federal government complements and enriches the efforts of state legislatures. The National Council of Chief State School Officers (1950) emphasized the states' educational responsibility and their relationship to local and federal agencies:

> Our system of constitutional government makes the states responsible for the organization and administration of public education and for general supervision of non-public schools. Each state has in practice delegated authority to organize and operate schools to various types of local administrative units of its own creation [boards of education]. Within its general unity, our system of education leaves room for diversified programs among states and local administrative units.

> Local, state and federal governments all have a vital interest in education. Each can contribute most effectively only if there is appropriate allocation of responsibility among them and only if relations among them are properly defined. Initiative and responsibility must be encouraged in the local units which operate most of the schools. The states must ensure organization, financial support and effective administration of education programs of suitable quality and make certain these programs are available to every child. The federal government has an obligation to provide supplementary assistance to the states in accord with the national interest in universal education.

> Local school boards and other state education authorities represent the public in the administration of education. Working with their professional staffs, these authorities are

responsible for carefully planned programs of education
and for obtaining the participation of the people in
planning the kinds of schools and education they need and
want. (pp. 5-6)

The purpose for conducting this study was not to trace the history of the development of school boards. The history of boards of education, however, is deemed valuable and appropriate as a source of information and background for this study. Public school districts are perhaps the most democratically controlled of all agencies in American government. Citizens of a given community elect school board members who are charged with formulating policies for the organization and administration of local schools (Rebore, 1984).

Local Control

The premise that the state is represented by board of education members by virtue of the authority delegated to school boards from the state legislature is vital to the issue of local control of school districts. Board members, as individuals, exercise no authority outside a legally constituted meeting. Policies and decisions can be agreed upon only in an official meeting, and individual members cannot commit the board at a legal meeting. Thus, the authority of the local board of education lies in the board as a corporate body. Since school board members have no existence except as dictated by constitutional or statutory enactment, their powers and duties are essentially those possessed by the school district.

Wiles and Bondi (1985) enumerated five sources of control over local school boards. Each of these sources gives the school board authority to act

in specific situations and limits the independent actions of board members. The five sources are:

1. Constitutional provisions. These are usually quite broad and the establishment of specific laws is generally considered a legislative function. Any constitutional provision (such as relating to individual rights) takes precedence over statutory provisions.

2. Legislative enactments. School boards are responsible to legislative control and can exact no powers outside of the provisions of the statutes. The state legislature can determine the degree of control which is exerts over the local school district.

3. Rules and regulations of the State Board of Education. State legislatures usually consider it their function to establish the broad outlines for operation of public education and to leave specific details to a state education agency or local school board. Operating for the commissioner of education or state superintendent for public instruction, the State Board of Education has powers narrowly described by the legislature. The State Board of Education can establish results and regulations, prescribe courses of study, and prescribe standards to be met.

4. Legal interpretation. Legal interpretation of statutes affecting the operation of schools is done by two agencies. The first, in most states, is the state attorney general. The other agency is the courts, which may decide on suits brought either by other agencies or the state or by private citizens. These cases may involve the proper legal definition of the authority of school boards. Legal definition of school board authority is necessary, particularly because of the doctrine of implied powers. The courts generally allow a school board to exercise the following powers and no others: (1) those powers expressly granted in the statutes; (2) those that are fairly implied in or incidental to the power expressly granted; and (3) those essential to the accomplishment of the schools' objectives.

5. Societal demands. In recent years society has demanded more and more of the schools. Many public school functions that were formerly carried on by such agencies as the home or church

are now considered to be the responsibility of the schools. As a result of increased pressures to extend the school program, school boards have either expanded the school program and justified their actions on the basis of implied powers, or the legislatures have extended the board's powers. Such extended powers then become operational obligations of local boards; e.g., special education programs. (Wiles & Bondi, 1985, pp. 5-6)

Effectiveness of School Board Membership

There is little question that effective board membership is vital to the success of an educational system. The cries for effective schools through the 1990s are as loud as they have ever been in the field of education. The demand for effective schools has led many prominent authorities in the field of education to attempt to identity those qualities most necessary for effective and efficient service on a board of education. The following comments represent some of the more accepted statements regarding desirable school board membership and thus support the theoretical construct that certain board members are more or less effective when compared to what authorities cite as desirable qualities of a school board member.

Legal Requirements for Board Membership

There are relatively few legal requirements for a board member. Among the most common requirements for eligibility that have been used at some time or another are citizenship, residence in the school district, ownership of property in the district, and a taxpayer in the district. While there are few requirements, most authorities have agreed that legislation is inadequate to determine minimum qualifications needed for successful board

membership. There is typically one legal requirement for eligibility: the candidate must be a qualified elector in the district where the election is held.

Personal Qualifications for Board Membership

Many scholars have written accounts concerning the qualifications regarded as essential for effective board membership. The opinions of these writers, combined with the findings of similar related research, provide a more adequate account of qualities thought necessary for effective board membership.

Cooke and Cope (1938) conducted a comprehensive review of all available publications concerning traits that school board members should possess. The traits were compiled in random order and sent to 49 superintendents in Tennessee to be ranked in order of importance. The following is a list of the 21 highest-ranked traits:

1. Recognize the superintendent as the head of the school system
2. Interest in the schools
3. Good business judgment
4. Interest in the community
5. Intelligent
6. Progressive
7. Knowledge of emotional problems
8. Honest and sincere
9. Cooperative
10. Plans for welfare of schools
11. Free of undesirable religious and political affiliations
12. Willing to learn
13. Community leader
14. Open-minded
15. Sense of responsibility

16. Does not interfere with the internal management of schools
17. Desires to be of public service
18. Able to withstand criticism
19. Ability to handle finances
20. Favors the professional training of teachers
21. Good character (pp. 34-36)

Stapley (1957) prepared a 54-item questionnaire which he sent to board members in the State of Indiana. Consensus was found on the following 11 items with regard to board members:

1. Board members should be chosen without regard to political party, church affiliation, or representation of any group or segment of the population.

2. Individuals should be chosen who are willing to give freely of their time, especially as it may be needed outside their own communities.

3. Effective members should be retained on the board for a relatively long term, since the first few years constitute a training period.

4. Board members should represent the will of the people but should also seek to mold public opinion in favor of good schools.

5. There should be no hesitation to choose women as board members.

6. Superintendents should recommend both teaching and non-teaching personnel. School boards should approve or reject those recommendations.

7. Superintendents should direct the activities of all school employees. Boards should speak through their executive officer.

8. Unprogressive local leadership should be charged with the blame for any failure of the schools to met the needs of youth.

9. Kindergarten should be financed jointly by the community and the state, as are grades 1-12 at present.

10. Standing committees of school board members should be considered undesirable.

11. The primary aim of the public schools should be to develop good citizens. (pp. 14-15).

Tuttle (1963) noted school board members are called upon to exercise qualities of leadership. He listed seven of those qualities:

1. Integrity--that quality which attracts the confidence of others: dependability; uprightness; honesty; loyalty. To have integrity is to be incorruptible, sound, unwavering in principle. "You always know where he stands."

2. Perseverance--that quality which persists in the face of difficulties, which never acknowledges defeat, which keeps an eye on the goal and tries again and yet again to attain it. "The harder you're thrown, why the higher you bounce."

3. Faith--an unfaltering belief that something better lies ahead; confidence in the ultimate triumph of right; an inner sense that problems arise to test us, not to thwart us; and "assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen."

4. Ability to Plan--that quality without which good will and good intentions go for naught; knowledge of the facts; judgment as to relative importance; mastery of the job; skill in organizing to accomplish a purpose; efficiency in coordinating the work of others "without showing off or showing them up."

5. Vision--that quality for lack of which "the people perish"; breadth of view; ability to see ahead and to plan not just for today, but for tomorrow and for another generation.

6. Initiative--ability to move ahead without waiting to be
shoved; get-up-and-go; a self-starting force which wastes
no time in setting about whatever needs to be done;
willingness to "go where there is no path" and to "leave a
trail" which will be a guide to the feet of those who follow.

7. Courage--inner strength to face whatever lies ahead, to
march "breast forward," never turning back or whimpering
at defeat; a resoluteness of spirit that is unconquerable; self-
discipline of the highest order; pluck. "I knew thee strong
and quiet like the hills." (p. 28)

Tuttle (1963) suggested a catalog of leadership responsibilities for

board members. He contended this was not a complete listing but covered

some of the most important areas:

1. Work for harmony and a "team spirit" within the board
itself.

2. Make certain that board policies are established in cooperation
with all concerned, are clearly and simply written, are made
available to the school staff and the community at large, and are
kept currently up to date.

3. Maintain the strongest possible administrative and teaching
staff at all costs.

4. Work for a curriculum (what the schools teach) which
adequately meets the needs of the children, youth, and adults
of your community in this present day.

5. Move steadily toward adequate housing and facilities for
the school populations, present and future.

6. Stand for generous financial support of public education,
based on an equitable distribution of the tax burden, and
efficient use of the tax dollar.

7. Encourage cooperative relationships between the school system and the community to the end that all the people may have all the facts all the time about their schools.

8. Take an interest in the advancement of public education on all levels of policy making--local, state, and national.

9. Support the development of a strong, active school board association in each state and its affiliation with the National School Boards Association.

10. Be alert to conditions and influences in the school district which have in them "seeds of controversy," and take steps to resolve them before they precipitate a crisis.

11. Work unceasingly to advance the quality and effectiveness of the local educational program as the soundest answer to those who advocate national control of public education. (p. 29)

Tuttle (1963) had the basic belief that a school system did not stay at the same level; the system either got better or poorer. His charge was that every school board of a local district was responsible to be the headquarters for directing the campaign for better schools, and each board member was to assure a role that would see to the school's success.

Ashby (1968) noted that qualities which make for a good school board member are similar to those which make for success in any major enterprise. Qualities he included as important were intelligence, social conscience, organizational ability, and an understanding of how boards can function most effectively. Ashby felt board members should be able to see the big picture in the meaning of education. Thus, their decisions would be based on the good of the whole and not on special interest groups or individual

concerns. The decisions should be for the good of the children of the school.

Ashby, 1968) listed the following functions of a good school board member:

1. Recognize the responsibility is not to run the schools, but to see that they are well run.

2. Work through the properly appointed administrative officers according to the organization as planned.

3. Function as a part of a policy-forming and control board rather than as part of an administrative board.

4. Familiarize themselves in a broad and non-technical manner with the problems of the school system.

5. Refer, as far as possible, all complaints and requests to the appropriate administrative officer.

6. Try to interpret to the school staff the attitudes, wishes, and needs of the people of the district, and try to interpret to the people the needs, problems, and progress of the schools.

7. Voice opinions frankly in board meetings and vote for what seems best for the children of the district.

8. Recognize fully that the appropriate administrative officer is entirely responsible for carrying out a particular policy in accordance with state law and local regulations.

9. Help to frame policies and plans only after considering the recommendations of the appropriate administrative officer, together with his reasons for making such recommendations.

10. Require oral and written reports for the purpose of keeping the board properly informed on school matters.

11. Give all school officials authority in keeping with their responsibilities.

12. Vote only for the best-trained technical and professional employees who have been properly recommended by the appropriate administrative officer.

13. Maintain harmonious relations with other board members when harmonious relations are consistent with their obligations to the schools.

14. Visit the schools to gain clearer understanding of school problems, but not to interfere in the day-by-day administration of the schools.

15. Establish criteria for evaluation of the efficiency of the administrative officers.

16. Present personal criticisms of school employees only to appropriate administrative officer.

17. Support and protect school officials in the performance of their duties.

18. Give friendly counsel and advice to the administrative officers.

Good board members lose effectiveness to the degree that they:

1. Interfere with the day-by-day routine details of school administration and supervision.

2. Refuse to support worthwhile school programs because of personal reasons.

3. Show favoritism to relatives and friends.

4. Make promises and commitments before the questions are fully discussed in the board meetings.

5. Join a clique to control board action.

6. Use board membership for political or business advancement for themselves, their families, their relatives, or other friends.

7. Indulge in petty criticism of the administration of their schools.

8. Divulge confidential information.

9. Assume authority in school matters when the board is not in session.

10. Accept gifts from school suppliers or contractors, or make personal purchases through the schools to gain advantage of the school district. (Ashby, 1968, pp. 44-45)

Davidson (1970) suggested an appropriate posture to be taken by a board member is to recognize the team approach to board meetings. He proposed the superintendent be likened to a team captain that coordinates the planning of the team. The importance of planning and coordinating is paramount to the ultimate success of the group. Davidson further implied that board members must know their personal responsibilities and follow established procedures on the team. Thus, the team can proceed with its functions of providing policy and rules and regulations regarding: employment of the superintendent, employee personnel functions, instructional programs, pupil personnel functions, school plant functions, and public relations functions.

Bippus (1985) addressed the issue of board and board members' self-evaluation. His contention was that self-evaluation was the most productive way to determine how the individual or the board was doing. Bippus listed the traits of effective school board members:

1. Prepares adequately for school board meetings.
2. Participates in board meetings.
3. Works within the board role as policy maker..

4. Communicates openly by asking appropriate questions and expressing personal opinions to: other board members, administrators, the public, staff members.

5. Expresses willingness to make unpopular decisions.

6. Supports majority decisions.

7. Expresses willingness to make changes in the system.

8. Attends board meetings regularly.

9. Attends work sessions, hearings, in-service sessions, and so on.

10. Puts sufficient effort into making sound decisions.

11. Listens to all sides before making a decision.

12. Respects those who differ in opinion and belief.

13. Accepts constructive criticism.

14. Remains calm and thinks clearly under pressure.

(p. 46)

The National School Boards Association (1987) published the book, Becoming a Better Board Member, which was intended to help board members be effective. The editors called upon hundreds of experts, including school board members, school administrators, and other educational leaders in the development of the book. The Carnegie Corporation of New York provided funding for the project.

Elements of becoming an effective board member included the work ethic for effective board members. For a school board member to say he or she was committed was not enough; the member must work for what he or she believed. The National School Boards Association (1987) list included:

1. Doing your homework before board meetings.

2. Keeping abreast of current educational issues within your own school system, throughout the state, and across the nation.

3. Making every attempt to attend all board meetings.

4. Becoming well-versed in parliamentary procedure.

5. Learning how to get and present facts, not merely interpretations of them.

6. Devoting sufficient time, thought, and study to proposed actions.

7. Considering alternative solutions to problems.

8. Encouraging ideas and opinions from students, staff, and citizens of the district, and endeavoring to incorporate their views in your deliberations and decisions.

9. Working with the rest of your board to establish effective board policies by which the superintendent can administer the schools.

10. Establishing fair and equitable terms and conditions of employment and evaluation for all school employees.

11. Selecting sound instructional strategies and materials, and submitting them to regular and impartial evaluations. (pp. 8-9)

The consideration that no code of ethics was complete without orthodox ethics, such as honesty, trust, fairness, and integrity, was also recognized. Not using an office for personal partisan gain or benefit for the family, church, or special interest groups was another standard cited as an integral part of the code (National School Boards Association, 1987).

Special recognition was given to the limits of authority an individual has as a board member. At no time does an individual board member have authority apart from the official actions of the board, and each board member should conduct his or her relationships with the school staff, the local citizenry, and all media on this basis. Experienced board members agreed upon the following standards as key elements of effective board service (National School Boards Association, 1987):

1. Base your decisions on the available facts and your independent judgment, and refuse to surrender that judgment to individuals or special interest groups.

2. Take no private action that will compromise the school system, the board, or the administration, and avoid being placed in a position of conflict of interest.

3. Support and protect the civil and human rights of all members of the school community.

4. Respect the confidentiality of information that is privileged.

5. Keep an open mind so that you can accept and evaluate new concepts.

6. Listen objectively to constructive criticism.

7. Know the difference between personal influence and factual persuasion.

8. Maintain a sense of humor.

9. Learn and practice the art of compromise.

10. Don't avoid confrontation merely to improve you chances for reelection.

11. Share the responsibility for all board decisions regardless of how you voted.

12. Strive for teamwork.

13. Do not undermine the authority of the superintendent or intrude into the spheres of responsibility that properly belong to the school administration.

With regard to communication, the National School Boards

Association (1987) presented the following "don'ts." Don't:

- be belligerent.

- talk too much or too loud.

- have all the solutions for all the problems of the district.

- fail to be a good listener.

- neglect to read your board policy manual.

- demonstrate apathy.

- discuss with press and constituents board matters discussed in executive session.

- back-stab another board colleague.

- monopolize the media and public spotlight.

- indicate you will support an issue in one way, then vote differently without giving any advance notice.

- be indifferent to the experience of your colleagues and ignore their advice.

- be inflexible, never explain alternative decisions or change your mind on issues.

- publicly criticize a board decision when your vote was in the minority. (p. 34)

The National School Boards Association (1987) publication covered board member responsibilities from becoming a board member to the personal life of a board member. This source dealt with many facets of board membership. For the purpose of this study, characteristics of effectiveness were selected from this publication.

Similarly, the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) (1988) conducted a study of school board effectiveness. A school board effectiveness program was developed from this study. The indicators of

school board effectiveness were categorized into fifteen areas. The fifteen areas pointed to the contributions necessary from each board member as an individual to actions of the board as a whole to be effective. The Institute for Educational Leadership (1988) indicated an effective board:

1. provides leadership for public education and is an advocate for the educational needs and interests of children and youth.

2. has a comprehensive program for communications with its various constituencies, including policies and procedures for working with the media.

3. seeks and responds to many forms of parent and community participation in the school district.

4. works to influence policies of state and local governmental bodies and other organizations whose decisions affect children and youth.

5. encourages and respects diversity, deals openly and straight-forwardly with controversy within the board and the community and follows democratic decision making processes.

6. uses strategic planning to set educational goals and determines the means of accomplishing them.

7. works to ensure an adequate flow of resources and achieves equity in their distribution.

8. establishes and follows policy to govern its own policy-making responsibilities.

9. exercises continuing policy oversight of education programs and their management, drawing information for this purpose from many sources and knowing enough to ask the right questions.

10. establishes and implements procedures for selecting and evaluating the superintendent.

11. recognizes the dilemma of distinguishing policy from administration and periodically clarifies these separate areas of responsibility in consultation with the superintendent.

12. promotes constructive relations with its employees and works to create conditions that enhance productivity.

13. establishes clear expectations for the conduct its members.

14. establishes and follows policies and procedures to manage its own operations.

15. has procedures for self-assessment and invests in its own development, using diverse approaches that address the needs of the board as a whole, as well as those individual board members. (pp. 3-15)

The section on effectiveness has provided information in support of

the characteristics or traits that lead to the effectiveness of a board member.

In 1963, Troester developed a ranking system of board members, based on a

review of the literature about board member effectiveness. The instrument

was reviewed by a panel of experts and served as the rating scale in his

dissertation. Troester's (1963) characteristics follow:

1. Shows a marked degree of willingness to consider all sides to all issues through careful questioning, outside study, and independent research.

2. Tends to consider the superintendent as a professional educator by asking appropriate questions of him and deferring to professional opinions voiced by the superintendent.

3. Looks first at needs of school and community, rather than at financial resources and limitations of the district.

4. Is principally concerned with board objectives of education, preferring to discuss and debate these rather than deal with details of administrative procedure in board meetings.

5. Recognizes that the board of education has authority only when acting as a group--refuses to speak or act on matters which properly belong to the board as a whole.

6. Demonstrates a ready concern for the welfare of the school faculty through thoughtful consideration of the effects of policies on teacher retention, morale, and effectiveness.

7. Strives to consider the effects of board action on the total program--remains free from the dominance of any part or faction in the school district.

8. Is anxious for the school system to be improve--and encourages surveys by the faculty, colleges, and citizen groups in evaluating the school program.

9. Realizes the importance of a close relationship between the board and the superintendent--appropriately supports the superintendent in his authorized functions.

10. Recognizes the need for sound written board policies-- insists that board action be consistent and in accordance with the adopted policies. (pp. 35-36)

Social Composition of Boards of Education

The first intensive study of the social composition of school boards was made by Counts (1927). Counts cited three previous studies, in which the findings were approximately the same. One study was by Nearing (1917), who found there was a concentration of school board members in a relatively small number of categories. Sixty-one percent of the school board members in Nearing's study came from the occupational classifications of merchants, manufacturers, bankers, brokers, and real estate men. In 1919, the teachers' union of New York City also conducted a study, which covered

67 cities with populations of more than 40,000. Representatives of labor were included on the board in only 17 of these cities (Counts, 1927). Struble conducted a study of 169 cities with populations of more than 2,500 and less than 250,000. Of the 761 men on boards of education, only 54 were classified as manual laborers (Counts, 1927).

The school boards in Eugene, Oregon were studied during the period of 1891 to 1944 (Hines, 1951). Hines concluded that the business and professional communities were represented at all times on the school boards. During the 53-year period, of the 60 men and women who served on the school board, 33 were in business, 19 were in professions, and eight were housewives.

Goldhammer (1964) reached the same conclusion in his study. Board members were men of economic substance in the community. They were representative of the proprietary group of the community.

Clearly, early research bears evidence that school boards were dominated by men. Further, those men tended to represent occupational and business facets of the community.

In the decade of the 1980s, some change from the earlier boards of education was shown. A summary of the Gallup Poll surveys published in the American School Board Journal is shown in Appendix A. The data shown in Appendix A has been gathered annually since 1980. A reflection of the national statistics gathered on sex, ethnic background, age, and family income is shown in the table. According to the statistics, the average school board member was male, age 41-50, white, and had a family income of $40,000 to $59,000. According to further statistics gathered for the survey,

the individual was married, had one or more children in school, had a graduate degree, was a homeowner, had a professional occupation, and had board experience ranging from one to three years (Freeman, Underwood, & Fortune, 1991).

An examination of the table in Appendix A shows a marked degree of gain in female board members; minorities in various ethnic areas did not show a gain. The increased number of female board members has led to a body of literature and research concerning the female board member, particularly in the role of superintendent-board member relationships.

The increase in female board members has raised questions concerning possible conflict between the male-dominated superintendency and female board members. In a survey of 500 superintendents, Mullins (1959) sought to identify the ideal school board member. When analyzing returned questionnaires, Mullins found superintendents desired professional white collar men as board members. Superintendents wanted the school board to consist of representative members of the community, with the exception of gender.

Saiter (1978) conducted a survey of 536 female board members. According to the female board members, sex discrimination was high. Thirty-five percent of the women respondents felt male board members thought less of their abilities simply because they were female.

A survey of 45 school districts in Illinois by Marshall and Heller (1983) implied several differences in male-female board service. The differences were revealed when analyzing the questionnaires received from 210 respondents. Of the 210 participants, 57 percent were male and 43

percent were female. The differences found by Marshall and Heller (1983) included:

1. Women go onto boards in a direct succession to other involvement with the school system.

2. Women become more personally involved, reflecting comparatively more experience than men in volunteer, non-profit organizations.

3. Women hold an expectation of effective and efficient leadership from the superintendent.

4. Women come from the PTA, the AAUW, the League of Women Voters, and so on, with behavioral norms sanctioned by such organizations.

5. Women tend to give priority to curriculum and program quality, and to public relations programs.

6. Women are comparatively more sensitive to a constituency, partly because of informal networks in their organization of origin (#4 above), and by the creation of policies through open debate, rather than as a corporation board of trustees. (pp. 31-32)

Researchers have suggested the decision making process is changing because the number of females on school boards is increasing. Marshall and Heller (1983) implied there was a power shift as a result of the influence of women board members; they suggested superintendents support that power shift through board member orientation and training.

The underrepresentation of women was recognized in the National School Boards Association (NSBA) convention report (1974). A Commission of the NSBA on the Role of Women in Educational Governance found the relatively few women who served on school boards

were as well or better educated than their male counterparts. More women (84.7%) than men (69.7%) had served on boards of other organizations; however, more men than women had professional or business board experience. At the 1974 NSBA convention, the delegate assembly passed a resolution calling for female representation on school boards. Examination of the statistical table in Appendix A supports the above findings.

O'Reilly (1985), in a paper presented to the Nebraska Council of School Administrators, summarized his research on the communication and performance of female board members and male superintendents:

> There is no doubt that characteristics on boards of education are changing demographically. More than socioeconomic status, age or race, the most current noteworthy change is in the sex identification of members. Not yet predominant in membership, women are in sharp ascendancy in numbers. It is both as a transitional and fluid situation in which contemporary women are finding a place on public school boards. They perform differently as members on boards, and relationship-performance patterns that may have been acceptable between male superintendents and male board members will falter and may fail in a female-male work relationship. The availability of time and sex-differentiated cultural differences influence this different performance.

In this section, the researcher intended to bring into focus the demographic information which existed regarding school boards. Related studies and the Myers-Briggs Inventory are focused upon in the next section. There were few studies found, other than survey research concerning demographic information, related to school board members. The fact that all studies evolved around group membership and did not examine individuals, except as a part of the whole board, was noteworthy.

School Board Studies

The foundation for the study of school boards can be traced back to research by political scientists on small groups. Examples of those studies would include: Fenno's (1962) study of congressional committees; Barber's (1966) study of local boards of finance; Eulau's (1969) study of city councils; and Cannon and Jaros' (1970) study of state supreme courts.

McCarty and Ramsey (1971) were among the first researchers to study school boards. In a comprehensive study examining the operation of social power in school systems, McCarty and Ramsey identified four community types, how each community type was reflected in the school board, and the subsequent role of the superintendent of schools. The four community types studied were: dominated, factional, pluralistic, and inert.

The dominated community was characterized by a power elite, with a few people or one person at the top. The school board, like the community, was dominated. Members of the school board were chosen on the basis that they would take the advice of the power elite. The acceptable superintendents tended to be the types who carried out policy rather than develop policy and were responsive to the dominant ideology of the power elite.

The factional community was characterized by at least two factions competing for control; power shifts from one group to another were experienced, dependent upon which group was most popular with the constituency. The school board was composed of members from the competing factions and represented those factions in the votes cast at board

meetings. The superintendent had to work closely with the majority factions, while at the same time avoiding alignment with any one faction. The effective superintendent tended to be a political strategist working in such a way as to balance power shifts and not alienate any of the factions.

The pluralistic community was characterized as having a variety of centers of influence, with no one group able to maintain power at all times. In a pluralistic community, education was important to all of the community interests, and the board of education tended to be composed of people who represented a wide variety of positions. The board was referred to as a status-congruent school board, whose members were collegial and treated each other as peers. Discussion dominated the meetings since consensus was the goal in the decision-making process. The superintendent served as a professional adviser to the status-congruent board and assumed a more statesmanlike role. The superintendent could present the board with alternatives and be objective in the assessment of the actions the board might take when policies were adopted or other decisions reached.

The inert community was characterized by the status quo. The school board in an inert community tended to be a sanctioning board, one that took little action without the direction of professional staff. The superintendent had to be the driving force for the educational program to be effective.

The four findings of the McCarty and Ramsey (1971) study were: (1) power varies from community to community; (2) power is held over community type boards and the professionals employed by the board; (3) the power structure of a community is based on the relationship between and

among community power figures, community boards, and professionals; and (4) those interrelationships vary in the various types of communities.

Blanchard (1975) noted that relatively little attention had been paid to school boards as an active decision-making group. Using school boards in Kentucky, Blanchard's study centered on conflict among school board members. Boards were classified as bipolar, unipolar, or nonpolar, based on responses to keyed questions in a questionnaire. The significance of the study was the demonstrated ability of applying a few small-group methods to a political study of local school boards.

Stelzer (1972) conducted a study on school board member receptivity. He defined school board member receptivity as an attitude set that favors greater communication and participation by a series of directed and non-directed questions, in which information about attitudes toward popular participation and communication was elicited. The questions grew out of raised attention toward representational adequacy of American institutions. The 1960s were found to be a decade of demand for increased participatory opportunities. The means by which school board members dealt with demands was through greater communication and participation by citizens. The finding that board members who were elected were more receptive than board members who were appointed was also noted. In addition, under conditions of community arousal, receptive board members interposed themselves in policy formulation through opposition to the superintendent.

Several propositions were set forth by Lutz (1980) in his political-anthropological analysis of local school board decision making. Lutz noted most board members came to their positions with little experience to guide

them in their political roles. They were seldom educational professionals and knew little about school law, teaching-learning processes, school organizations, school finance, or traditions of school boards. They sought office for a wide variety of reasons. Amazingly, the vast majority of those persons ended up behaving as board members in very similar ways. Lutz (1980) noted the following observations about the school board as a whole:

1. School boards are a fundamental grass-roots unit of American democracy governed by the principles of the dissatisfaction theory.

2. The vast majority of policy decisions in public education are made, with considerable latitudes by local school boards, in spite of or in conjunction with federal and state regulations and mandates.

3. School board behavior is shaped by a set of "significant symbols" called a culture of school boards that includes norms and values shared by the majority of the 15,000 local school boards.

4. The majority of school board policy decisions are made in elite fashion by school boards that can best be termed elite councils.

4a. When school board members are forced into arena behavior, they become dissatisfied with their own behavior and tend to resign or fail to run for re-election.

5. Education in our pluralistic culture requires culturally pluralistic values, and these are best served by arena council behavior. (pp. 452-465)

Robinson and Stacey (1984) researched school board membership from the position of a stepping stone for a political career. Ten former school board members who served or were serving in the House of

Commons Legislative Assembly of British Colombia were examined. Of the ten, only one deliberately set out to build a political career using the school board as a stepping stone. During the course of their tenure, however, the former board members had experiences which changed their political careers from office-bound to upward-bound ambitions. The experience on the school board was cited as a useful and productive political experience.

Pflum and Brown (1984) used graduate students to simulate school board members making decisions about educational programs. The research questions developed for the study were:

1. Does amount of time to make a decision, the quality of decision, and the conflict present individually affect or interact to affect group information use in decision making?

2. Does amount of time to make a decision, the quality of decision, and the conflict present individually affect or interact to affect group process or behavior in decision making? (p. 35)

Simulation activities revealed that the quality of decision, defined as reversibility or degree of commitment to a decision, affected support for program continuation; interactions of conflict and quality affected a need for more information and more time in decision making; a conflict and time interaction affected a preference to talk to other board members; and changes in situational context affected information need and use in decision-making groups (Pflum & Brown, 1984).

Brown, Herman, and Rivers (1985) examined the effect contextual variables had on school board members' information needs for decision making. The contextual variables included (1) the importance of the decision, (2) the amount of conflict involved, and (3) the content of the

evaluated program. A national sample of 237 school board members read simulated evaluation forms and indicated their information needs and sources. In this study, importance, conflict, and content were found to be associated with board members' needs for time, information, and consultation, as well as whom they wanted to consult with and what kind of information they needed. The opinions of others, particularly the viewpoints of the superintendents, appeared to be a very important source of information for board members.

In 1986, Newman, Bull, Brown, and Rivers conducted a comprehensive examination of the decision-making process, including the characteristics and styles of decision makers. The researchers suggested that personal characteristics of decision makers influenced how information was used. One of the characteristics that was found to influence decision making was a sense of control. Locus of control was posited as a useful construct for understanding the behavior of decision makers. An important factor affecting decision makers' behaviors was whether the control was internal locus of control, themselves in control, or external locus of control, at the fate of others. Overall, when external locus of control came into play, individuals wanted more information and more informal contacts, and were less supportive of new programs than in decisions where internal locus of control was applied.

The consistency of the above findings with previous research indicated that evaluation is affected by a number of reactions and opinions concerning its use; that decision making in an evaluation context is complex; that personal characteristics, role perceptions, and the evaluation context all

influence the process and perhaps the outcomes. This study provided some theoretical background for the investigation of personality types of board members.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Briggs & Myers, 1976) is probably the most widely used instrument for non-psychiatric populations in clinical, counseling, and personality testing. The MBTI grew out of Jung's type theory as interpreted by Isabel Briggs Myers. The MBTI was designed to sort people into groups. The instrument consists of four separate dichotomies or indices: Extroversion-Introversion (EI), Sensing-Intuition (SN), Thinking-Feeling (TF), and Judgment-Perception (JP). According to MBTI type theory, an individual's four dichotomies interact. Given the four dichotomies, sixteen different four-letter types are possible.

The Myers-Briggs Type Inventory was intended for normal populations. The MBTI measures personality dimensions, both polarities of which may be viewed as strengths. The non-judgmental quality, which extends to the description of four letter types, is unusual in personality instruments. This characteristic of the instrument facilitates the sharing of results with the client. In fact, the instrument is intended more for the respondent than for the professional.

While the items were written within a forced-choice format, the MBTI is not particularly aversive. Any single question deals with only one polarity so that the responses within an item generally reflect two opposing, rather

than competing, choices. This feature also permits normative rather than ipsative scoring.

Data have been presented to show test validity as related to such variables as personality measures, SAT performance, selected Strong Vocational Interest Bank scales, and the Edward's Personal Preference Schedule. Also, there have been correlations of the instrument with faculty ratings on a number of personality dimensions. Test-retest reliability studies have been published by Carskadon (1977), Carlyn (11977), Levy, Murphy, and Carlson (1972), and Stricker and Ross (1964). Test-retest reliability coefficients from these studies have been good, ranging from .48 (14 months) to .87 (seven weeks). The test-retest reliability of males on Thinking-Feeling was the least stable.

Rather than measure continuous variables, as with other instruments, the theory underlying the MBTI posits that preference represents a fundamental or qualitative difference. Essentially, the MBTI favors a dichotomous view with the four types: Extroversion-Introversion, Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling, and Judgment-Perception; however, the MBTI does give some concession to continuous scores. In the view of type theorists, this reluctance for continuous scores points to inconsistency. When average continuous scores are converted into type, a "proto-typical type" may emerge which is not representative of the group. The issue regarding type versus continuous scores will possibly remain unsettled for those espousing traditional test construction standards and procedures(Carskadon, 1977).

Devito (1985) felt that the MBTI merits more serious consideration by psychologists. The use of the MBTI in counseling and within organizations should be encouraged.

Further Research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicators

Carlson (1989) wrote a review in support of the MBTI. He undertook his research review from an admitted skeptical point of view but found a relatively favorable pattern of findings with regard to the typological approach found in the MBTI. The research reviewed by Carlson included:

1. Fifty percent of the subjects rated their type descriptions as "very true of me," and a low percentage of subjects rated artificially reversed descriptions as characteristic (Cook, 1982).

2. Significant correlations were found between ratings of spouses and the subjects' MBTI profiles (Cohen, Cohen, & Cross, 1981).

3. The MBTI was useful in promoting the client's self-awareness (Pickney, 1983).

4. The MBTI was useful in furthering the awareness of an individual to the references and actions of someone else, such as one's spouse (Sherman, 1981).

5. Reliability coefficients for the MBTI continuous scores ranged from .78 to .87 across a five-week period, where subjects were given the test during varying induced mood states (Howes & Carskadon, 1979).

6. A five-week test-retest of the reliabilities of continuous scores ranged from .77 to .89, dependent upon the scale (McCarty & Carskadon, 1983).

7. Scores of medical students were compared on the original (166 item) form of the MBTI and an abbreviated (50 item) form across a period of 9 to 12 months. The significant r values were: .41 (TF scale), .63 (SN scale), .64 (EI scale), and .66 (JP scale) (Leiden, Veach, & Herring, 1986).

8. Observed feeling-oriented respondents who experienced "burnout" were more likely to manifest negative reactions to others as contrasted to thinking-oriented subjects who experienced "burnout," who exhibited mixed or more positive reactions. The author argued the results have implication for conceptual treatment of burnout based on the MBTI profile of thinking-feeling (Garden, 1985).

9. Ware, Wilson, and Yokomoto (1986) found that since thinking types prefer "analysis and weighing, and feeling types rely more on "likes and dislikes," more time should be afforded thinking types in situations where the client has to process or interpret information.

Carlson's (1989) review, although largely unsystematic theoretically, was generally positive of the MBTI. He did note more research has focused on the EI scale, and that further research was warranted on the other three scales.

Applications of the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory

Rideout and Richardson (1989) designed a team-building approach utilizing the MBTI and female/male developmental theory. The MBTI was used to help participants in a workshop understand one another better and rather than try to change those differences to preserve and even nurture them. While success was noted, most difficulties were found in dealing with female/male developmental issues. Long years of conditioning and

adherence to the "white male system," which seemed to blur the female-voiced values, were cited as obstacles related to gender differences.

Kardunc (1987) applied psychological dimensions to a person's preference to proceed and judge information with regard to technical training. She revealed sensing types and thinking types, rather than intuitive and feeling types, had stronger interest in technical training content. Sensing types were detail people who relied on concrete facts, as did thinking types who made judgments by reliance upon facts. Extroverts tended to view project dimensions associated with greater task certainty as important. Extroverts also tended to view the organizational characteristics associated with mechanistic organizational structures as important. Extroverts were more interested in managerial or non-training topics, thus suggesting possible recommendations as to the types of people to be hired for specific types of jobs.

Agov (1985) conducted survey research of 5000 people in public administration. Using the intuition scale of the MBTI, respondents were scored on levels of intuition. Analysis of the data revealed the higher the management ladder, the higher the level of intuition. Agov's recommendation was that more emphasis be placed on training individuals to use intuitive thinking skills.

Brightman (1984) studied a sample of 39 assistant principals of a suburban school district. Using Vroom's 1976 model of leadership behavior, administrators were ranked on effectiveness. The administrators were given the MBTI. Brightman found that most administrators tended to be sensing managers. Less than half of the 17 ST (sensing-thinking) principals and

slightly over half of the 13 SF (sensing-feeling) principals were rated as highly effective. Brightman noted that his findings were not to imply ST and SF principals could not be effective, but that they would have to learn what characteristics affected their performance and how they might compensate in a given situation.

The intent of the section of the review of literature was to summarize some of the research which gave reliability and validity to the MBTI. Further, applications of the MBTI and the use of results generated from such application were cited.

Summary

The review of literature established that: (1) throughout the history of boards of education, sufficient research and opinions of experts gave support to a ranking system of individual board members on an effectiveness instrument; (2) demographic data about board members have been considered important to researchers; (3) the reliability, validity, and application have shown the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to have merit; and (4) research on individual board members, other than survey research regarding demographic data, was limited.

The study was designed to examine the role of personality theory and board member effectiveness. This area has been given little attention by researchers.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

The research methods and procedures employed to compare personality type to the effectiveness of a board member are presented in this chapter. The specific sections included in this chapter are: Sample, Design, and Instruments.

Sample

The population surveyed for this research study was composed of school board members of Class II and Class III public schools in the State of Nebraska. Superintendents had at least five years of experience in the individual districts. There were 266 Class II and Class III public school districts; each district had a six- to nine-member board of education. Of those school districts, 180 had retained the same superintendent for five or more years; thus, the population for this study was 180 superintendents and 180 school boards.

Design

The design of this study was survey research. The design was selected because descriptive, explanatory, or exploratory data from a large population can be obtained with survey research (Nunnery & Kimbrough, 1971). The

survey population included members of 180 boards of education, in which the same superintendent had been retained for five years. The entire board of education was selected because the district superintendent rated the effectiveness of all board members. According to the superintendent's rating, a board member's effectiveness was determined. The individual board member in each district identified as most effective was asked to complete a two-part questionnaire. In part one, experience data were elicited, and in part two, a personality profile was constructed. The personality profiles were then compared.

Instruments

Two questionnaires were used for this study. A questionnaire to rate the effectiveness of board members was developed and used in a dissertation by Troester (1963). The validity and reliability of the Troester instrument were established in the following manner. An analysis of the literature yielded 20 statements in which the effectiveness of a board member was reflected. A jury of ten experts reviewed the 20 statements and selected ten statements that were felt to best distinguish the effectiveness of school board members. The ten characteristics were then incorporated into a rating scale that was considered valid by the jury of experts (Troester, 1963).

In this study, superintendents used Troester's instrument to rank each board member's effectiveness from highest to lowest on the following characteristics:

1. Shows a marked degree of willingness to consider all sides to all issues through careful questioning, outside study, and independent research.

2. Tends to consider the superintendent as a professional educator through asking appropriate questions of him and deferring to professional opinion voiced by the superintendent.

3. Looks first at needs of school and community rather than at financial resources and limitations of the district.

4. Is principally concerned with broad educational objectives, preferring to discuss and debate these rather than deal with details of administrative procedure in board meetings.

5. Recognizes that the board of education has authority only when acting as a group--refuses to speak or act on matters which properly belong to the board as a whole.

6. Demonstrates a ready concern for the welfare of the school faculty through thoughtful consideration of the effects of policies on teacher retention, morale, and effectiveness.

7. Strives to consider the effects of board action on the total program--remains free from the dominance of any party or faction in the school district.

8. Is anxious for the school system to be improved--encourages surveys by the faculty, colleges, and citizen groups in evaluating the school program.

9. Realizes the importance of a close relationship between the board and the superintendent--appropriately supports the superintendent in his authorized functions.

10. Recognizes the need for sound written board policies--insists that board action be consistent and in accordance with the adopted policies. (Troester, 1963, p. 34)

The superintendents were instructed to assign a code letter to each board member's survey. The code letter was used by the superintendent when ranking the board members. For example, each board member of a six-member board was assigned a code letter A to E. The superintendent then considered each individual characteristic and ranked the six individuals on the characteristic:

	Highest					Lowest
Characteristic	D	C	F	B	E	A

Consistently shows interest in board
activity through intelligent discussion
and the making of worthwhile motions.

The above example indicates that board member D ranked highest on the characteristics and board member A ranked the lowest. Using a six-point ranking scale, board member D was assigned six points, board member C was assigned five points, and so on. The final ranking of effectiveness for each board member was determined by the sum of the points given for the ten questions. The range of scores was from 10 to 60. The superintendent supplied the name of the board member who ranked highest.

The highest-ranked board member in each district was requested to complete a two-part questionnaire. Part one contained demographic information and reflected the control variable experience. The second part was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). This instrument was used to assess the personality profile of each participating board member. "The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is probably the most widely used instrument for non-psychiatric populations in the area of clinical, counseling and personality testing" (Devito, 1985, p. 1029).

The instrument grew out of Jung's type theory as interpreted primarily by Isabel Briggs Myers (Briggs & Myers, 1977). In keeping with Jung's type theory, when using the MBTI an attempt is made to sort people into groups. The MBTI is intended for normal populations. The items are written within a forced-choice format; however, they are not as aversive as those in other forced-choice instruments (Devito, 1985). Data were presented to show that the MBTI is related to variables such as personality measures, SAT, performance, selected Strong Vocational Interest Bank scales, and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Correlations of the instrument with faculty ratings on a number of personality dimensions were also presented. Validity data were presented in the manual, showing that self-ratings of type of the assignments made by the instrument have closer correspondence than would be expected by chance (Devito, 1985). Test-retest reliability studies have been published by Carskadon (1977), Carlyn (1977), Levy, Murphy, and Carlson (1972), and Stricker and Ross (1964). Test-retest reliability coefficients from these studies were good, ranking from .48 (14 months) to .87 (seven weeks).

A packet that included a cover letter, rating form for the superintendent, questionnaires for each board member, and directions for superintendents were sent, along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope (see Appendix B). Each identified effective board member was contacted and requested to participate in the research (see Appendix C). Follow-up attempts were made to the superintendents and individual board members to insure an adequate return (see Appendix D).

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The findings and statistical analysis of the data are presented in this chapter. The response rate, demographic data, and personality profile data are specifically addressed in this chapter.

Response Rate

The population for this study was Class II and III school districts in the State of Nebraska; the superintendents had been associated with the school districts for a minimum of five years. In Nebraska, there were a total of 266 Class II and Class III school districts at the time of the study; of these 266 school districts, the superintendent had been retained in 180 school districts for the past five years. All 180 school districts were included for survey purposes. Of the 180 school districts, 107 superintendents participated in the study, for a 59.5 percent return rate.. They identified their most effective school board member, using Troester's (1963) instrument. The 107 most effective board members were sent the two part survey, consisting of demographic data and a personality profile. Eight-four board members completed the survey for a response rate of 78.6. percent. The overall participation rate of the original 180 districts was 46.7 percent.

Demographic Data

Descriptive information concerning the effective school board members is presented in this section. A visual representation of the demographic data collected is provided in tables.

The effective school board member group consisted of 59 (70.2%) males and 24 (28.6) females (see Table 1). This percentage was similar to the Gallup Poll surveys of the last ten years (see Appendix A).

Table 1

Gender of Effective School Board Members

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	59	70.2
Female	24	28.6
No response	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

A large majority of the effective school board members were married (96.4%). Only one effective school board member was in each of the categories of single, divorced, and widowed (see Table 2).

All effective school board members had a high school diploma. Seventy-one percent of the board members had formal education beyond the

high school diploma; over forty-five percent of the board members had a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or a doctorate (see (Table 3).

Table 2

Marital Status of the Effective School Board Members

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	1	1.2
Married	81	96.4
Divorced	1	1.2
Widowed	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

A total of 86.9 percent of the effective school board member's occupations were in the categories of professional/semi-professional (34.5%), proprietor/manager (14.3%), and farmer (38.1%). Very small percentages of the school board members were in the categories of clerical/sales, housewife, skilled/semi-skilled, or other (see Table 4).

The hours spent each month on school board business are shown in Table 5. The average time spent on school board business by the effective school board members was six to ten hours per month.

Table 3

Formal Education of the Effective School Board Members

Education	Frequenc	Percent
Less than high school diploma	0	0.0
High school diploma	20	23.8
Two or less years of college	14	16.7
More than two years of college	8	9.5
Bachelor's degree	25	29.8
Master's degree	8	9.5
Doctorate	5	6.0
Other	2	2.4
No response	2	2.4
Total	84	100.0

Table 4
Occupation of Effective School Board Members

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Professional/semi-professional	29	34.5
Proprietor/manager	12	14.3
Farmer	32	38.1
Clerical/sales	2	2.4
Housewife	2	2.4
Skilled/semi-skilled	4	4.8
Other	2	2.4
No response	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 5

Hours Spent on Board Business by Effective School Board Members

Hours	Frequency	Percent
1- 5 hours	10	11.9
6-10 hours	37	44.0
11-15 hours	24	28.6
16-20 hours	8	9.5
21 hours or more	1	1.2
No response	4	4.8
Total	84	100.0

The years of experience on a public school board varied from zero to 25 years for the effective school board members. The median and mode of school board experience was seven years (see Table 6).

Table 6

Years of School Board Experience for Effective School Board Members

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent
0	4	4.8
1	3	3.6
2	3	3.6
3	13	15.5
4	5	6.0
5	7	8.3
6	3	3.6
7	16	19.0
8	3	3.6
9	3	3.6
10	4	4.8
11	4	4.8
12	3	3.6
13	3	3.6
14	1	1.2
15	2	2.4
16	1	1.2
17	2	2.4
19	1	1.2
20	1	1.2
21	1	1.2
25	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Personality Profile Data

People are sorted into groups when the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is used. The instrument consists of four separate dichotomies: Extroversion-Introversion (E-I), Sensing-Intuition (S-N), Thinking-Feeling (T-F), and Judgment-Perception (J-P). Using the four dichotomies, people can be sorted into 16 groups. The number of effective school board members in each of the 16 groups is shown in Table 7.

A large number of effective board members (42.9%) were in the ISTJ group (Introvert, Sensing, Thinking, and Judging). Nineteen percent of the effective board members were in the ESTJ group (Extrovert, Sensing, Thinking, and Judging). This accounted for 61.9 percent of the personality profiles of the effective board members. The definitions of the personality profile terms are as follows (Briggs & Myers, 1976):

Introversion (I). Person's preference for the inner world of concepts and ideas.

Extroversion (E). Person's preference for the outer world of people and things.

Sensing (S). The eyes and ears and others senses tell one what is actually there and actually happening. Sensing is especially useful for gathering the facts of the situation.

Intuition (N). Shows meaning and relationships and possibilities that are beyond the reach of the senses. Intuition is especially useful for seeing what might be done about a situation.

Thinking (T). Thinking predicts the logical results of any particular action that may be taken.

Table 7

Personality Profiles of Effective School Board Members

Profile	Frequency	Percent
ESTJ	16	19.0
ESTP	1	1.2
ESFJ	3	3.6
ESFP	0	0.0
ENTJ	4	4.8
ENTP	1	1.2
ENFJ	1	1.2
ENFP	3	3.6
ISTJ	36	42.9
ISTP	5	6.0
ISFJ	5	6.0
ISFP	0	0.0
INTJ	4	4.8
INTP	3	3.6
INFJ	2	2.4
INFP	0	0.0
Total	84	100.0

Feeling (F). Feeling takes into account anything that matters
or is important to the individual or other people and is decided
on the basis of personal values.

Judging (J). Person's preference to live in a planned, decided,
orderly way, wanting to regulate life and control it.

Perceiving (P). Person's preference for dealing with the outer
world by living in a flexible, spontaneous way, wanting to
understand life and adapt to it.

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the four dichotomies which
make up the MBTI personality profile were analyzed. The binomial test was
used to determine the probabilities of the possible outcomes that might be
observed if a binomial population was sampled. If the hypothesis is
$H_O = p = p_0$, the probabilities of various outcomes can be calculated when
one assumes that H_O is true. By this test, the proportion (or frequencies) of
the two categories in a sample reasonably could have been drawn from a
population with hypothesized values of p_0 and $1-p_0$. In brief, the summary
of steps used to determine if the appearance of one of the personality profile
descriptions from each dichotomy is significant is as follows:

1. Assume H_O: $p = 1/2$.

2. Determine N = the total number of cases.

3. Determine the frequencies of the observed occurrences in each of
the two categories.

4. Calculate the z score, where z is approximately normally
distributed with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 to 5.

5. If the probability associated with the observed value is equal to or
less than stated alpha, reject the H_O. Otherwise, the H_O is not rejected (Sigel
& Castellan, 1988).

The binomial test was applied to each of the four dichotomies. The basic assumption for this test was that the probability of selecting either characteristic from the dichotomy was equal, p = 1/2. The level of significance for the rejection of the hypothesis was set at $p \leq .05$. The data obtained regarding the personality profiles of the effective board members are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Binomial Test of the Four Dichotomies for Male and Female Effective School Board Members

Dichotomy	Frequency	Test Probability	Observed Probability	Two-Tailed Probabilty
Extrovert (E)	29			
		.5000	.3452	.0064*
Introvert (I)	55			
Sensing (S)	66			
		.5000	.7857	.0000*
Intuition (N)	18			
Thinking (T)	70			
		.5000	.8333	.0000*
Feeling (F)	14			
Perception (P)	13			
		.5000	.1548	.0000*
Judgment (J)	71			

*$p \leq .05$

Significant statistical differences in each of the dichotomies are shown by the data in Table 8. In terms of a profile, the predominant profile of the group would be as follows: Introvert as opposed to Extrovert (observed probability = .3452, p = .0064); Sensing as opposed to Intuition (observed probability = .7857, p = .0000); Thinking as opposed to Feeling (observed probability = .8333, p = .000); and Judging as opposed to Perceiving (observed probability = .1548, p = .000). These data were supported by the findings shown in Table 7. The personality profile of 42.9 percent of the effective school board members was ISTJ.

Upon further examination of the data, some Extrovert-Introvert differences were found. The differences found in male and female effective school board members are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

The population for the female subgroup was 24, which reduced the statistical reliability of the binomial test (see Table 9). The dichotomy of Thinking-Feeling was significant at the .05 level (observed probability = .7500, p = .0227), and the dichotomy of Judging-Perceiving was also significant (observed probability = .2500, p = .0227). Analysis of the frequencies revealed that one change for any one of the four dichotomies would change the significant difference established by the analysis.

Fifty-nine of the 84 effective school board members were male. Examination of the data reveals Sensing-Intuition (observed probability = .8136, p = .0000), Thinking-Feeling (observed probability = .8644, p = .0000), and Judging-Perceiving (observed probability = .1186, p = .000)

were significant (see Table 10). The Extrovert-Introvert dichotomy was not significant, which was also true of the female subgroup population.

Table 9

Binomial Test of the Four Dichotomies for the Female Effective School Board Members

Dichotomy	Frequency	Test Probability	Observed Probability	Two-Tailed Probability
Extrovert (E)	7			
		.5000	.2917	.0639
Introvert (I)	17			
Sensing (S)	17			
		.5000	.7083	.0639
Intuition (N)	7			
Thinking (T)	18			
		.5000	.7500	.0227*
Feeling (F)	6			
Perception (P)	6			
		.5000	.2500	.0227*
Judgment (J)	18			

*p ≤ .05

Note: There is a discrepancy in numbers because one respondent did not chose to identify gender.

Table 10

Binomial Test of the Four Dichotomies for the Male Effective School Board
Members

Dichotomy	Frequency	Test Probability	Observed Probability	Two-Tailed Probability
Extrovert (E)	22	.5000	.3729	.0684
Introvert (I)	37			
Sensing (S)	48	.5000	.8136	.0000*
Intuition (N)	11			
Thinking (T)	51	.5000	.8644	.0000*
Feeling (F)	8			
Perception (P)	7	.5000	.1186	.0000*
Judgment (J)	52			

$p \leq .05$

Note: There is a discrepancy in numbers because one respondent did not
chose to identify gender.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

As the focus of the American society on public education continues to rise, more and more attention is being devoted to the men and women who serve on boards of education. The influence of these individuals on the direction of public schools today is paramount to the success of the school district.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose for conducting this study was to compare the sixteen personality types generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) of perceived effective school board members in Nebraska Class II and Class III public school districts. Demographic data were collected and used as a control for this study. Little research pertaining to individual board members was revealed in the review of literature. This study adds to the relatively small body of information.

Review of Literature

The review of literature established that school boards and serving as a board member have evolved over the years. Public school districts have been perhaps the most democratically controlled of all agencies in the

American government (Rebore, 1984). The legal authority for school boards is derived from state constitutions and legislative statutes.

The review of literature further established:

1. Throughout the history of boards of education, sufficient research and opinions of experts have given support to a ranking system for individual board members on an effectiveness instrument.

2. Demographic data about board members have been considered important to researchers.

3. The reliability, validity, and application of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator have merit.

4. Research on individual board members, other than survey research regarding demographic data, is limited.

The study was designed to examine the role of personality theory and board effectiveness. Little attention had been given to this area in the review of literature.

Methodology

The study was limited to Class II and Class III school districts in the State of Nebraska. Participating superintendents had been associated with their school district for at least five years. There were 180 school districts that qualified for participation in the study and all were included in the original survey.

The design of the study was a two-step process. First, all superintendents were requested to complete ratings of their board members. The instrument used was one that had been rated by a panel of experts as valid and reliable. From the superintendent's rating, one board member

emerged as the most effective. An assumption was made by the researcher that the individual was an effective board member, and each such person was placed in the population of effective board members. Of the 180 surveys sent to superintendents, 107 were returned with the name and address of the board's most effective member.

A second survey was sent to the 107 identified effective board members. The first part of the survey instrument was designed to gather demographic data, and the second part was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Eighty-four board members completed and returned the survey.

Data Analysis

The group of effective school board members was predominantly male (70.2%). The vast majority of effective school board members were married (96.4%) and had attained a relatively high level of formal education. All board members had completed high school, and 74.4 percent of the board members had training beyond high school. Forty-one percent of the effective board members had a bachelor's degree or higher. The occupations of the majority of the effective board members (86.9%) were professional/semi-professional, proprietor/manager, or farmer. The effective school board members spent an average of six to ten hours per month on board business and had an average of seven years experience on the board.

A review of the personality profiles of effective board members revealed 16 of the 84 participating board members were Extrovert, Sensing, Thinking, and Judging (ESTJ, 19.0%), and 36 of the 84 participating board members were Introvert, Sensing, Thinking, and Judging (ISTJ, 42.9%).

This finding raised some question regarding the Extrovert-Introvert dichotomy.

The binomial test was applied to the personality profiles generated by the MBTI. The binomial test is used when data are dichotomous. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator generates a personal profile from four dichotomies. They are Extrovert-Introvert, Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling, and Perception-Judgment. Statistically analyzing each of the dichotomies at a .05 level of confidence yielded the following results: Extrovert-Introvert (observed probability = .3452, p = .0064), with Introvert as the predominant profile; Sensing-Intuition (observed probability = .7857, p = .0000), with Sensing as the predominant profile; Thinking-Feeling (observed probability = .8323, p = .0000), with Thinking as the predominant profile; and Perception-Judgment (observed probability = .1548, p = .0000), with judgment as the predominant profile.

Grouping the effective board members into male and female sub-groups yielded the following results:

1. For females, the dichotomies of Thinking-Feeling (observed probability = .7500, p = .0227) and Perception-Judgment (observed probability = .2500, p = .0227) were statistically significant at the .05 level. The predominant profiles of more females were Thinking and Judgment.

2. For males, the dichotomies of Sensing-Intuition (observed probability = .8136, p = .0000), Thinking-Feeling (observed probability = .8644, p = .0000), and Perception-Judgment (observed probability = .1186, p = .0000) were statistically significant at the .05 level. The predominant profiles of males were Sensing, Thinking, and Judgment.

3. No significant differences were found in the dichotomy Extrovert-Introvert for males or females; however, a statistical significance was found for the entire group of effective school board members for the dichotomy Extrovert-Introvert.

Conclusions

From the findings of this study the following conclusions can be made:

1. More effective school board members in the State of Nebraska were Introverts than Extroverts and had a preference for the inner world of concepts and ideas.

2. A predominant number of effective school board members had a Sensing personality rather than a Intuitive personality and used their eyes, ears, and other senses to tell them what was actually there and was actually happening.

3. When the dichotomy of Thinking-Feeling was statistically tested, more effective school board members were found to have a Thinking personality profile and predicted the logical results of any particular actions that may have been taken.

4. More effective school board members had a Judgment personality than a Perception personality and preferred to live in a planned, decided, and orderly way, wanting to regulate life and control it.

This study had a small theoretical base on which to draw. The conclusions were arrived at from the data gathered. Generalizations beyond the board members who participated are speculative at best. Yet, the

findings that arose from the data have implications for board members, superintendents, school board associations, and administrators' associations.

Recommendations

If the data are accepted as representative, board members, administrators, and their respective organizations would profit from examining the personality profiles of effective board members. Inservice programs that demonstrate attributes of the personality profiles of effective board members in decision making and participation on a board could be developed. If administrators who work with board members with various types of personalities have a better understanding of these personality profiles, better communication and dealings with all board members will result.

No implications have been made by the authors of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator that certain personalities are better, nor did the researcher imply all board members should be of a certain type of personality. According to the research findings, a variety of personality profiles were associated with the most effective board members. By understanding that certain personality types appear to be effective, methods can be explored to improve all members' effectiveness on a school board. Superintendents should examine ways to work more closely with board members who have different personality profiles.

Recommendations for Further Research

Many questions have been raised in this research which warrant further consideration. These questions include: Could these results be replicated in other school districts in Nebraska or the United States? How does the personality profile of the effective board member compare to the superintendent's personality profile? How does the personality profile of an effective board member compare to an ineffective board member? What are the personality profiles of all board members?

Strategies to deal with participation in a study which could be construed as sensitive in nature could be developed. There was a 46.7 percent participation rate for this study, which was acceptable considering the two-part process involved. Superintendents were the most hesitant and concerned about participation because of the sensitive nature of the project and the role they were assigned. Professional organizations that are trusted by their membership, such as the Nebraska Council of School Administrators, the Nebraska Association of School Boards, and other organizations, could endorse and support research modeled after this study.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Agov, W. H. (1985). Instruction as a brain skill in management. Public Personnel Management Journal, 14(1), 15-24.

Aken, J. (1984). Size up your superintendent's style. American School Board Journal, 171(10), 32-33.

American Association of School Administrators (1949). School boards in action (24th Yearbook). Washington, D. C.: The Association.

Ashby, L. W. (1968). The effective school board member. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

Barber, J. D. (1966). Power in committees. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bippus, S. L. (1985). Leap obstacles to board leadership with this simple evaluation process. American School Board Journal, 172(9), 46-47.

Blanchard, P. D. (1975). Small group analysis and the study of school board conflict. School Group Behavior, 6(2), 229-237.

Briggs, K. C., & Myers, I. B. (1977). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Brightman, H. (1984). Improving principals' performance through training in the decision sciences. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 50-56.

Brown, R. D., Newman, D. L., & Rivers, L. S. (1985). An exploratory study of contextual factors as influences on school board evaluation information needs for decision making. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(1), 35-43.

California School Boards Association (1961). Boardsmanship. Alexandria, Virginia: National School Boards Association.

Cannon, B. C., & Jaros, D. (1970, Winter). External variable, institutional structures, and dissent on state supreme courts. Polity, 3.

Carlson, J. G. (1989). Affirmative: In support of researching the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67(9), 484-486.

Carskadon, R. G. (1977). Test-retest reliabilities of continuous scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Psychological Reports, 41, 1011-1012.

Cartwright, D. (1968). Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Row.

Cole, R. M. (1949). Your school board's job. Illinois Education, 92(4).

Cooke, D. H., & Cope, Q. E. (1938). Rating school board members. Nation's Schools, 21, 34-36.

Counts, G. S. (1927). Social composition of boards of education (Supplementary Educational Monograph #33). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cubberly, E. P. (1934). Public education in the United States. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Danzburger, J. P., Carol, L. L., Cunningham, L. L., Kerst, M. W., McCloud, B. A., & Usdan, M. D. (1987, September). School boards: The forgotten players on the education team. Phi Delta Kappan, 69.

Davidson, J. L. (1970). Effective school board meeting. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.

Devito, A. J. (1985). Review of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook, 2, 1029-1032.

Eulau, H. (1969, August). The informal organization of decision structures in small legislative bodies. Midwest Journal of Political Science Review, 13, 341-366.

Fenno, R. F. (1982, June). The house appropriations committee as a political system: The problem of integration. American Political Science Review, 56, 310-324.

Freeman, J. L., Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. (1991). What boards value. American School Board Journal, 178(1), 32-36.

Goldhammer, K. (1964). The school board. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Hines, C. (1951, April). A study of school board administrative relationships: The development of the Eugene, Oregon superintendency. American School Board Journal.

Institute for Educational Leadership (1988). Research project--board effectiveness. Washington, D. C.: The Institute.

Janis, L., & Mann, L. (1977). Decision making: A psychological analysis of conflict, choice and commitment. New York: Free Press.

Jennings, M. K., & Zeigler, H. (1970). Interest representation in school governance. Paper presented at the 1970 American Political Science Association meeting, Los Angeles, California.

Kardunc, N. J. (1987). Psychological attributes of training professionals and their preferences for project and organizational characteristics. Journal of Studies in Technical Centers, 9(4), 325-337.

Lutz, F. W. (1980). Local school board decision making: A political-anthropological analysis. Education and Urban Society, 12(4), 452-465.

Marshall, S. A., & Heller, M. (1983, August). A female governance. American School Board Journal, 187, 31-32.

McCarty, D. J., & Ramsey, C. E. (1971). The school managers: Power and conflict in American public education. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Corporation.

Mullins, C. (1959). If superintendents could pick their own school board members. American School Board Journal, 161(9), 261-266.

Nearing, S. (1917, January). Who's who on our boards of education? School and Society, 89-90.

National Council of Chief State School Officers (1950). Our system of education. Washington, D. C.: The Council.

National School Boards Association (1987). Becoming a better board member. Alexandria, Virginia: The Association.

Newman, D. L., Brown, R. D., Rivers, L. S., & Glock, R. F. (1983). School boards' and administrators' use of evaluation information. Evaluation Review, 7(1), 110-125.

Newman, D. L., Bull, K. S., Brown, R. D., & Rivers, L. S. (1985). Locus of control as an influence of evaluation needs. Education Review, 10(4), 536-552.

Olsen, H. C. (1988). The works of boards of education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

O'Reilly, R. C. (1985, June). Communication on performance: The female board members and the male superintendent. Paper presented at the Summer Conference of the Nebraska School Administrators.

O'Reilly, R. C., Kasten, K. (1987, August). Gender hiring preferences and hiring patterns in selected Nebraska school districts. Paper presented at the National Conference of Educational Administration.

Pflum, G. D., & Brown, R. D. (1984). The effects of conflict quality and times on small group information use and behavior in evaluative decision making situations. Evaluation and Program Planning, 7, 34-43.

Rebore, R. W., Sr. (1984). A handbook for school board members. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Reeves, C. E. (1954). School boards--their status, functions and activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rideout, C. A., & Richardson, S. A. (1989). A team building model: Appreciating difference using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator with developmental theory. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67(9), 529-533.

Robinson, N., & Stacey, C. (1984). Serving on the school board: A political apprenticeship for higher office. The Algebra Journal of Educational Research, 30(2), 115-125.

Saiter, S. (1978). Women's lib among women school board members. Phi Delta Kappan, 60(3), 251-252.

Salmon, P. (1982). Who runs our schools? A definite answer is impossible. American School Board Journal, 169(11), 29-31.

Shepard, C. R. (1964). Small groups. San Francisco: Chandler.

Sigel, S., & Castellan, J., Jr. (1988). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Smith, R. W. (1986). Don't be snookered into your board's authority to the superintendent. American School Board Journal, 173(9), 23-29.

Stapley, M. E. (1957). School board studies: A report prepared by the cooperative program in educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stelzer, L. (1972). School board receptivity: A representation study. Education and Urban Society, 5(1), 69-90.

Thomas, M. J. (1958). Public education through school board actions. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Troester, G. D. (1963). <u>An analysis of the composition and qualifications of board of education members in class III school districts in Nebraska</u>. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Tuttle, E. M. (1963). <u>School board leadership in America</u>. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. C. (1985). Heads up: Our annual survey of board members. <u>American School Board Journal, 172</u>(1), 25-32.

Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. C. (1988). Board profile: Who you are. <u>American School Board Journal, 175</u>(1), 20-25.

Underwood, K. E., Fortune, J. C., & Boole, N. A.. (1984). Fill yourself in: Sixth annual survey of school board members. <u>American School Board Journal, 171</u>(1), 24-29.

Underwood, K. E., Fortune, J. C., & Dodge, H. W. (1982). Your portrait: School boards have a brand-new look. <u>American School Board Journal, 169</u>(1), 17-20.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1974). Decision making as a social process: Normative and descriptive models of leader behavior. <u>Decision Sciences, 5</u>, 743-769.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1985). <u>The school board primer</u>. Newton, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Yock C., Keough, K. E., Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. C. (1990). School board survey: Happily ever after. <u>American School Board Journal, 177</u>(1), 28-35.

APPENDIX A

Gallup Poll Statistics

Table A-1

Summary of Gallup Poll Surveys Published in the American School
Board Journals

	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %	1984 %	1985 %
Sex						
Male	72.5	67.2	71.7	62.9	61.7	63.9
Female	27.5	32.8	28.3	27.1	38.3	36.1
Ethnic						
Black	4.0	3.7	2.2	2.8	2.4	3.0
White	90.0	91.5	91.2	93.1	90.4	93.5
Hispanic	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.5	1.8	1.2
Am. Indian	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Oriental	*	*	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3
Other	3.0	2.1	3.5	1.7	4.3	1.2
Age						
Under 25	0.0	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.5	0.5
26-35	9.0	10.9	9.2	9.4	8.8	8.1
36-40	19.0	17.1	17.8	17.7	18.7	17.3
41-50	39.0	39.8	37.3	43.3	42.7	42.8
51-60	25.0	22.8	23.0	24.8	20.8	23.8
Over 60	8.0	8.7	10.7	10.7	7.9	7.6
Family Income						
Under 20	13.0	9.6	7.1	8.1	3.6	9.3
20- 29	28.0	23.2	19.5	18.4	13.6	13.2
30- 39	26.0	24.1	24.4	20-.1	21.5	20.0
40- 49	33.0	24.1	19.9	19.6	17.0	18.7
50- 59	*	*	10.7	13.8	12.9	15.4
60- 69	*	*	18.4	5.1	8.6	6.6
70- 79	*	*	*	3.6	5.7	4.7
80- 89	*	*	*	3.2	3.3	4.0
90- 99	*	*	*	1.1	1.5	1.7
100-149	*	*	*	6.8	7.0	6.0
150/over	*	*	*	*	*	*

Table A-1 (continued)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Sex					
Male	63.4	61.0	68.1	66.2	66.3
Female	36.6	39.0	31.9	33.8	33.7
Ethnic					
Black	2.4	3.6	3.4	4.6	2.9
White	95.2	94.4	93.7	93.2	93.5
Hispanic	1.1	1.5	2.3	2.4	1.3
Am. Indian	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.6	0.9
Oriental	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2
Other	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2
Age					
Under 25	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
26-35	7.0	6.9	7.3	5.5	6.1
36-40	17.1	19.4	15.4	15.0	15.9
41-50	42.8	41.8	44.5	44.3	44.7
51-60	21.0	20.9	20.0	21.0	19.9
Over 60	11.2	10.9	12.6	13.6	12.5
Family Income					
Under 20	5.8	5.0	3.4	3.0	1.9
20- 29	13.2	10.3	7.9	8.8	8.6
30- 39	18.7	17.7	15.6	11.9	13.9
40- 49	18.3	18.1	17.5	17.4	15.5
50- 59	14.3	14.3	15.7	16.0	12.2
60- 69	9.8	11.7	11.0	11.7	10.7
70- 79	4.1	6.7	7.6	7.3	8.9
80- 89	3.7	4.3	4.6	5.7	6.5
90- 99	4.1	2.7	3.3	4.2	4.4
100-149	4.8	5.7	6.6	7.6	8.7
150/over	3.2	3.7	3.4	5.5	5.5

*Data not reported

APPENDIX B

Correspondence, Instructions, and Rating Form

Dear Superintendent:

Several studies have been conducted regarding the composition and qualifications of board of education members. This letter is intended to briefly explain this study and to enlist your cooperation for participating in this doctoral dissertation research project.

Acting privately and confidentially, the first step is a request that you rank your board members on the enclosed ten-characteristic inventory. Using the stamped return envelope, please send the name, address and phone number of that top-ranked board member to me. After that, I will contact the board member soliciting his/her cooperation in this research, to take the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Inventory.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter I will send to your highest-ranked board member asking his or her participation. No mention of ranking will be given.

The instruction sheet for ranking board members is also included. I understand how busy you are, but would greatly appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

David L. Jones, Superintendent
Oakland-Craig Public Schools
309 North Davis
Oakland, NE 68045

Instructions for Superintendents

Step One: Alphabetize your board members and assign a letter to each member, A through F or A through I, depending on the size of your board.

Step Two: Complete the rating form by ranking (example--1st rank, board member B; 2nd rank, board member D, etc.) your entire board on each characteristic. Use the same letter assigned to each board member throughout the rating form. Please do not use names. If possible, try to avoid assigning the same ranking to more than one board member on any single characteristic. Now refer to the rating form on the next page and rank your board members according to the instructions provided.

Step Three: Assign the rank points and determine the highest ranked board member.

Step Four: Please give name, address and phone number of the highest ranked board member.

Step Five: Return completed rank form in the envelope enclosed.

Rating Form

Directions: A list of ten characteristics of board members is provided below. Rank your entire board on each characteristic by recording the <u>letter</u> in the appropriate column. Please see the example below. The left-hand column represents the highest ranking; the right-hand column designates the lowest. In this example, board member <u>D</u> received the highest ranking; board member <u>A</u> the lowest. Please note that nine columns are provided since some schools have nine-member boards. <u>All</u> ties should be resolved and only one letter recorded in each column.

	Rankings (A-F or A-I)	
Characteristics	Highest	Lowest

Example: Consistently shows interest in board activity through intelligent discussion and the making of worthwhile motions.

    D   C   F   B   E   A

1. Shows a marked degree of willingness to consider all sides to all issues through careful questioning, outside study, and independent research.

2. Tends to consider the superintendent as a professional educator through asking appropriate questions of him and deferring to professional opinions voiced by the superintendent.

3. Looks first at needs of school and community rather than at financial resources and limitations of the district.

Characteristics	Rankings (A-F or A-I)	
	Highest	Lowest

4. Is principally concerned with broad educational objectives, preferring to discuss and debate these rather than deal with details of administrative procedure in board meetings.

5. Recognizes that the board of education has authority only when acting as a group-- refuses to speak or act on matters which properly belong to the board as a whole.

6. Demonstrates a ready concern for the welfare of the school faculty through thoughtful consideration of the effects of policies on teacher retention, morale, and effectiveness.

7. Strives to consider the effects of board action on the total program-- remains free from the dominance of any party or faction in the school district.

8. Is anxious for the school system to be improved--encourages surveys by the faculty, colleges, and citizen groups in evaluating the school program.

9. Realizes the importance of a close relationship between the board and the superintendent--appropriately supports the superintendent in his authorized functions.

10. Recognizes the need for sound written board policies--insists that board action be consistent and in accordance with the adopted policies.

Please give the name, address and phone number where the highest ranked board member may be reached:

Name   _____

Address _____

        _____

Phone   _____

APPENDIX C

Correspondence and Survey of School Board Members

Dear Board Member,

Several studies have been conducted regarding the composition and qualifications of board of education members. This letter is intended to briefly explain this study and to enlist your cooperation for participating in this doctoral dissertation research project.

The purpose of the study will be to compare measured personality types using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and board members' effectiveness. You should be proud as your superintendent has recommended you as effective and he or she was only allowed to pick one individual. Therefore, it is my hope you will participate.

I understand and appreciate how busy you are and your apprehensiveness regarding participation. Only you, your superintendent and I will know you have participated. Your name will be kept confidential and only statistical data will be reported.

I ask that you fill out the survey of school board members found on the buff colored paper, which is a little history about yourself. Please write your responses on that questionnaire. The questions on the white paper are the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory. Each personality trait is good. I am attempting to see if there are more of one type or another associated with effective board members. Use the bubble sheet included for listing your responses. Please use a number 2 lead pencil for completely filling in the bubbles.

Thank you in advance for your participation. I wish you continued success as an effective board member.

Sincerely,

David L. Jones
Oakland-Craig Public Schools
309 North Davis
Oakland, NE 68045

Survey of School Board Members

Part I. General Information--please provide all information requested in the spaces provided.

1. Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

2. Age: _____

3. What is your marital status? Please check.

_____ Single   _____ Divorced

_____ Married   _____ Widowed

4. How much formal education did you complete? Please check.

_____ Less than 8th grade   _____ More than two years, no degree
_____ Eight grade graduate   _____ Bachelor's degree
_____ High school, unfinished   _____ Master's or first professional
_____ High school graduate   degree
_____ Two years of college   _____ Doctor's degree
      or less   _____ Other--specify_____

5. What is your major occupation? Check the one which you think best describes your work.

_____ Professional or semi-   _____ Housewife
      professional
_____ Proprietor, manager or   _____ Skilled or semi-skilled
      official (except farm)
_____ Farmer or farm manager   _____ Unskilled
_____ Clerical or sales   _____ Other--specify_____

6. How many children do have that are of the following ages:

_____ Preschool age
_____ Elementary school age
_____ Junior high school age
_____ High school age
_____ Beyond high school age

7. What type of school did your elementary and high school age children attend? Check all that apply.

Elementary	High School
_____ Public	_____ Public
_____ Parochial	_____ Parochial
_____ Private (non-church affiliated)	_____ Private (non-church affiliated)

8. How many hours per month do you spend on school board business in an official capacity as a board member?

_____ 1 - 5 hours   _____ 16-20 hours
_____ 6 -10 hours   _____ 21 hours or more
_____11 -15 hours

9. What is the total number of years that you have been a member of this board of education?

_____ years

10. Place an X before or write in the names of the educational organizations to which you belong.

_____ Local school board association
_____ Nebraska School Board Association
_____ National School Board Association
_____ None
_____ Others--specify _____

11. Please write in the spaces below the names of the organizations, business or professional, to which you belong (examples--Chamber of Commerce, labor union, medical society).

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

12. Please write in the spaces below the office and/or committee memberships which you currently hold on the board of education.

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

APPENDIX D

Follow-up Letters

Dear Superintendent,

Adequate returns for the study on personality profiles and effective school board members have not been received as of this time. Although I realize that this is a busy time of year, it would certanly be helpful to me if you would return the board member rating form in order that I might contact your effective board member.

Sincerely,

David L. Jones
Oakland-Craig Public Schools
309 North David
Oakland, NE 68045

Dear Board Member,

I have not received your response to the history profile and Myers-Briggs Type Inventory. Your participation is extremely vital to the success of the project. I realize you are very busy, but it would certainly be helpful to me if you would complete the survey and profile instrument.

Sincerely,

David L. Jones
Oakland-Craig Public Schools
309 North Davis
Oakland, NE 68045