2020

PREPAREDNESS FOR THE KEY WORK OF SCHOOL BOARD GOVERNANCE BY VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE, OCCUPATION, AND GENDER

Kathryn Behr
Saint John's University, Jamaica New York

PREPAREDNESS FOR THE KEY WORK OF SCHOOL BOARD GOVERNANCE BY VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE, OCCUPATION, AND GENDER

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

to the faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

of

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

at

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

New York

by

Kathryn Behr

Submitted Date_____ Approved Date_____

Kathryn Behr

Dr. Rosalba Corrado Del Vecchio

ABSTRACT

PREPAREDNESS FOR THE KEY WORK OF SCHOOL BOARD GOVERNANCE BY VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE, OCCUPATION, AND GENDER

Kathryn Behr

The purpose of this cross-sectional nonexperimental correlational study was to investigate whether gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences can predict the preparedness of elected New York State school board members in the *Key Work* of school board governance. In this study, I investigated to what extent, if any, differences emerged in the school, community, and occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members, based on gender. Data accruing on a 33-question multiple choice, short answer, and Likert-type scale electronic survey were analyzed through regression models, independent samples *t*-tests, and chi-square tests. Gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences were statistically significant predictors of preparedness of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, and board/superintendent relationships in this sample. Women reported more types and numbers of school volunteer experiences, including positions of leadership, than their male counterparts. No significant differences emerged in community volunteer and occupational experiences based on gender, though patterns arose in the data confirming and contrasting the perpetuation of stereotypical gender roles. Understanding and acknowledging differences among board members will help

researchers study the predictors of school board governance, promote best practices, and improve effectiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Purpose of the Study

Researchers in the field of education work to improve student learning and close the achievement gap (McFarland et al., 2019). The body of literature includes best practices for teaching and learning, selecting materials and curricular programs, and developing strategies for instructional leadership aimed at continuous improvement. Researchers reported strategies to overcome challenges associated with a diverse population of learners in and out of the classroom (Bullock et al., 2014; Salinas & Garr, 2009). Though prior research was integral to the advancement of the educational system, the role of the school board has been largely overlooked. School boards design the overarching structure serving as a basis for the implementation of policy at the building level.

One challenge facing researchers has been isolating the variables that differentiate the effectiveness of these governing bodies. The purpose of this cross-sectional nonexperimental correlational study was to investigate whether gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences predicted the preparedness of elected school board members in New York State. I used the *Key Work* framework to measure preparedness for the five action areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships (Gemberling et al., 2015).

The National School Boards Association estimated that more than 90,000 boards of education oversee 50 million students and six million faculty in over 14,000 school districts with annual budgets surpassing $739 billion nationwide (Gemberling et al.,

2015; National School Boards Association, 2006). In New York State, local community members are elected or appointed to serve as board of education trustees who govern public schools. School board members represent the beliefs and values of the community, collaborate with district officials, and maintain district policies to remain in compliance with state and federal education laws and mandates.

Boards of education originated in New England to establish and maintain schools among new settlers in 1642 (National School Boards Association, 2006). Local oversight ensured local control over the educational experiences in each community. An increase in the number of schools and the size of the population meant an increase in the number and size of each school board as well.

At the turn of the 20th century, nearby individual schools consolidated under the leadership of one superintendent and school board. Consolidating districts increased the educational offerings for students and the complexity of satisfying the beliefs and values of those in the expanding boundaries (National School Boards Association, 2006). The role of the school system evolved to meet the needs of a diversifying student population, incorporate societal demands to educate the whole child, and remain current on the changing list of state and federal education laws and mandates.

Contemporary board of education representatives are responsible for hiring and evaluating the superintendent, developing and adopting policies, and shaping the vision of the district to guide daily decision-making practices (New York State School Boards Association [NYSSBA], 2019a). This governing body also adopts the annual budget and classroom textbooks, oversees personnel, curricula, and facility maintenance, and engages with the community and political representatives in an official capacity

(NYSSBA, 2015). Monthly school board meeting dates and locations must be posted to encourage transparent governing practices, communicate relevant information with stakeholders, and publicly conduct nonconfidential business.

In New York State, school boards range in size from three to nine members. Trustees gain membership through local elections or mayoral appointment, serving a term length between 3 and 5 years. Hess and Meeks (2010) reported that 94.5% of nationwide school board members were elected, and 5.5% were appointed ($N = 884$). Members may receive salaries, stipends for meetings, reimbursements for associated travel expenses, or serve without compensation in accordance with local district and board policies. In the same study, Hess and Meeks reported that 62.5% of trustees serve without salaries, and 23.5% receive per-meeting stipends ranging from less than $100 to $1,000 per meeting ($N = 882$).

Potential candidates for school board election must be 18 years of age, registered voters in the district, able to read and write, and reside in the district for 1 year continuously before the election (NYSSBA, 2019a). Also, candidates may not be employed by the board of education for which they intend to run. Further, they may not live in the same household as a family member who is currently serving on the board.

The National School Boards Association developed a framework to support and improve school board governance, known as the Key Work framework (Gemberling et al., 2015). The original version of this framework offered eight action areas to enhance understanding and guide the implementation of best practices in the areas of vision, standards, assessment, accountability, resource alignment, climate, collaboration, and continuous improvement (Gemberling et al., 2000). The third edition referenced in this

study identified the best practices of highly effective boards through the five action areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships (Gemberling et al., 2015).

An emerging body of research has separated the work of school boards from their private-sector and not-for-profit counterparts. Though researchers have started to investigate the significance of school boards and isolate the variables that impact effectiveness, a gap persists in the available literature (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000; Shober & Hartney, 2014; VanTuyle & Watkins, 2017; Waters & Marzano, 2006). Although researchers listed occupational experiences in the demographic information of studies, such as those by the National School Boards Association (Shober & Hartney, 2014) and Deckman (2006, 2007), researchers have not connected the data with effectiveness, according to the third edition of the National School Boards Association Key Work action areas. At the time of this study, research identifying school and community volunteer experiences of elected school board members, even in demographic information, was unavailable.

The NYSSBA mandates a minimum of 6 hours of training in the areas of fiscal oversight, accountability, and fiduciary responsibility for new school board members in their first year of service (NYSSBA, 2019b, para. 1). Continuing or veteran members may opt to participate in a refresher course. The New School Board Academy offers these training opportunities in person and online.

During the limited timeframe available for mandatory training, every minute and each topic is essential. Without striving for continuous improvement, increasing the knowledge of individual school board members, and connecting experiences with

governing practices, practitioners risk maintaining the status quo while continuing to face current challenges and responding to evolving external factors. A better understanding of the membership and predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance may assist national and state associations in meeting the needs of individual trustees, supporting governing practices, and enhancing the effectiveness of school boards in the pursuit of success for all students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this cross-sectional nonexperimental correlational study was to investigate whether gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences can predict the preparedness of elected school board members in New York State. I used the Key Work framework to measure preparedness in the five action areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships (Gemberling et al., 2015). In addition, I investigated to what extent, if any, differences emerged in the school, community, and occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members, based on gender. I investigated the emergence of patterns in the types and numbers of reported volunteer and occupational experiences by gender to better understand preparedness in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships, as defined by the National School Boards Association (Gemberling et al., 2015).

Theoretical Frameworks

By examining differences in the prerequisite volunteer and occupational experiences of male and female school board members, I aimed to better understand the existing inequalities perpetuated by society and cultures in school systems to challenge

the status quo. Investigating social capital allowed me to study the importance of relationships and networks necessary to facilitate productive action through collaboration among trustees and with stakeholders.

Social relations approach. The social relations approach was the first theoretical framework used for this study on the relationship between gender and volunteer and occupational experiences, prior to school board candidacy. I selected this framework because of the focus on gender inequalities perpetuated through social institutions, serving as a method to analyze existing inequalities through the distribution of resources, responsibility, and power (March, Smyth, & Mukhopadhyay, 1999). I used the approach to investigate how social institutions reinforce relationships between people, as well as people's relationships to resources and activities through concepts including social relations, institutional analysis, and institutional gender policies outlined in the framework. Beyond the espoused rules of society or an organization, I used the social relations approach to investigate the impacts of culture in small daily decisions and the reinforcement of gender roles (Kabeer, 1994).

Social capital theory. The second framework for this exploration of school board trustees was social capital theory. I employed this theory to investigate the networks and relationships that enable effective functioning, the value of which lies beyond companionship and social support. Proponents of the theory suggested that social capital facilitates action by providing access to resources embedded in relationships (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In the field of education, social relationships are an integral part of realizing the mission of the institution through decision-making processes, daily operations, teaching, and learning.

Potential school board candidates in the State of New York must submit a nominating petition to their local district approximately 1 month before the budget vote and school board election day in May. Exact specifications vary by the type of school district. Typically, the candidate must obtain the signatures of at least 25 residents who are registered voters or 2% of the total number of voters in the previous election, whichever is greater (NYSSBA, 2019a). The candidate must continue to gather voter support after filing the petition, as success relies on the ability to collect a majority vote. Once elected, school board members must cultivate relationships and use their social capital to facilitate productive action. Investigating the impact of social capital on school board practices increases understanding of the internal and external connections necessary for efficacy.

Review of related research. Ford and Ihrke (2015) studied the original Key Work framework in Wisconsin, investigating to what extent, if any, school board governance practices improved district performance through an original 89-question survey. The researchers used the mathematics and reading criterion-referenced standardized Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE), administered to students in Grades 3 through 8 and Grade 10, and the average district accountability score on the Wisconsin official state report card, to measure student achievement. The researchers did not find statistical significance in the relationship between the Key Work of school board governance and WKCE proficiency and district accountability scores until analyzing the multivariate regression results for responses from school board members serving 5 or more years (n = 91; Ford & Ihrke, 2015). Results revealed statistically significant positive relationships between the Key Work index and reading

proficiency (r = .003) and the Key Work index and district accountability score (r = .163). Development as a governing body and improvement on measures of academic proficiency were the result of adherence to the Key Work framework best practices over time (Ford & Ihrke, 2015). The researchers identified limitations of the study, including the limited scope, restricted geographic region, and descriptors of the eight action areas used to identify the new and unfamiliar framework (Ford & Ihrke, 2015). Additional research using the revised Key Work of school board governance framework, increased familiarity with the five action areas, and a new geographic region were needed to address the gap in the literature.

Students in communities where the school board exhibited high levels of internal and external relationships exhibit higher academic performance (Saatcioglu & Sargut, 2014). Although research in the field is still scant, Burt (2005) and Saatcioglu and Sargut (2014) suggested that brokerage and closure are critical components of effective school boards in an era of standardized testing and accountability. Burt (2005) identified the strongest boards as cohesive groups with diverse external ties and the weakest boards as divisive groups with homogeneous external relations. These relationships between otherwise disconnected groups represented a competitive advantage for those who can identify and cultivate rewarding opportunities. The effectiveness of social capital relied on a combination of nonredundant relationships (Coleman, 1988).

The capacity of individual school board members correlated with achievement when they prioritized academic improvement exclusively (Shober & Hartney, 2014). Shober and Hartney (2014) reviewed data from a 2009 National School Board Association survey of 900 school board members in 417 districts nationwide. Four

patterns emerged from the data. First, school board members' knowledge of their district was accurate, their understanding of academics was limited, and their priorities were inconsistent. Second, more successful districts prioritized academic achievement above all else. Next, self-reported political ideology impacted a board member's understanding of funding, collective bargaining, and class size (Shober & Hartney, 2014).

Even when controlling for political ideology, trustees in this sample with a background in the field of education were 6.4% more likely to purport fiscal limitations as barriers to academic improvement, regardless of funding levels (Shober & Hartney, 2014). School board members without occupational experience in education demonstrated a more accurate knowledge of the budget, compensation, and other district conditions. Those in the educational field were 19% more likely to place importance on raising teacher compensation, 14% more likely to have more than one priority, and 6% more likely to agree that academic expectations are unreasonable. Furthermore, researchers did not find a correlation between business experience and academic success, despite the supposition that professionals in the field focus on measurable achievement as the essential element (Shober & Hartney, 2014).

Furthermore, Shober and Hartney (2014) suggested that school board training, compensation, and time allocation positively correlated with student achievement. Without knowledge of the training quality and the socioeconomic status of participants, the correlations with achievement were weak. The researchers included occupational experiences of board members in the study but did not consider school and community volunteer experiences.

Similarly, Waters and Marzano (2006) emphasized the importance of the school board's role in establishing and maintaining focus on clear and specific student achievement goals. Their meta-analysis synthesized findings from 27 rigorous quantitative studies between 1970 and 2005 that investigated a correlation between leadership and standard measures of student achievement. Study results included data from 2,817 districts and the achievement scores of 3.4 million students ($p < .05$). Collaboration between the school board and district administration to support and align districtwide goals positively correlated with student achievement ($r = .29$). Furthermore, by prioritizing academic achievement, the board promoted a focus on goals for achievement and instruction. The researchers suggested that personal agendas may be detrimental to academic improvement (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Because the Waters and Marzano (2006) study focused on the effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement, they tangentially included the school board. The significance of the governing body was in hiring the superintendent, developing the vision and mission of the district, and establishing policies to support improvement. The study failed to isolate specific board actions, behaviors, training, occupational experience, volunteer experience, and other factors related to school board effectiveness.

A 5-year study conducted by the Iowa Association of School Boards (2000) investigated very high- and low-achieving districts through interviews with 159 school board members, superintendents, and school personnel. Six researchers conducted interviews with multiple stakeholders to explore various perspectives involved in the school district decision-making process. To improve reliability, the researchers who

conducted interviews were unaware of the achievement status of the institutions (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

After controlling for extraneous variables, researchers found that trustees in high-achieving districts demonstrated an ability to clearly identify their role in supporting school improvement initiatives with high expectations for student achievement (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000). These trustees were knowledgeable about specific goals for improvement, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and staff development. The researchers outlined the characteristics of moving districts and stuck districts in side-by-side comparisons. Differences in response patterns related to the specificity of priorities, challenging the status quo, and dedication to continuous progress. Sample descriptions included information about the districts studied including achievement data, enrollment, and demographic information. The researchers did not detail demographic information of board members and other interviewees. Further research may better correlate patterns in prerequisite experiences, best practices, and personal qualities to the characteristics of moving districts.

Significance of the Study

Study findings were intended to support the National School Boards Association's goals of "clarifying how and in what ways the key work of local school boards reflects grassroots democracy in action" and "emphasizing the clear focus of America's school boards on advancing student achievement through strong political governance" (National School Boards Association, n.d.). Contemporary board and governance research in the field of education is limited. One of the most significant barriers to determining the differences in effectiveness between school boards with

similar structures is isolating the variables that promote success. A better understanding of the prerequisite volunteer and occupational experiences allows those in the field to determine best practices and replicate the success of effective boards of education in an effort to improve student achievement.

Additionally, a better understanding of school board members may reveal patterns in recruitment, diversity, representation, and future ambition. For example, I investigated stereotypical gender roles in the data and gender inequalities perpetuated through existing societal structures. Enhanced knowledge has the potential to illuminate systemic structures that maintain the status quo and serve as a starting point to enact meaningful change.

Existing research examined the practices and characteristics of current membership, the political ideology of candidates and trustees, perceptions of power, future political aspirations, and election processes to isolate the variables that promote board effectiveness. Investigating the prerequisite volunteer and occupational experiences added to the field of research by further isolating the variables that make one school board different from another and created a foundation for further research on student achievement and best practices. A better understanding of gender and prerequisite experiences as predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance has the potential to inform training opportunities, support the membership, and promote best practices.

Connection with Social Justice or Vincentian Mission in Education

By investigating differences in the prior volunteer and occupational experiences of male and female school board members, I aimed to better understand inequalities that

may be perpetuated by the culture in school systems and challenge the status quo. The social relations approach focused on gender inequalities perpetuated through social institutions and served as a method to analyze existing inequalities through the distribution of resources, responsibility, and power (March et al., 1999).

Research Questions

RQ_1: To what extent can gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences predict preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships?

RQ_2: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the school volunteer experiences of elected New York State school board members?

RQ_3: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the community volunteer experiences of elected New York State school board members?

RQ_4: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members?

Hypotheses

H_{01}: Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences are not statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships.

H_{a1}: Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences are statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key

Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships.

H_{02}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a2}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{03}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a3}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{04}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a4}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members.

Definition of Terms

In this study, I defined the board of education, also known as a school board, as locally elected officials who govern school districts in the State of New York.

Gemberling et al. (2015) described the National School Boards Association's definition of the five action areas in the Key Work framework as follows:

> Vision: Effective school boards establish a clear vision with high expectations for quality teaching and learning that supports strong student outcomes. They establish clear and specific goals to move districts forward.
>
> Accountability: High academic standards, transparency, and accountability undergird a world-class education. True accountability depends on open decision-making, community engagement and support, and receptivity to new ideas and constructive criticism.
>
> Policy: Policy is how a board sustainably exercises power to serve students. Through policy, school boards establish a set of cohesive guidelines able to transform vision into reality.
>
> Community Leadership: Through public advocacy and community engagement, school boards share their concerns and actions with the public. Community leadership that builds public support is vital to implement the board's vision.
>
> Board/Superintendent Relationships: Both the school board and the superintendent have essential leadership roles with strong collaboration and mutual trust. (p. 2)

Sociologists have suggested a distinction between volunteering for an association and isolated volunteerism. The former involves members working for rather than on behalf of the organization (Wilson, 2000). Wilson (2000) defined volunteering as a "helping behavior" to the benefit of a person, group, or cause through a commitment of time. In this study, I identified the school volunteer experience by the numbers and types of different experiences. School volunteer types included school Parent–Teacher Association (PTA) president, school PTA nonpresident executive board,

school PTA committee member, school PTA member who consistently attends meetings, school PTA member who rarely attends meetings, school PTA paper membership without meeting attendance, school level committee participation such as shared decision-making, district-level committee such as safety, interview committee participant, school/district athletic association member with consistent attendance, school/district athletic association member with occasional attendance, district PTA membership, school/district music association member with consistent attendance, school/district music association member with occasional attendance, school/district theater association member with consistent attendance, school/district theater association member with occasional attendance, not applicable, and other. I also identified community volunteer experience by the numbers and types of different experiences including neighborhood organization, religious organization, cultural organization, library organization, athletic organization, fine or performing arts organization, executive board experience, or not applicable.

I defined occupational experience by number and type. Number referred to employment status, including full-time, part-time, self-employed, not currently employed/seeking employment, not currently employed/not seeking employment, student, and retired. Type referred to field, including education, business/commerce, labor/production, transportation, farming/fishing/forestry, sales, construction, professional services (law, medicine, etc.), nonprofit, government, homemaker, or other.

CHAPTER 2

In this study, I investigated how elected school board members in New York State reported preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance by volunteer experience, occupational experience, and gender. A review of related literature addressed the frameworks used, the importance of social capital, the role and history of the board of education, eligibility requirements, motivations for candidacy, trustee demographics, and school board membership as a political pipeline.

Theoretical Frameworks

Social relations approach. The social relations approach was the first theoretical framework selected because of the focus on gender inequalities perpetuated through social institutions. This framework served as a method to analyze existing inequalities through the distribution of resources, responsibility, and power (March et al., 1999). I used social relations theory to investigate how social institutions reinforce relationships between people as well as people's relationships to resources and activities through concepts delineated in the framework. Beyond the espoused rules of society or a particular institution, I used the social relations approach to investigate the impacts of culture in small daily decisions and the reinforcement of gender roles (Kabeer, 1994).

Through this lens, I investigated three concepts: social relations, institutional analysis, and institutional gender policies. Social relations (Concept 1) included the structural relationships created and reproduced systemically to determine how people self-identify, how people assume their roles, responsibilities, and rights, and how people perceive their control over their own lives and the lives of those around them. I used institutional analysis (Concept 2) to challenge the assumption that institutions are

ideologically neutral. I also investigated institutional gender policies (Concept 3) in school boards as gender-blind community organizations that have perpetuated existing gender relations (March et al., 1999). By examining existing inequalities in the prior volunteer and occupational experiences of male and female school board members, I aimed to better understand inequalities perpetuated by the culture in school systems and society.

Social capital theory. The second framework for this exploration of school board trustees was social capital theory. I used this theory to investigate the networks and relationships that enable effective functioning, the value of which lies beyond companionship and social support. Proponents of the theory suggested that social capital facilitates action by providing access to resources embedded in relationships (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In the field of education, social relationships have been an integral part of realizing the mission of the institution through decision-making processes, daily operations, teaching, and learning.

The definition of social capital has depended on the context. The term initially offered a cultural explanation for economic outcomes (Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2006). Bourdieu (1986) defined social capital as the sum of actual or virtual resources cultivated through relationships and networks that enable otherwise unattainable outcomes (Coleman, 1988). Putnam (1993) proposed that trust, norms, and networks of social capital help facilitate coordinated action more efficiently. For this study, I used social capital to describe the relationships and networks developed to build support, foster mutual trust, cultivate relationships, and accomplish the necessary tasks for school improvement.

Relationships, networks, civic engagement, reciprocity, and trust have formed the foundation of contemporary social capital research. Researchers used the shared values, beliefs, and norms therein to "facilitate cooperation and collective action for mutual benefit" (Bhandari & Yasunobu, 2009, p. 480). Uzzi (1997) suggested that social capital is why those who are better connected are more successful than those who are less well connected. The ability to cultivate social capital represented a practical advantage for achieving a desired outcome (Saatcioglu & Sargut, 2014). Those who succeeded possessed the necessary social capital to establish productive relationships and networks while maximizing brokerage and closure opportunities to advance the organization.

Though the requirements for candidacy are minimal, the state association suggested that the characteristics of effective board members include strong communication, collaboration, and interpersonal skills (NYSSBA, 2019a). These components of social capital are integral to the successful governing body. How school board members build social capital for election to the board of education may play a role in the types and number of volunteer and occupational experiences trustees possessed. Further exploration of the data increased understanding of whether strong social capital encourages candidacy or if potential candidates purposefully built the necessary networks required for election.

Two types of social capital. I used two types of social capital in the present study. The first was closure. Closure is the internal relationships among members of an organization that allow people to collaborate for a common purpose (Alsbury, 2008). These types of relationships describe the cohesiveness of trustees engaged in the

governing practices and accountability measures of an organization. Closure has the potential to foster mutual trust, a shared vision, and a unified purpose necessary for achieving desired outcomes.

The second type of social capital was brokerage. Brokerage examines connections with actors outside the organization to cultivate support and allow greater influence for the benefit of the organization (Burt, 2005; Fukuyama, 1995). Brokerage enables a governing body to employ creativity, knowledge, skills, and external support to influence the development and implementation of policy to best support instructional practices and learning (McDermott & Jensen, 2005). The importance of brokerage lies in the exposure to new information and ideas, reduction of uncertainty, and cultivation of support from external actors (Saatcioglu & Sargut, 2014).

If closure and brokerage promote the success of the governing body, the way in which female and male trustees build social capital through prior experiences may differ. Investigating the volunteer and occupational experiences by type and number offered insight into the social capital, networks, closure, and brokerage of trustees by gender.

Key Work of school board governance. The National School Boards Association recognized five action areas in their Key Work framework: vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships (Gemberling et al., 2015). The third edition of the framework included the importance of each action area, offered strategies to enhance best practices, provided a self-assessment tool, and outlined the roles and responsibilities of the school board and superintendent.

A vision guides the district toward the future. With a focus on student achievement, the vision reflects the shared values of stakeholders and seeks to shape the future rather than maintaining the status quo. The vision guides decision- and policymaking practices to align with desired results. Once developed, the next step is to implement the vision through strategic planning (Gemberling et al., 2015). Collaboration, goal setting, and reporting progress in the organization are integral components of implementation. Policy review for alignment with the vision not only reduces conflict, it also signals focus on and dedication to the vision.

Measures of accountability focus on the student outcomes, standards, and transparency. As motivation for continuous improvement, clarity of the benchmarks and reporting data in an understandable format are crucial to involving stakeholders in the process (Gemberling et al., 2015). The board must know how district performance compares locally, in the state, and nationally, as well as gaining a full picture of disaggregated data. Accountability and data provide a means for continuous improvement rather than a means for punitive action.

As the governing body, the school board is responsible for adopting and managing district policy to address significant issues in alignment with the vision of the school to define the *who, what,* and *why* of the operational parameters. This alignment ensures consistency and objectivity in the decision-making process and organizational memory without micromanaging. Policy may be preemptive or reactionary and originate from legal precedents, rules, or local needs. Remaining current with best practices, monitoring compliance reports, and reevaluating existing policies will enhance

alignment with the vision, applicability to contemporary school issues, and accountability (Gemberling et al., 2015).

As locally elected representatives, school board members connect the community with the school system through transparency and two-way communication. School board members serve as advocates, champions of public education, and community liaisons (Gemberling et al., 2015). Promoting collaboration and support from the community, enhancing relationships with local politicians, and focusing on finding common ground as a foundation for future disagreements are all responsibilities of school board membership.

The school board is responsible for hiring and evaluating the superintendent of schools. The relationship between the school board and superintendent and an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each are integral components necessary for the success of the school district. Transparent and clearly articulated evaluation criteria and evaluative performance measures for both parties enhances the relationship, promotes intentional conversations, and fosters continuous improvement. The National School Boards Association also recommends building for the future by cultivating leadership in the community and organization (Gemberling et al., 2015). This structure has the potential to develop a pipeline for future trustees and administrators.

Related Research

Role of the board of education. Local boards of education govern public schools. School boards comprise community representatives who are responsible for the oversight and management of their local districts in accordance with educational law

and reflect the needs of the community. This governing body is charged with hiring and evaluating the superintendent; developing, adopting, and maintaining policies; approving the annual budget developed by the district; shaping the vision and mission of the district to guide decision-making; and supporting academic achievement through rigorous accountability standards, alignment of resources with district goals, and striving for continuous improvement (NYSSBA, 2019a). School board members must collaborate with fellow members of the board and stakeholders in the district and community to promote the success of the students.

If the school board is an integral part of the organization, researchers must investigate the members, motivation for candidacy, and prerequisite experiences prior to election. A greater understanding of the membership will enhance the relationship between the superintendent and school board trustees, inform training opportunities, and improve student achievement.

A brief history of school boards. Boards of education originated in New England as a means of establishing and maintaining schools among new settlers in 1642 (NYSSBA, 2006). These officials and committees were responsible for procuring a location for schooling, hiring and evaluating an instructional leader, then known as a schoolmaster, enforcing compulsory attendance for school-aged students, and evaluating learning outcomes. Local oversight ensured local control over educational experiences in each community.

As the population expanded, the number of communities and schools increased. Additional schools and larger schools meant an increase in the number and size of school boards (NYSSBA, 2006). At the turn of the 20th century, nearby individual

schools were consolidated under the leadership of one superintendent and school board. What began as 89,000 school districts nationwide in 1948 merged into 14,500 school districts at the time of this study (NYSSBA, 2006). Consolidating districts increased the educational offerings for students and the complexity of satisfying the views of stakeholders in growing school communities (NYSSBA, 2006). The role of the school system expanded to meet the needs of a larger student population and address societal demands to educate the whole child while remaining current on the expanding list of state and federal education laws and mandates.

Types of board service. Two types of school boards exist in New York State: appointed and elected. Appointed school boards gained momentum in 1992 under mayoral control in urban school systems as a strategy to improve academic achievement (Wong & Shen, 2013). Prior to 1990, the local mayor appointed each of the nine board members in Yonkers, New York. This practice continued at the time of the Wong and Shen (2013) study. From 2002 until 2015, the Mayor of New York City appointed a Schools Chancellor and eight school board members to the Panel for Educational Policy. Each of the five borough presidents selected an additional school board member. When combined with mayoral selections, New York City appointed 13 school board members.

Proponents for school board appointments emphasize high voter turnout for mayoral elections, a citywide public education agenda, and strategies specifically addressing the achievement gap in large urban systems. Researchers warned that mayoral control alone was insufficient (Wong & Shen, 2013). Mayors must become actively involved in the education system, tailor strategies for the city's unique needs,

and strive for continuous improvement by challenging the status quo. Opponents of mayoral control emphasized the need for local representation separate from political agendas.

The 2008 Urban School Board Survey, distributed by the Council of the Greater City Schools, reported that 86% of school board respondents were elected and 14% were appointed (n = 42). In the 2011 Urban School Board Survey by the Council of the Greater City Schools, 61% of school board members received compensation (n = 38). Hess and Meeks (2010) reported that 94.5% of nationwide school board members were elected and 5.5% were appointed (N = 884). Members may receive a salary, stipends for meetings, reimbursements for associated travel expenses, or serve without compensation in accordance with local district and board policies. In the same study, Hess and Meeks reported that 62.5% of trustees served without salaries and 23.5% received stipends ranging from less than $100 to $1,000 per meeting ($N$ = 882).

Board of education eligibility requirements. Potential candidates must be 18 years of age, registered voters in the district, able to read and write, and have resided in the district residents for 1 year continuously before the election (NYSSBA, 2019a). In addition, candidates may not be employed by the board of education for which they intend to run and may not live in the same home as a family member who is serving on the board. Though the requirements for candidacy are minimal, the characteristics of effective board members include strong communication, collaboration, and interpersonal skills (NYSSBA, 2019a). Characteristics of social capital are important when seeking election and after gaining membership to the governing body. Though the

organizations are gender-blind, preexisting conditions in the culture may impact the perceived social and human capital requirements for candidacy.

Declaring candidacy. Potential school board candidates in the State of New York must submit a nominating petition to their local district approximately 1 month before the budget vote and election day. Specifications vary by the type of school district. Typically, the candidate must obtain the signatures of at least 25 residents who are registered voters or 2% of the total number of voters in the previous election, whichever is greater (NYSSBA, 2019a). The candidate must gather voter support after filing the petition, as elections rely on an ability to collect a majority vote. Investigating the impact of social capital of school boards may increase understanding of the internal and external connections necessary for election and continued success as a school board member.

Demographics. In spite of limited legal requirements for candidacy, the National School Boards Association (n.d.) identified that 75% of the nation's board members are well educated, holding at least a bachelor's degree, have an average age of 25 or older, and have an overall moderate political view (Hess & Meeks, 2010). The Just over half of the 900 school board respondents were motivated to ensure schools reached their potential, 22.4% were motivated by a commitment to civic duty, 10% reported specific concerns as the motivator, 8% were recruited, and 5% listed other reasons such as appointment to the board seat, ensuring another candidate was not elected, or as an introduction to public service (Hess & Meeks, 2010). Of respondents, 44% were women and 40% had school-aged children. The most common professions of

school board respondents were education (27.1%) and business (18.1%; Hess & Meeks, 2010).

Sociodemographics. Bartanen, Grissom, Joshi, and Meredith (2018) investigated the geographic and sociodemographic distribution of school board candidates to identify differences in zoning characteristics between candidacy and successful election. The researchers contacted local election offices for the 2009 and 2011 school board candidate and election result information for each of Ohio's 610 school districts. Bartanen et al. collected addresses for 96% of the 2,437 candidates in 2009 and 95% of the 2,049 candidates in 2011.

Bartanen et al. (2018) geocoded and matched residential candidate addresses to the corresponding U.S. Census Bureau block and assigned neighborhood schools to create block groups. Block groups with at least one winner had a median household income of $6,300 higher than the norm, median home value of $15,000 higher, had 3.8% more adults with bachelor's degrees, and had a 1.4% lower population of Black and Hispanic residents than block groups without school board representatives. Analysis of candidates elected by assigned school revealed a consistent relationship between achievement and representation. One standard deviation represented a 7% increase in winner likelihood (Bartanen et al., 2018).

The researchers reported that median income and housing values predicted representation, older and more educated blocks had greater representation, and block groups with higher numbers of school-aged children increased representation on the school board (Bartanen et al., 2018). This researchers failed to investigate the prerequisite volunteer and occupational experiences of the individual candidates as

predictors of school board representation. Further investigation of the variables that differentiate school board members may enhance understanding of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance.

Volunteerism. Sociologists distinguish between volunteering for and volunteering on behalf of an organization (Wilson, 2000). Wilson (2000) defined volunteering as a "helping behavior" to benefit a person, group, or cause through a commitment of time. Social networks, human capital, and resources increased the likelihood of volunteering, though Wilson (2000, 2012) reported educational attainment as the most significant predictor for volunteerism. Women were more likely to engage in volunteer experiences than their male spouses, slightly more likely to volunteer in North America than their male counterparts, and driven toward stereotypical gender roles in their volunteerism. Wilson (2012) suggested the need for ethnographic studies to understand how gendered divisions in rates, duration, and types of activities have come to exist; a goal not easily explored through survey research.

Deckman (2007) found that women have higher membership in PTAs and were more likely to indicate community and social goals as motivators for candidacy than their male counterparts. Tallerico (1992) also reported gender stereotypes in the assumed roles of school board candidates. In an analysis of four studies, Tallerico reviewed recordings and transcripts of open-ended interviews with superintendents and school board members. Regardless of prior experiences, women were stereotyped into PTA and homemaker roles and men were stereotyped into financial and facility roles. Furthermore, male participants attributed gender inequalities to be a product of society,

whereas female participants attributed inequalities to local communities and organizational culture.

Impact on student achievement. The performance of a school board impacts the health of an organization. Once elected, school board trustees must collaborate with colleagues and district administrators to develop the vision and mission of the school district. A growing body of research indicated that successful boards of education positively influence student achievement (Ford & Ihrke, 2015; Lorentzen, 2013; VanTuyle & Watkins, 2017).

Ford and Ihrke (2015) studied the Key Work of school boards in Wisconsin to investigate to what extent, if any, school board governance practices improve district performance through an original 89-question survey. The researchers measured achievement by the mathematics and reading criterion-referenced standardized WKCE administered to students in Grades 3 through 8 and Grade 10, as well as the average district accountability score on the Wisconsin official state report card. The survey response rate of 23.3% (n = 321) included at least one board of education member from 47.4% of Wisconsin districts (n = 201). The survey asked participants to rate their agreement with a statement related to organizational engagement in each of the eight original action areas identified by the original Key Work framework: standards, assessment, accountability, alignment, climate, collaboration and engagement, and continuous improvement. The researchers combined the aforementioned variables into the Key Works index with a Cronbach's alpha of .71 (Ford & Ihrke, 2015).

Ford and Ihrke (2015) found no statistical significance in the relationships between the Key Work action areas and levels of WKCE proficiency and district

accountability score until exclusively considering responses from school board members serving 5 or more years (n = 91). Results of multivariate regressions identified statistically significant positive relationships between the Key Work index and reading proficiency (r = .003) and district accountability score (r = .163). Researchers suggested that development as a governing body and improvement on measures of academic proficiency resulted from adherence to the Key Work framework best practices over time. Limitations of the study included the limited scope, restricted geographic region, and descriptors of the eight action areas used to identify the new and unfamiliar framework (Ford & Ihrke, 2015). The current study addressed the gap in literature by using the revised Key Work of school board governance framework and a different geographic region.

Lorentzen (2013) studied the relationship between school board governance behaviors and student achievement on the Grade 10 criterion reference test in Montana. The 69-question survey designed specifically for the study rested on five standards: responsible governance (Standard 1), high expectations (Standard 2), culture (Standard 3), accountability (Standard 4), and engagement and values (Standard 5). Lorentzen established instrument validity through factor analysis, analyzing data from 74 board members representing 27 districts using multivariate regression models.

Lorentzen (2013, p. 93) found statistically significant correlations between student achievement and district accountability for "meeting student learning expectations" through an evaluation of the superintendent on clearly defined goals and outcomes (Standard 4: reading r = .165, p = .421; science r = .517, p = .005; mathematics r = .427, p = .030; overall r = .448, p = .022) and establishing a culture that

promotes success for staff and students (standard 3: reading $r = .137$, $p = .501$; science $r = .467$, $p = .016$; mathematics $r = .359$, $p = .072$; overall $r = .390$, $p = .049$). Of the five standards studied, only Standards 3 and 4 had statistically significant overall scores. No statistical significance emerged between reading scores and any of the standards measured through the instrument in this sample. Standards 1 ($r = .388$, $p = .050$), 2 ($r = .419$, $p = .033$), 3 ($r = .467$, $p = .016$), and 4 ($r = .517$, $p = .007$) had a statistically significant relationships with science scores. Only Standard 4 ($r = .427$, $p = .030$) had a statistically significant relationship with mathematics scores. Limitations of the study included volunteer bias, social desirability bias, and variation among boards.

The limited availability of research investigating school board impact on student achievement emphasized the need for a greater understanding of members who comprise the governing body. Expanding the geographic area and preparedness for governance helped increase knowledge of school board membership. The capacity of individual school board members correlated with achievement when their focus was on specific academic improvement (Shober & Hartney, 2014). Shober and Hartney (2014) reviewed data from a 2009 National School Board Association survey of 900 school board members in 417 districts nationwide. Four patterns emerged in the collection of data. First, members' knowledge of the district was accurate, whereas understanding of academics was limited and priorities were inconsistent. Second, more successful districts prioritized academic achievement.

Next, self-reported political ideology impacted a board member's understanding of funding, collective bargaining, and class size (Shober & Hartney, 2014). Even when controlling for politically ideology, trustees in this sample with a background in the field

of education were 6.4% more likely to purport fiscal limitations as barriers to academic improvement, regardless of funding levels. Researchers found that school board members in the study without occupational experience in education demonstrated more accurate knowledge of budget, compensation, and other district conditions. Those in the education field were 19% more likely to place importance on raising teacher compensation, 14% more likely to have more than one priority, and 6% more likely to agree that academic expectations are unreasonable. Furthermore, no correlation emerged between members with business experience and academic success, despite the supposition that professionals in the field focused on measurable achievement as the ultimate goal.

Last, researchers reported that a district's ability to "beat the odds" and succeed academically linked with on-cycle, at-large school board elections (Shober & Hartney, 2014, p. 5). Improvement of measured proficiency levels were 2.4% higher in districts where voting took place on the same day as state and national elections. This emphasizes the necessity for preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance to maximize the consistency and effectiveness of individual trustees.

Shober and Hartney (2014) also suggested that school board training, compensation, and time allocation positively correlated with student achievement. Without knowledge of training quality, the socioeconomic status of trustees in the study, and efficiency of time spent, correlations with achievement were weak. Though the researchers included occupational experience of board members in the study, they did not consider volunteer experiences related to schools and the community.

Similarly, Waters and Marzano (2006) emphasized the importance of the school board's role in establishing and maintaining focus on clear and specific student achievement goals in their meta-analysis synthesizing findings from 27 rigorous quantitative studies between 1970 and 2005. Prior research included in the study investigated the relationship between leadership and standard measures of student achievement. The results analyzed involved 2,817 districts and achievement scores of 3.4 million students ($p < .05$). Collaboration between the school board and district administrators to support and align districtwide goals positively correlated with student achievement ($r = .29$). Furthermore, by prioritizing academic achievement, the board promoted a focus on goals for achievement and instruction. Personal agendas may be detrimental to improvement (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Because the Waters and Marzano (2006) study focused on the effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement, the school board was included in a tangential role. The significance of the governing body in the study was in the selection of the superintendent, development of the vision and mission of the district, and establishment of policy to support improvement. The researchers failed to isolate specific preparedness for governance as a component of school board effectiveness.

A 5-year study conducted by the Iowa Association of School Boards (2000) investigated very high- and low-achieving districts through interviews with 159 school board members, superintendents, and school personnel. Six researchers conducted interviews with multiple stakeholders to explore the various perspectives involved in the school district decision-making process. To improve reliability, the interviewers were unaware of the achievement status of students in the districts involved in the study.

After controlling for extraneous variables, the researchers found that trustees in high-achieving districts demonstrated an ability to clearly identify their role in supporting school improvement initiatives with high expectations for student achievement (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000). These trustees were knowledgeable about specific goals for improvement, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and staff development. The researchers outlined the characteristics of moving districts and stuck districts in side-by-side comparisons (p. 50). Differences in response patterns related to the specificity of priorities, ability to challenge the status quo, and dedication to continuous progress. Sample descriptions included information about the districts studied, including achievement data, enrollment, and demographic information. The investigators did not detail board member and other interviewee demographics. The researchers recommended further research related to patterns in prerequisite experience, best practices, and personal qualities to the characteristics of moving districts.

Through a review of literature, Johnson (2013) identified 12 school board leadership practices that support student achievement. Combined with a panel review to increase content validity, Johnson identified the following leadership practices:

> creating a vision, using data, setting goals, monitoring progress, creating awareness and urgency, engaging the community, connecting with district leadership, creating climate, providing staff development, developing policy, demonstrating commitment, and practicing unified governance. (p. 480)

Johnson used these practices to form the 33-question Effective Board Leadership Practice Survey to measure effective school board leadership characteristics. The

researcher distributed the instrument to 34 trustees in 34 low-wealth, high-poverty school districts in Ohio.

Johnson (2013) used a factor analysis that identified six factors accounting for 80.72% of the variance in the following practices: "creating and supporting a vision, focusing on improvement, valuing learning and instruction, practicing shared governance, using data and policy to support learning, and focusing on professional development to improve instruction" (p. 480). Johnson used Cronbach's alpha (.94) to determine the internal consistency of the instrument and established predictive validity of the instrument by comparing the mean scores of high- and low-achieving districts. From the literature review and data collected from the Effective Board Leadership Practice Survey, Johnson suggested that board of education leadership practices positively influence student achievement.

The problem of volunteer bias threatened the external validity of studies relying on self-report data. Survey respondents were self-selected and responses of volunteer participants may not represent the opinions and ideology of those choosing not to participate in a survey of this nature. The small sample size and limited scope of the Johnson (2013) study was also a threat to validity and may not represent the population of school districts nationwide.

Honingh, Ruiter, and van Thiel (2018) conducted a systematic literature review to investigate the impact of school boards on student achievement, narrowing their search of 4,939 studies to 16 studies. The researchers selected articles based on their dependent and independent variables of location, methodology, and primary or secondary education. Honingh et al. coded data using NVivo, software designed to

analyze qualitative data. Findings indicated that contemporary research in the field lacks empirical data evidencing a correlation between school boards and student achievement. Instead, the researchers suggested evidence of an indirect effect of school boards on student achievement. The complexities related to board differences, isolating variables, and personal demographics presented unique challenges in the study of school boards (Honingh et al., 2018).

Though literature in this area was limited at the time of the current study, research designed to investigate the importance of school boards was emerging. Lorentzen (2013) and VanTuyle and Watkins (2017) posited that successful boards positively impact academic achievement. Honingh et al. (2018) reported a lack of empirical data necessary to establish a relationship between school boards and academic achievement. Inclusion of the prerequisite volunteer and occupational experiences of school board members and connection with the National School Boards Association Key Work framework expanded the understanding of factors associated with effectiveness in the effort to improve student achievement.

Social capital. Saatcioglu and Sargut (2014) explored the patterns of school board brokerage and closure to determine the relationship between social capital and proficiency on the reading and mathematics eighth-grade Pennsylvania System of School Assessment. The Pennsylvania School Boards Association mailed three copies of a social capital questionnaire to each of the state's 500 school districts for distribution to the board chairperson and two trustees selected by the secretary. The researchers averaged usable responses from the same district together, resulting in the representation of 171 districts and a response rate of 34%. The Pennsylvania Department of Education

and the National Center for Education Statistics provided academic, community, and student-characteristic data. The investigators designed the instrument to better understand the social capital of school boards. Leana and Pil's (2006) 5-point scale formed the basis for measuring closure or internal ties. The 7-point measure for brokerage, or external ties, built on prior work by O'Toole (1997) and Meier and O'Toole (2003). The scholars used 4 years of Pennsylvania System of School Assessment scores, starting with the 2003–2004 school year and investigated community and student characteristics from 2004 to 2007.

Saatcioglu and Sargut (2014) found no correlation between brokerage and closure ($r = .073$, $p \geq .100$). The coefficient effect size for reading proficiency related to brokerage was .089 ($p = .043$), for closure was .081 ($p = .037$), and for both brokerage and closure was .065 ($p = .029$). When controlling for extraneous variables, brokerage accounted for a 1.1% increase in reading proficiency, closure accounted for a 2% increase, and the combination of brokerage and closure accounted for a 2.8% increase in proficiency from the 2004–2005 academic year to the 2006–2007 academic year. The coefficient effect size for mathematics proficiency related to brokerage was .076 ($p = .034$), for closure was .079 ($p = .021$), and for both brokerage and closure was .058 ($p = .025$). When controlling for extraneous variables, brokerage accounted for a 1.4% increase in mathematics proficiency, closure accounted for a 1.4% increase, and the combination of brokerage and closure accounted for a 3.8% increase in proficiency from the 2004–2005 academic year to the 2006–2007 academic year.

Saatcioglu and Sargut (2014) found a positive correlation between the brokerage and closure of school boards and academic achievement. Collaborative boards with

diverse external relations scored higher on measures of achievement than contentious boards with repetitive external networks. The volunteer and occupational experiences of school board members may have implications for social networks and capital developed prior to future candidates' ability to facilitate action through productive relationships.

Importance of social and human elements. After reporting the insignificance of structural and procedural components, Sonnenfeld (2002) suggested the importance of social and human elements as determining factors of a board's success. The social composition of the board had the most significant impact on the health of an organization, developed through mutual trust, continuous learning, honest discussion about the organization, and uncontentious discord. After ensuring all voices were heard, the board must come together as a unified team to reach consensus and move forward. Examining how these social elements can be replicated may promote board and organizational success.

Articulating the factors making one board successful whereas another with an identical composition fails is complex. The chemistry between people is difficult to quantify and replicate. Development of an effective board occurs over time. Members must form positive relationships, build mutual respect, and foster trust to discuss delicate matters. Beyond prior experience and skills is the importance of finding the right fit (Sonnenfeld, 2002). This fit indicates chemistry rather than credentials and encourages lower rates of turnover. Alsbury (2008) reported that lower rates of board trustee turnover equate to higher English language arts and mathematics scores, as turnover represents instability, conflict, poor relationships, and divisiveness.

Through collaborative effort, the board must develop a shared vision outlining the community's beliefs, high expectations, and clearly defined goals for student achievement and high-quality instruction. Additionally, the relationship between the school board and superintendent is imperative to the success of a district. In an article, Characteristics that strengthen or weaken this bond include trustees with strong communication skills, openness to new ideas, the ability to build and maintain trust, and the cultivation of positive relationships (Rice, 2017). In contrast, individuals who promoted a divisive personal agenda, unwillingness to compromise, and mistrust hindered progress. A disintegration in communication, lack of clear roles, misalignment with districtwide goals, lack of transparency, or unclear vision made student achievement unfeasible.

Mountford and Brunner (2010) explored the influences of gender on school board members' perceptions of vocal space and influence in organizational decision-making practices. Researchers also examined the perceptions of school board colleagues and the superintendent. The researchers investigated factors related to decision-making style (Mountford, 2004; Mountford & Brunner, 2010). Similarly, the researchers depicted the data analysis as a vocal space and influence continuum, decision-making continuum, and perception of power continuum and developed three matrices from cross-plotting the continua.

Of 20 participants, 17 self-reported or were described as highly vocal and influential (Mountford & Brunner, 2010). Male school board members were consistently plotted on the high vocal end of the continuum whereas their female counterparts were placed in the center, indicating a moderate space. The investigators placed eight

participants—six men and two women—on the far side of the decision-making continuum, indicating micromanaging behaviors. In contrast, they placed seven women and five men on the collaborative end of the spectrum (Mountford & Brunner, 2010).

Cross-analyzation of the relationship between perception of power and continuum matrix depicted a strong correlation between micromanaging behavior and power, defined as power over others (Mountford & Brunner, 2010). Collaborative behavior correlated with perceptions of power with rather than power over others. The scholars placed 67% of female participants and 45% of male participants in the collaborative–power with others box; 22% of female participants in the collaborative–power over others box; and 11% of female participants and 56% of male participants in the micromanager–power over others box. Though women were consistently less vocal, the matrix for vocal space/influence and power did not depict a correlation because the researchers placed 85% of participants on the high vocal side of the continuum.

Micromanagers had behaviors in common, including constant communication with the superintendent of schools, frequent visits to school buildings, directives issued to school personnel, involvement in day-to-day operations, and personal agendas related to their children (Mountford & Brunner, 2010). Collaborative commonalities included promotion of common goals, seeking and carefully listening to stakeholder input, and valuing contrasting viewpoints. At the close of the study, Mountford and Brunner (2010) suggested the research findings recognize and acknowledge the impact of gender on decision-making rather than perpetuate gender-blind neutrality. The researchers also suggested that the experiences of female trustees differ from those of their male counterparts. Although Mountford and Brunner investigated differences by gender, they

failed to link findings with the National School Boards Association Key Work of school board governance.

Critique. Skepticism over the lack of a universal definition of social capital, methods of measurement, and causal relationships with economic outcomes and social transformations persists (Bhandari & Yasunobu, 2009). Castle (2002) expressed concerns over precision and comparability in the concept of social capital. Though ambiguity in the definition and role of social capital in society remains, further exploration into the relationships and networks of school board trustees enhance the efficacy of the governing body. In this context, researchers used social capital to describe the relationships and networks developed to build support, foster mutual trust, cultivate relationships, and accomplish the tasks necessary for school improvement.

Scholars used social capital theory to identify how relationships can promote or hinder desired outcomes (Bhandari & Yasunobu, 2009). Though descriptive research has been a highly useful tool in bringing attention to important matters, suggestions for improvement in the field are lacking. The available research data were cross-sectional (Mountford & Brunner, 2010; Saatcioglu & Sargut, 2014; Shober & Hartney, 2014; Waters & Marzano, 2006), focused on the board president (VanTuyle & Watkins, 2017), and not representative of diverse community urbanicity. For a greater understanding of effective boards, those in the field would benefit from a longitudinal study in urban, suburban, and rural communities of different socioeconomic statuses.

The availability of educational research that identified ways to develop best practices for trustees with varying personal and occupational backgrounds has been limited. Though similarities may exist, the elected public school board of education

trustees face unique challenges that differ from their private and not-for-profit counterparts. School board members must campaign to secure a majority vote and maintain relationships with the district staff and community, especially when they have school-aged children enrolled in the district in which they serve. Considering that the vast majority of citizens have attended school, people have preconceived notions and self-proclaimed expertise in the area of schooling.

The cultivation of social relationships and networks improve the chances of successful board candidacy. Once elected to the board of education, trustees have an opportunity to promote academic success through high levels of internal closure and external brokerage. Ineffective school boards engaged in divisive practices with homogeneous external relationships hinder success. Using social capital to support instruction and learning by fostering collaboration, mutual trust, and alignment of effort toward a common goal will maximize school board effectiveness.

Motivation for school board membership and perceptions of power. Individual members have various motivations for seeking membership and come from a variety of personal and occupational backgrounds. Their prior experiences with the school district shape relationships and form understandings ranging from policies and practices to curricula, personnel, operations, and fiduciary responsibilities. Meyer (2004) wrote a compelling article about personal experiences as a trustee, including motivations to improve the failing school district where the author's son would be attending school, and imparting meaningful change in the once thriving community. After unsuccessful attempts to initiate change through parent organizations, the author sought board membership to focus on academic improvement for the failing district.

Instead, Meyer experienced adversity and surprise as a result of decisions made to maintain the status quo.

Eraca (2016) conducted a phenomenological qualitative study of 60 New York State Board of Education members and 191 community members to identify common themes in the motivation to attain school board membership; the impact of New York State eligibility requirements on board practices and operations; and perceptions of influence on education policy through surveys, focus groups, and interviews. Board member responses indicated a desire to have a positive impact on children and decision-making in the form of influence and power as the motivators for candidacy. Community members were unfamiliar with the eligibility requirements and focused on the democratic process. Perceptions of candidacy by community members skewed toward self-serving aspirations for power or fulfillment of a personal agenda (Eraca, 2016).

Mountford (2004) conducted a secondary-analysis qualitative study to examine how gender influences school board members' self-perceptions of vocal space and influence during decision-making, as well as the perceptions of others. The most significant finding was a relationship between a member's definition of power and motivation for service, and the difference in responses by gender. Male school board members' motivations for candidacy were altruism and power. Female school board members indicated altruistic and personal reasons as their motivation for candidacy. The researcher identified a pattern in the perceptions of power. Board members who defined power as having the power over another had a more significant personal reason for candidacy. Counterparts who defined power as the power with another were more likely to have altruistic motivations for school board candidacy.

Connection with politics. To date, female candidates have been underrepresented in political office. Deckman (2006, 2007) took an interest in school board elections as a political pipeline to higher elected offices. The purpose of this study was to investigate the political ideology, policy views, and platforms of school board candidates by gender. The researcher used data from the responses of 671 school board candidates in a 1998 survey. The researcher obtained a list of the approximately 15,000 school districts from the U.S. Department of Education and randomly selected 300 school districts. The investigator requested a list of school board candidates from each district and the 91% response rate resulted in a list of 1,220 potential participants. The author distributed the paper survey in two rounds of mailings, resulting in responses from 254 female and 414 male participants, or a 55% response rate. The survey included demographic information and Likert-type scale responses.

Deckman (2006) found significant partisan and ideological differences between male and female school board candidates. Even after controls, female trustees were more politically liberal than their male counterparts and self-reported moderate to conservative political views. Women also reported a less conservative view about controversial topics such as multiculturalism, homosexuality, school prayer, and creationism. Though less conservative than men in the same position, female trustees still identified as Republican. Because the majority of women in politics have representation in the Democratic party, the pipeline from elected school board member to higher political office may not hold true.

Female candidates were more likely to report education as their occupational experience than their male counterparts (Deckman, 2006). Women were also more

likely to report being unemployed. The author investigated the difference in demographic political ideology by gender. Although political affiliation may be unrelated to the politics of the district, ideology and backgrounds of the candidates has implications for decision-making. Because the school board hires and evaluates the superintendent, adopts and maintains policy, and guides the daily practices of the administrative team, an exploration of prior volunteer and occupational experiences may enhance understanding of school board members.

Though scholars have posited that a higher representation of women on boards of education may lead to greater gender equality in the field of politics, Deckman (2007) found no evidence to support that contention. The disparity in future political aspirations may lie in the initial motivations for school board candidacy. In the study, Deckman (2007) used the same survey data collected from 1,220 urban, suburban, and rural school board candidates nationwide and received 671 usable responses. Men were more likely to seek school board candidacy to influence policy, apply religious beliefs, and restore traditional values. Women were more likely to seek school board candidacy for community and social reasons. Only 16% of male and 10% of female participants indicated political ambition.

Elder (2004) suggested that although female political candidates receive equal party and financial support as their male counterparts, women are underrepresented in politics because they are less likely to run for office. Among the reasons for fewer female candidates, the researcher suggested that "political gender role socialization, a lack of political confidence, family responsibilities, and the relatively few numbers of visible women role models in politics all contribute to why women don't run" (Elder,

2004, p. 27). In contrast, women represented almost half of school board members (Hess & Meeks, 2010) and were elected to boards of education at rates higher than any other elected political office, though were less represented in small districts (Deckman, 2007). To cultivate leaders in the community, Zlotkin (1993) suggested recruiting active members in the community who demonstrate the necessary skills to lead their fellow stakeholders.

VanTuyle and Watkins (2017) conducted a study about female school board presidents in Illinois to investigate self-efficacy and revealed common themes through surveys and interviews. Using Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy framework, VanTuyle and Watkins (2017) identified the following themes: "the ability to execute and produce results, triadic reciprocity considering personal factors, behavior, and environmental influences, and mastery experience, vicarious, experience, and persuasion of others" (p. 10). Female school board presidents were confident in their ability to execute the roles and responsibilities of the position. The investors failed to connect self-efficacy with the five action areas outlined in the National School Boards Association Key Work of school board governance.

The available body of research initiated an investigation of the relationship between the governing body and student achievement on state and national assessments. Studies conducted by Lorentzen (2013), Shober and Hartney (2014), and Johnson (2013) identified that characteristics of effective boards positively correlated with academic achievement. The Iowa School Boards Association (2000) emphasized the necessity of understanding the role of the school board, members possessing accurate and specific knowledge of strategies, and striving for continuous improvement. Waters

and Marzano (2006) indicated the importance of boards establishing and maintaining focus on clear and specific achievement goals through collaborative effort. The social capital of individual members promoted effectiveness through collaboration and productive relationships. Honingh et al. (2018) challenged the findings of available research through a secondary analysis and indicated that the data do not conclusively support a relationship between school boards and student achievement.

Individual school board members have various motivations for seeking membership and develop from a variety of personal and occupational backgrounds. Their prior experiences with the school district shape relationships and form understandings ranging from policies and practices to curricula, personnel, operations, and fiduciary responsibilities. Eraca (2016) explored the discrepancy between school board candidate motivation and community member perceptions. Mountford (2004) investigated perceptions of power in candidate motivations for membership.

Women represented almost half of the studied school board population (Hess & Meeks, 2010) but remain underrepresented in the field of politics. Although female candidates received an equal amount of support, confounding variables and perceived efficacy prevent candidacy (Elder, 2004). VanTuyle and Watkins (2017) examined the self-efficacy reported by female school board presidents and chairs, finding that participants were confident in their ability to execute the roles and responsibilities of the position. Parallels in political candidacy fell short when exploring the ideology of candidates in both sectors in that the ideology of female school board members is self-reported to be more conservative than that of women in higher political office (Deckman, 2006, 2007).

Relationship Between Prior Research and the Present Study

Investigating the practices, qualities, and characteristics of school board members enhanced understanding of the governing body to further isolate the variables that make one board successful while another struggles. Although several referenced studies included descriptive statistics related to gender and employment, the available research failed to investigate how these areas connect. This study strengthened understanding of individual members, addressed a gap in the literature, and identified inequalities perpetuated by the school system.

In accordance with research conducted by Deckman (2007), analysis of data from a small-scale pilot study in preparation for the present study indicated that female board of education members had a greater quantity of school volunteer experience than their male counterparts. Though additional research is needed, candidacy may be a continuation of female board members' commitment to the community. Seeking candidacy as continuation of community service rather than as a start to volunteering may also be perceived differently by the community (Eraca, 2016). As Shober and Hartney (2014) suggested, occupational experience may impact an individual's priorities as a school board member.

Future research. Additional research is necessary to demonstrate a relationship between gender and prerequisite experience types, because no prior research to corroborated the data collected at the time of research. Researchers who wish to replicate the study should seek to expand the sample size and diversity of participants and districts. Furthermore, connecting achievement data in districts with prior volunteer experience of male and female school board members will better determine its

importance. Researchers may also investigate the availability and quality of training opportunities for new and returning board members to address gaps in knowledge, understanding, and skills. Researchers may consider examining volunteerism by gender as it relates to the Key Work of school board governance and the existence of a school board pipeline.

Though researchers have initiated an investigation of school board membership to determine effectiveness, a gap in the literature persists. At the time of this study, researchers primarily had used occupational experiences and gender for demographic purposes while overlooking volunteer experiences. Studying the volunteer and occupational experiences of board of education members based on gender as predictors of the Key Work of school board governance may improve professional training opportunities. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the quantitative approach used in this study.

CHAPTER 3

Methods and Procedures

The intent of this chapter is to introduce and outline the research methodology for this cross-sectional nonexperimental correlational quantitative study in which I aimed to investigate the differences in the self-reported volunteer and occupational experiences of elected school board members in New York State by gender, and their preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance. In this study, I investigated the extent to which differences emerged in the school, community, and occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members based on gender, and the extent to which each variable predicted preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance. The National School Boards Association framework outlined best practices for five action areas: vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships.

I investigated the emergence of patterns in the types of reported experiences and frequency of school and community volunteer work by gender to better understand preparedness for the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships, as defined by the National School Boards Association (Gemberling et al., 2015). In this chapter, I outline the research methodology, participants in the study, procedures, method of analysis, and ethical concerns.

Research Questions

RQ_1: To what extent can gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences predict preparedness for the Key Work of school

board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and Board/Superintendent relationships?

RQ_2: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the school volunteer experiences of elected New York State school board members?

RQ_3: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the community volunteer experiences of elected New York State school board members?

RQ_4: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members?

Hypotheses

H_{01}: Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences are not statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships.

H_{a1}: Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences are statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships.

H_{02}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a2}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{03}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a3}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{04}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a4}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members.

Research Design and Data Analysis

I used a quantitative method to investigate the relationship between variables through a preestablished research design (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019). The intent was to formulate generalizations applicable beyond the current study with inferential statistics. I used associational ex post facto research to investigate the difference between female and male participants.

I used a correlational research design to determine the extent to which a relationship exists between school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences and gender and to what extent those experiences predict preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the five action areas of vision,

accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships. I used this type of associational research design to investigate the relationship between quantitative variables; the value lay in identifying possible causes that may contribute to the phenomena studied (Fraenkel et al., 2019). I analyzed data through building a regression model, including testing all assumptions. I used the enter method to identify statistically significant predictors of preparedness for each action area and ran a stepwise multiple linear regression using each statistically significant predictor of preparedness for respective action areas. The goal was to provide additional insight into the strength of the significance, aligned with independent variable categories.

In this study, I sought to investigate the types and quantity of volunteer experiences and the occupational fields and employment status self-reported by New York State Board of Education members by gender. I collected quantitative data using an electronic survey described in the instrument section below. Descriptive statistics demonstrated the representativeness of the personal and district demographics of the sample participants. To build a predictive model, I ran a linear regression using each of the preparedness values as dependent variables and each of the categorical and continuous independent variables. Further, I used a series of regressions to investigate the interactions among the dependent variables to isolate the effect of the independent variables on each dependent variable.

I ran a series of three independent samples *t*-tests to determine the difference, if any, between the numbers of school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences by gender. I used a series of chi square tests to determine if a relationship existed between types of school volunteering, community volunteering, and occupation

by gender. The selected threshold, alpha, for statistical significance was .05. The independent and dependent variables appear in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1

Independent Variables

Independent Variable	Qualitative/ Quantitative	Number of levels	Names of levels	Active/ Attribute	Between/Within	Maine/Co-variate
Gender	Qualitative	2	• Female • Male	Attribute	Between	Maine
Number of School Volunteer Experience	Quantitative	Continuous		Attribute	Between	Maine
Number of Community Volunteer Experience	Quantitative	Continuous		Attribute	Between	Maine
Number of Occupational Experience (FTE status)	Qualitative	7	• full-time • part-time • self-employed • not currently employed - seeking employment • not currently employed - not seeking employment • student • retired	Attribute	Between	Maine

Independent Variable	Qualitative/ Quantitative	Number of levels	Names of levels	Active/ Attribute	Between/Within	Maine/Co-variate
Type of School Volunteer Experience	Qualitative	18	• parent-teacher association (PTA) president • PTA non-president executive board • PTA committee member • PTA member, consistently attends meetings • PTA member, rarely attends meetings • PTA paper membership, no meeting attendance • school level committee participations, such as shared decision making • district-level committee, such as safety • interview committee participant • athletic association member, consistently attends meetings • athletic association member, occasionally attends meetings • district PTA membership • music association member, consistently attends meetings • music association member, occasionally attends meetings • theater association member, consistently attends meetings • theater association member, occasionally attends meetings • not applicable • other	Attribute	Between	Maine
Type of Community Volunteer Experience	Qualitative	8	• neighborhood • religious • cultural • library • athletic • fine or performing arts • executive board experience • not applicable	Attribute	Between	Maine

Independent Variable	Qualitative/ Quantitative	Number of levels	Names of levels	Active/ Attribute	Between/Within	Maine/Co-variate
Type of Occupational Experience (Field)	Qualitative	12	• education • business/commerce • labor/production • transportation • farming/fishing/forestry • sales • construction • professional services (law, medicine, etc.) • nonprofit • government • homemaker • other	Attribute	Between	Maine

Table 2

Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	Operational Definition	Qualitative / Quantitative
Vision	"Effective school boards establish a clear vision with high expectations for quality teaching and learning that supports strong student outcomes. They establish clear and specific goals to move districts forward." (Likert scale response)	Quantitative
Accountability	"High academic standards, transparency, and accountability undergird a world-class education. True accountability depends on open decision making, community engagement and support, and receptivity to new ideas and constructive criticism." (Likert scale response)	Quantitative
Policy	"Policy is how a board sustainably exercises power to serve students. Through policy, school boards establish a set of cohesive guidelines able to transform vision into reality." (Likert scale response)	Quantitative
Community Leadership	"Through public advocacy and community engagement, school boards share their concerns and actions with the public. Community leadership that builds public support is vital to implement the board's vision." (Likert scale response)	Quantitative
Board/ Superintendent Relationships	"Both the school board and the superintendent have essential leadership roles with strong collaboration and mutual trust." (Likert scale response)	Quantitative

All survey responses were anonymous. I collected demographics and prior volunteer and occupational experiences in one survey to analyze results for patterns while maintaining participants' anonymity. The survey was open for 23 days to meet or exceed the minimum required sample. Due to the age requirements for school board membership, all participants were at least 18 years of age and did not require additional consent.

Validity of the research design. To make the results of the study generalizable and to improve the statistical power of the test required an adequate and representative

sample. I checked for representativeness through the inclusion of typical cases (as suggested by Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). I selected the sample from a population of elected school board members in urban, suburban, and rural districts in New York State.

Threats to internal validity are the most significant limitations of associational research (Fraenkel et al., 2019). Relationships were established, but without the ability to measure an intervention group against a control group; thus, causation could not be established. Lack of randomization, subject characteristics threat, and data collector bias were additional challenges in this type of research. To evaluate threats to internal validity, I identified external factors that may have affected preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance, including personal and district demographics, years of experience as a school board member, age, educational attainment, size of the school board, student enrollment, and urbanicity. Using a survey, I investigated the extent of patterns, if any, in the volunteer and occupational experiences of school board members by gender and identify and evaluate threats to internal validity.

The chi square test required a large enough sample to prevent 20% or more of the cells from having values less than five. When analyzing pairs of categorical data, I tested assumptions of variance and normality. Internal validity and consistency improved through a review of the research instruments by professors, colleagues, and a superintendent of schools. I conducted ministudies to pilot the electronic questionnaire, refining the instrument, as necessary, before conducting the full study. The editorial team at the NYSSBA reviewed the survey. I used feedback to further improve the

instrument prior to distribution and Cronbach's alpha to evaluate reliability. The selected threshold, alpha, for statistical significance was .05.

Sample and Population

Sample. The sample drew from a population of New York State Board of Education members who are elected and unsalaried. I recruited participants through the NYSSBA membership, my existing professional networks, by e-mails to the district board of education accounts, and the snowballing method. The NYSSBA distributed a description of the study and survey link to their approximately 5,200 school board members.

The survey asked school board members to complete demographic questions at the beginning of the survey, as shown in Appendix B. Demographic information enabled me to analyze the representativeness of the sample, compared to NYSSBA figures. The survey required electronic informed consent, shown in Appendix A, before participants could proceed to the survey. According to the New York State Department of Education (2019b), the State of New York has 766 school districts. Each district has between three and nine trustees. The NYSSBA (2019b) has a membership of 675 school districts representing approximately 5,200 members. The minimum required sample size for the multiple regression was 103, based on a statistical significance of .05, seven predictors, an anticipated effect size of 0.15, and a desired statistical power of 0.8. A response rate of less than 2% would have yielded the minimum required sample of 103. A response rate of 10% would have yielded a sample of 520, exceeding the minimum required sample of 103.

At least one participant from each of NYSSBA's 13 defined geographical regions responded to the survey, totaling 114 engagements. After removing incomplete surveys (n = 10), responses from appointed school board members (n = 2), and one survey indicating preference to omit gender, I analyzed the remaining responses (N = 121). The majority of responses came from NYSSBA Area 11, Nassau County (53.5%, n = 54). NYSSBA Area 12, Suffolk County, had the second highest response rate at 8.9% (n = 9; see Table 3).

Female board members represented 60.4% of respondents (n = 61). The overwhelming majority self-reported race as White or Caucasian (94.1%, n = 95). A third had master's degrees (35.6%, n = 36) and another third had bachelor's degrees (31.7%, n = 32). Of the data analyzed, 95% reported having at least one child (n = 96), 85.1% had at least one child enrolled in the school district at the time of their first election to the board, and almost half had one more children still attending the school district (47.5%, n = 48). Every school board member indicated they are not compensated (n = 101).

The majority of participants were from suburban districts (82.2%, n = 83). Districts with fewer than 2,500 students comprised about a third (32.65%, n = 32), and two-fifths served between 2,500 and 4,999 (41.84%, n = 41) students. 91.1% of trustees serve 3-year terms (n = 92) and 56.4% of participants serve on seven-member boards (n = 57). Additional demographic tables can be found in Appendix C.

Table 3

Participant Demographics

	Frequency	Percent
Female	61	60.4
Male	40	39.6
New York State School Boards Association geographical area		
Area 1—Erie, Genesee, Niagara, Orleans, & Wyoming	2	2.0
Area 2—Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Seneca, Wayne, & Yates	7	6.9
Area 3—Allegany, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, & Steuben	2	2.0
Area 4—Broome, Cayuga, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Onondaga, Schuyler, Tioga, & Tompkins	4	4.0
Area 5—Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, & Oswego	5	5.0
Area 6—Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Hamilton, & St. Lawrence	2	2.0
Area 7—Albany, Columbia, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady, Warren, & Washington	5	5.0
Area 8—Delaware, Fulton, Montgomery, Otsego, & Schoharie	3	3.0
Area 9—Dutchess, Greene, Orange, Sullivan, & Ulster	5	5.0
Area 10—Putnam, Rockland, & Westchester	3	3.0
Area 11—Nassau	54	53.5
Area 12—Suffolk	9	8.9
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.0
Black or African American	1	1.0
White or Caucasian	95	94.1
Asian or Asian American	2	2.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2.0
Educational attainment		
High school degree or equivalent	3	3.0
Some college	9	8.9
Associate's degree	7	6.9
Bachelor's degree	32	31.7
Master's degree	36	35.6
Doctorate	14	13.9

	Frequency	Percent
Child(ren)		
Yes	96	95.0
No	5	5.0
Years of experience		
1 year	9	8.9
2 years	15	14.9
3 years	14	13.9
4 years	5	5.0
5 years	7	6.9
6 years	5	5.0
7 years	5	5.0
8 years	9	8.9
9 years	4	4.0
10 years	2	2.0
11 years	1	1.0
12 years	3	3.0
14 years	4	4.0
15 years	6	5.9
17 years	1	1.0
18 years	3	3.0
21 years	2	2.0
22 years	1	1.0
24 years	2	2.0
25 years	1	1.0
27 years	1	1.0
30 or more years	1	1.0
School-district urbanicity		
Urban	1	1.0
Suburban	83	82.2
Rural	17	16.8

	Frequency	Percent
School-district enrollment		
Fewer than 2,500 students	32	31.7
2,500 to 4,999 students	44	43.6
5,000 to 7,499 students	20	19.8
7,500 to 9,999 students	2	2.0
10,000 or more students	3	3.0

Population. The sample drew from a population of New York State Board of Education members. I generalized results to contemporary elected New York State school board members. I compared representativeness of the target population to the demographics of the NYSSBA.

Instrumentation

The electronic survey used to gather data was available on SurveyMonkey, designed to ascertain personal and district demographic information, the type and extent of volunteer and occupational experiences prior to candidacy, and preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance, including vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships. Modeled after the Ford and Ihrke (2015) and Hess and Meeks (2010) surveys, this instrument comprised 33 multiple-choice, multiple-response, Likert-type scale, and short-response questions shown in Appendix B. After receiving feedback from colleagues and supervisors, the editorial team at the NYSSBA reviewed the survey. I used feedback to further improve the instrument, prior to distribution. The anticipated completion time was approximately 15 minutes.

I entered each multiple-choice response into SPSS separately. The multiple-response school volunteer question asked respondents to check all of the following prior

experiences that applied to them: school PTA president (S1), school PTA nonpresident executive board (S2), school PTA committee member (S3), school PTA member who consistently attends meetings (S4), school PTA member who rarely attends meetings (S5), school PTA paper membership without meeting attendance (S6), school-level committee participations such as shared decision making (S7), district-level committee such as safety (S8), interview committee participant (S9), school/district athletic association member with consistent attendance (S10), school/district athletic association member with occasional attendance (S11), district PTA membership (S12), school/district music association member with consistent attendance (S13), school/district music association member with occasional attendance (S14), school/district theater association member with consistent attendance (S15), school/district theater association member with occasional attendance (S16), not applicable (S17), and other (S18). The multiple-response community volunteer question asked respondents to check all prior experiences that applied to them: neighborhood organization (C1), religious organization (C2), cultural organization (C3), library organization (C4), athletic organization (C5), fine or performing arts organization (C6), executive board experience (C7), or not applicable (C8).

The survey asked trustees to select the time frame prior to filing the necessary paperwork that best described their first consideration for school board candidacy. The six options included less than 1 year, between 1 and 2 years, between 2 and 3 years, between 3 and 4 years, between 4 and 5 years, or more than 5 years prior to filing the necessary paperwork. This question was meant to determine whether female trustees built a resume of volunteer experience after deciding to run for the board or if they

decided to become a candidate after volunteer experiences. The survey prompted participants to indicate which experiences best prepared them for membership on the board, in an open-response format.

The survey asked participants to rate their preparedness for each of the five action areas defined by the National School Boards Association on a 5-point Likert-type scale, as influenced by the Ford and Ihrke (2015) instrument. Zero denoted "not at all" and a response of 3 indicated "completely prepared." A higher score indicated greater preparation for the Key Work action area described. The survey included one item for each action area, including vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships.

I used Cronbach's alpha to evaluate reliability. Review by experts established content validity, including Executive Assistant Metheny of the NYSSBA, who shared the instrument with members of the editorial team. I revised and streamlined the survey instrument with feedback from members of the editorial team. The selected threshold, alpha, for statistical significance was .05.

Treatment/intervention. This study had an ex post facto nonexperimental design; hence no treatment conditions were implemented.

Procedures for Collecting Data

I submitted an Institutional Review Board application through Cayuse and obtained the necessary institution and NYSSBA approvals to conduct research. NYSSBA staff included information about the study in an electronic monthly newsletter distributed to members in each of the 13 geographic areas. Potential participants from the population of New York State school board members received an identical invitation

in the form of a hyperlink to complete the survey on SurveyMonkey. The survey began with details about me, the significance of the study, approximate completion time, and limited physical and mental concerns related to participation in the study, aligned with Institutional Review Board guidelines. The survey was open for approximately 3 weeks. I also used professional networks to increase the number of study participants. A response rate of 2% would have exceeded the minimum number of participants.

I first asked participants who followed the link to the electronic survey to read and acknowledge the informed consent prior to participation in the study (see Appendix A). The informed consent provides contact information for the appropriate St. John's University faculty overseeing the dissertation and research process and me. The anticipated survey completion time was 15–20 minutes. All responses were anonymous. The survey controls were set to exclude all respondent information, including names, e-mail addresses, and IP addresses from results of the survey.

The survey began with personal and district demographic questions. I requested demographic information in the same survey as the volunteer and occupational experiences questions to connect the data by gender and to ensure representation of the sample. I requested no personally identifiable information in the survey. Responses accrued in a spreadsheet and input into SPSS for statistical testing and analysis.

Research ethics. In adherence to the Institutional Review Board requirements, the informed consent provided information about the voluntary nature of participation. Participants indicated agreement with the informed consent by clicking "submit" and moving to the first page of the survey. Anonymity was protected by the confidentiality of responses. I secured the data on my laptop with additional password protection.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this cross-sectional nonexperimental correlational study was to investigate whether gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences predict the preparedness of elected school board members in New York State. I used the Key Work framework to measure preparedness for the five action areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and board/superintendent relationships (Gemberling et al., 2015). In addition, based on gender, I further investigated to what extent, if any, differences emerged in the school, community, and occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members. I designed this chapter to review the sample demographics, share the survey results, and respond to each of the research questions and related hypotheses.

The sample of elected school board trustees drew from a population of the NYSSBA membership recruited through the NYSSBA electronic newsletter, my professional networks, the district board of education accounts, and the snowballing method. I collected a total of 114 responses, 104 participants completed the survey, and elected school board members submitted 102 of the completed surveys. The results described below reflect the responses of completed surveys of elected school board members who indicated male or female as gender ($N = 101$).

Female board members represented 60.4% of respondents ($n = 61$). Participants self-reported school volunteer experience prior to board membership. Approximately half of female respondents listed school PTA experience as president (50.82%, $n = 31$), on the PTA executive board (44.26%, $n = 27$), as a PTA committee member (57.38%,

n = 35), on a school building committee (45.9%, *n* = 28), on a district committee (49.18%, *n* = 30), or on an interview committee (44.26%, *n* = 27). The frequency of self-reported male school board members school volunteer experiences averaged 13.95%. The highest frequency of participation was on district level committees (30%, *n* = 12), followed by participation on school PTA committees (20%, *n* = 8), school PTA president (17.5%, *n* = 7), and school PTA executive board (15%, *n* = 6). Of female participants, 42.62% reported five or more different school volunteer experiences (*n* = 26); 12.5% of male participants reported five or more different school volunteer experiences (*n* = 5); 1.64% of women reported no school volunteer experience (*n* = 1); and 25% of men reported the same (*n* =10).

The highest frequencies of community volunteer experiences were in the categories of neighborhood and athletic organizations. Approximately half of male respondents reported community volunteer experience in each neighborhood (47.5%, *n* = 19) and athletic (47.5%, *n* = 19) organizations; 42.62% of women reported each neighborhood (*n* = 26) and 37.7% athletic (*n* = 23) organizations; 42.62% of women (*n* = 26) and 32.5% of men (*n* =13) reported holding executive board positions in a community organization; and 16.39% of female participants (*n* = 10) and 12.5% of male participants reported no community volunteer experience (*n* =5).

Approximately half of male participants (52.5%, *n* = 21) and a third of female participants (39.34%, *n* = 24) reported full-time employment; 13.11% of women (*n* = 8) and no male participants reported part-time employment; and 14.75% of women (*n* = 9) and 2.5% of men (*n* = 1) reported no current employment and not seeking employment.

I calculated Cronbach's alpha (.834) to determine the reliability of the five preparedness for governance indicators.

Findings

RQ1: To what extent can gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences predict preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and Board/Superintendent relationships?

H_{01}: Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences are not statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and Board/Superintendent relationships.

H_{a1}: Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences are statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the areas of vision, accountability, policy, community leadership, and Board/Superintendent relationships.

I conducted a multiple linear regression to predict preparedness for vision based on gender, school volunteer experience, community volunteer experience, and occupation ($N = 101$). In the case of categorical predictors, the assumption of linearity was weak and could not be established. Based on a visual inspection of scatterplots and normality plots, no significant deviations from normality occurred and the assumption of normality was met. Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; the assumption of independence were met. Based on a visual inspection of residuals, no autocorrelational errors or patterns emerged; the assumption of homoscedasticity was

met. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, identifying that the independent variables were not closely related. The alpha level for all statistical tests was established as .05.

I used the enter method to identify statistically significant predictors of preparedness for vision (M = 3.38, SD = .786). As shown in Table 4, the overall regression model was statistically significant, $F(39, 100) = 1.925$, $p = .011$ with an R^2_{Adjusted} of .265. When considered together, gender, the numbers and types of school and community volunteer experiences, occupational field, and employment status accounted for 26.5% of the variance in preparedness for vision as a component of school governance.

Table 4

Vision Variance for All Predictors

				Change statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	F change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F change
.743	.552	.265	.673	.552	1.925	39	61	.011

The following categories had statistical significance when included as part of each variable: school volunteer experience including PTA president (β= -.351, p = .029), PTA member with no meeting attendance (β= .285, p = .006), athletic association member with occasional activity (β= .251, p = .027), and other school volunteer experiences (β= -.381, p = .001); community volunteer experiences with organizations including religious (β= .322, p = .013), cultural (β= -.274, p = .025); and occupational experience including education (β= .368, p = .002). Table 5 encapsulates

only the statistically significant variables for preparedness for vision. The complete coefficients table is available in Appendix C.

Table 5

Statistically Significant Predictors of Preparedness for Vision

Source	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.316	.384		8.642	.000
School PTA[a] President	-.567	.253	-.351	-2.239	.029
School PTA member –no meetings attended	1.310	.462	.285	2.834	.006
Athletic assoc. member (occasionally attends, vol.[b], etc.)	.773	.341	.251	2.266	.027
Other school vol. experience	-.721	.205	-.381	-3.512	.001
Religious org.[c]	.556	.217	.322	2.565	.013
Cultural org.	-.559	.243	-.274	-2.296	.025
Education	.579	.180	.368	3.220	.002

[a] Parent-Teacher Association, [b] Volunteer, [c] Organization.

The standardized beta represented the magnitude of each independent variable's ability to predict preparedness for vision. The absolute value of each standardized beta was small and reflected the power of the variable to increase preparedness with a positive value or decrease preparedness with a negative value. In the case of small beta values, it was important not to inflate the predictability of each independent variable.

I ran a stepwise multiple linear regression using each statistically significant predictor of preparedness for vision to provide additional insight into the strength of the significance by independent variable categories. When considered together, the statistically significant predictors accounted for 31.6% ($R^2_{\text{Adjusted}} = .316$) of the variance in vision. Table 6 features the variance for significant predictors using the stepwise method. The outcome of the preparedness for vision regression was statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level, and I rejected the null hypothesis. Gender,

school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences were statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the area of vision in this sample.

Table 6

Vision Variance for Significant Predictors

				Change Statistics		
	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	F change	Sig. F change
Education	.318	.101	.092	.749	11.134	.001
Education, Other School Vol. Exp.	.442	.195	.179	.712	11.496	.001
Education, Other School Vol. Exp., School PTA member—no meetings	.489	.239	.216	.696	5.608	.020
Education, Other School Vol. Exp., School PTA member—no meetings, Athletic Assoc. member (occasionally attends)	.520	.270	.239	.685	4.004	.048
Education, Other School Vol. Exp., School PTA member—no meetings, Athletic Assoc. member (occasionally attends), Religious org.	.553	.305	.269	.672	4.842	.030
Education, Other School Vol. Exp., School PTA member—no meetings, Athletic Assoc. member (occasionally attends), Religious org., School PTA President	.578	.334	.291	.661	3.998	.048
Education, Other School Vol. Exp., School PTA member—no meetings, Athletic Assoc. member (occasionally attends), Religious org., School PTA President, Cultural org.	.603	.364	.316	.650	4.377	.039

In the area of vision, 55.4% of respondents reported they were completely prepared (n = 56), 27.7% reported mostly prepared (n = 28), 15.8% reported somewhat prepared (n = 16), 1% reported being barely prepared (n = 1), and 0% reported not prepared. Four school volunteer types, two community volunteer types, and education as occupational experience had statistical significance in preparedness for vision.

I conducted a multiple linear regression to predict preparedness for accountability based on gender, school volunteer experience, community volunteer experience, and occupation ($N = 101$). For categorical predictors, the assumption of linearity was weak and could not be established. Based on a visual inspection of scatterplots and normality plots, no significant deviations from normality occurred; the assumption of normality was met. Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; the assumption of independence was met. Based on a visual inspection of residuals, no autocorrelational errors or patterns emerged; the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, identifying that the independent variables were not closely related. The alpha level for all statistical tests was established as .05.

I used the enter method to identify statistically significant predictors of preparedness for accountability ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .853$). The overall regression model was statistically significant, $F(39, 100) = 1.611$, $p = .047$, with an R^2_{Adjusted} of .192. When considered together, gender, the numbers and types of school and community volunteer experiences, occupational field, and employment status accounted for 19.2% of the variance in preparedness for accountability as a component of school governance (see Table 7).

Table 7

Accountability Variance for All Predictors

				Change Statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.712	.507	.192	.767	.507	1.611	39	61	.047

The following categories had statistical significance when included as part of each variable: school volunteer experience including athletic association member with occasional activity (β= .256, p = .031) and other school volunteer experiences (β= -.271, p = .020); community volunteer experiences with organizations including religious (β= .270, p = .045) and no community volunteer experience (β= .371, p = .003); and occupational experiences including farming/fishing/forestry (β= -.246, p = .025). Table 8 encapsulates only the statistically significant variables for vision preparedness.

Table 8

Statistically Significant Predictors of Preparedness for Accountability

Source	*B*	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.856	.389	.256	2.202	.031
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.558	.234	-.271	-2.387	.020
Religious organization	.506	.247	.270	2.052	.045
No Community Volunteer Experience	.940	.299	.371	3.142	.003
Farming/fishing/forestry	-1.497	.652	-.246	-2.297	.025

The standardized beta represented the magnitude of each independent variable's ability to predict preparedness for accountability. The absolute value of each standardized beta was small and reflected the power of the variable to increase preparedness with a positive value or decrease preparedness with a negative value. In the case of small beta values, it was important not to inflate the predictability of each independent variable.

I ran a stepwise multiple linear regression using each statistically significant predictor of preparedness for accountability to provide additional insight into the strength of the significance by independent variable categories. As shown in Table 9, when considered together, the statistically significant predictors account for 14.5% ($R^2_{\text{Adjusted}} = .145$) of the variance in accountability as a component for school governance.

Table 9

Accountability Variance for Significant Predictors

					Change Statistics		
	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	F change	Sig. F change
Farming/fishing/forestry	.324	.105	.096	.811	.105	11.610	.001
Farming/fishing/forestry, No Community Vol. Exp.	.402	.162	.145	.789	.057	6.627	.012

The outcome of the preparedness for accountability regression was statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis. Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences were statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the area of accountability in this sample.

In the area of accountability, 61.4% of respondents reported they were completely prepared ($n = 62$), 24.8% reported mostly prepared ($n = 25$), 11.9% reported somewhat prepared ($n = 12$), 0% reported being barely prepared, and 2% reported not prepared ($n = 2$). Preparedness for accountability had the largest difference in the number of completely prepared responses by gender with 65.6% of women ($n = 40$) and 55% of men ($n = 22$) reporting being completely prepared for accountability.

I conducted a multiple linear regression to predict preparedness for policy based on gender, school volunteer experience, community volunteer experience, and occupation ($N = 101$). In the case of categorical predictors, the assumption of linearity was weak and could not be established. Based on a visual inspection of scatterplots and normality plots, no significant deviations from normality emerged; the assumption of normality was met. Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; the assumption of independence was met. Based on a visual inspection of residuals, no autocorrelational errors or patterns emerged; the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, identifying that the independent variables were not closely related. The alpha level for all statistical tests was established as .05.

I used the enter method to identify statistically significant predictors of preparedness for policy ($M = 3.22$, $SD = .820$). As shown in Table 10, the overall regression model was not statistically significant, $F(39, 100) = .717$, $p = .865$, with an R^2_{Adjusted} of -.124. The outcome of the regression was not statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level. Therefore, I did not reject the null hypothesis. Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences were not statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the area of policy in this sample.

Table 10

Policy Variance for All Predictors

				Change Statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 Change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.561	.314	-.124	.869	.314	.717	39	61	.865

In the area of policy, 46.5% of respondents reported they were completely prepared ($n = 47$), 28.7% reported mostly prepared ($n = 29$), 25.8% reported somewhat prepared ($n = 25$), and 0% reported being barely or not prepared. Policy had the lowest percentage of respondents who reported being completely prepared (46.55%) and the highest frequency of respondents who selected somewhat prepared or less (24.8%).

I conducted a multiple linear regression to predict preparedness for community leadership based on gender, school volunteer experience, community volunteer experience, and occupation ($N = 101$). In the case of categorical predictors, the assumption of linearity was weak and could not be established. Based on a visual inspection of scatterplots and normality plots, no significant deviations from normality occurred; thus, the assumption of normality was met. Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; thus, the assumption of independence was deemed to have been met. Based on a visual inspection of residuals, no autocorrelational errors or patterns emerged; the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, identifying that the independent variables were not closely related. The alpha level for all statistical tests was established as .05.

I used the enter method to identify statistically significant predictors of preparedness for community leadership ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.028$). The overall regression

model was statistically not significant, $F(39, 100) = 1.484$, $p = .082$, with an R^2_{Adjusted} of .159. The outcome of the regression was not statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level. Therefore, I did not reject the null hypothesis. Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences were not statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance in the area of community leadership in this sample.

In the area of community leadership, 55.4% of respondents reported that they were completely prepared ($n = 56$), 19.8% reported mostly or somewhat prepared ($n = 20$), 2% reported being barely prepared ($n = 2$), and 3% reported not prepared ($n = 3$; see Table 11).

Table 11

Community Leadership Variance for All Predictors

				Change Statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.698	.487	.159	.943	.487	1.484	39	61	.082

I conducted a multiple linear regression to predict preparedness for board/superintendent relationships based on gender, school volunteer experience, community volunteer experience, and occupation ($N = 99$). In the case of categorical predictors, the assumption of linearity was weak and could not be established. Based on a visual inspection of scatterplots and normality plots, no significant deviations from normality occurred; the assumption of normality was met. Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; thus, the assumption of independence was met. Based on a visual inspection of residuals, no autocorrelational errors or patterns

emerged; the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, identifying that the independent variables were not closely related. The alpha level for all statistical tests was established as .05.

I used the enter method to identify statistically significant predictors of preparedness for board/superintendent relationships (M = 3.40, SD = .957). As shown in Table 12, the overall regression model was statistically significant, $F(39, 98) = 2.236$, p =.003, with an R^2_{Adjusted} of .330. When considered together, gender, the numbers and types of school and community volunteer experiences, occupational field, and employment status accounted for 33% of the variance in preparedness for board/superintendent relationships as a component of school governance.

Table 12

Board/Superintendent Relationships Variance for All Predictors

				Change Statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	F change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F change
.772	.596	.330	.784	.596	2.236	39	59	.003

The following categories had statistical significance when included as part of each variable: school volunteer experience including PTA member with no meeting attendance (β= .229, p = .022), other school volunteer experiences (β= -.267, p = .013), no community volunteer experiences (β= .243, p = .032), and occupational experiences including business/commerce (β= -.344, p = .004) and government (β= -.231, p = .043). Table 13 encapsulates only the statistically significant variables for preparedness in board/superintendent relationships.

Table 13

Statistically Significant Predictors of Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships

Source	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
School Parent-Teacher Association member – no meetings attended	1.271	.538	.229	2.362	.022
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.613	.239	-.267	-2.559	.013
No Community Volunteer Experience	.686	.312	.243	2.200	.032
Business/commerce	-.727	.239	-.344	-3.040	.004

I ran a stepwise multiple linear regression using each statistically significant predictor of preparedness for respective action areas to provide additional insight into the strength of significance by independent variable categories. As demonstrated in Table 14, when considered together, the statistically significant predictors account for 4.4% ($R^2_{\text{Adjusted}} = .044$) of the variance in board/superintendent relationships as a component for school governance.

Table 14

Board/Superintendent Relationships Variance for All Predictors

					Change Statistics		
	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	Sig. *F* change
No Community Vol. Exp.	.232	.054	.044	1.005	.054	5.646	.019

The outcome of the preparedness for the board/superintendent relationships regression was statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level. I rejected the null hypothesis. Gender, school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences were statistically significant predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of

school board governance in the area of Board/Superintendent relationships in this sample.

The standardized beta represented the magnitude of each independent variable's ability to predict preparedness for board/superintendent relationships. The absolute value of each standardized beta was small and reflected the power of the variable to increase preparedness with a positive value or decrease preparedness with a negative value. In the case of small beta values, it was important not to inflate the predictability of each independent variable.

Board/Superintendent relationships had the highest percentage of respondents selecting completely prepared (63.6%); 20.2% (n = 20) reported being mostly prepared, 12.1% (n =12) reported being somewhat prepared; 1% (n = 1) reported being barely prepared; and 3% (n = 3) reported not being prepared. The combination of business/commerce experience, no community volunteer experience, PTA membership without attending meetings, and other types of school volunteer experiences were the only statistically significant predictors.

RQ2: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the school volunteer experiences of elected New York State school board members?

H_{02}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a2}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

I ran a series of chi square tests to determine how likely the observed distribution of school volunteer experience by gender was due to chance ($N = 101$). The mathematical assumption requiring that all variables be categorical for the use of chi square was met. The following school volunteer types had a significant asymptotic value and a significant difference between female and male participation: PTA president [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 11.428, $p = .001$, $\lambda = .051$], executive board [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 9.404, $p = .002$, $\lambda < .001$], PTA committees [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 13.805, $p < .001$, $\lambda = .181$], PTA member with consistent attendance [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 4.684, $p = .030$, $\lambda < .001$], school-level committee [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 12.252, $p < .001$, $\lambda = .027$], interview committee [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 11.260, $p = .001$, $\lambda = .014$], no school volunteer experience [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 13.585, $p = .001$, $\lambda = .176$], and other school volunteer experience [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .020, $p = .887$, $\lambda < .001$].

The following school volunteer types did not have a significant asymptotic value and did not have a significant difference between female and male participation: PTA with rare attendance [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 1.904, $p = .168$, $\lambda < .042$], PTA with no attendance [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .947, $p = .331$, $\lambda < .023$], district-level committee [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 3.659, $p = .056$, $\lambda < .001$], athletic association consistent [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 2.224, $p = .136$, $\lambda < .001$], athletic association occasional [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .967, $p = .325$, $\lambda = .021$], district PTA membership [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 2.767, $p = .096$, $\lambda < .001$], music association with consistent attendance [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .383, $p = .536$, $\lambda < .001$], music association with occasional attendance [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .051, $p = .822$, $\lambda < .001$], and theater association with consistent attendance [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) =

1.403, $p = .236$, $\lambda < .001$]. One variable—theater association occasional member—was not selected. Chi square tables are available in Appendix C.

I conducted an independent samples *t*-test to determine if a statistically significant difference emerged in the number of school volunteer experiences of New York State elected school board members by gender ($N = 101$, $p < .05$). Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; the assumption of independence was met. The data accrued from a representative sample of the population and met the assumption of a simple random sample. The number of school volunteer experience met the criteria for a ratio variable and the grouping variable, gender, had two categorical values, thus the scale of variable was met. I examined skew and kurtosis, found to be ±1; thus, the variables were normal enough for the purpose of a *t*-test, which is robust enough to withstand weak violations of normality (Cooper & Schindler, 2013).

The independent variable, gender, included two groups: female ($M = 4.197$, $SD = 2.645$, $n = 61$) and male ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 2.076$, $n = 40$). Levene's test for equality of variances was violated $F(2,101) = 4.989$, $p = .028$. Using the values for equal variances not assumed, a statistically significant difference emerged in the quantity of school volunteer experiences between female and male New York State elected school board members in this sample, $t(95.723) = 4.659$, $p < .001$. Women in this sample averaged 4.2 school volunteer experiences, more than double that of their male counterparts who averaged two school volunteer experiences each. The outcome of the independent samples *t*-test was statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level. I rejected the null hypothesis. Based on gender, a statistically significant difference

emerged in the numbers and types of school volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members in this sample (see Table 15).

Table 15

School Volunteer Experience by Gender-Group Statistics

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	Female	61	4.1967	2.64462
	Male	40	2.0000	2.07550

Female school board members in this sample reported more types and a higher number of school volunteer experiences, including roles in positions of leadership. Of female participants, 42.62% reported five or more different school volunteer experiences ($n = 26$) whereas 12.5% of male participants reported five or more different school volunteer experiences ($n = 5$). Of women, 1.64% reported no school volunteer experience ($n = 1$), and 25% of men reported the same ($n = 10$; see Table 16).

Table 16

Number of School Volunteer Experiences by Gender

		Levene's test for equality of variances		*t*-test for equality of means				
		F	Sig.	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	Equal variances assumed	4.989	.028	4.432	99	.000	2.19672	.49568
	Equal variances not assumed			4.659	95.723	.000	2.19672	.47154

RQ3: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the community volunteer experiences of elected New York State school board members?

H_{03}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a3}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

I ran a series of chi square tests to determine how likely the observed distribution of community volunteer experience by gender was due to chance ($N = 101$). The mathematical assumption requiring that all variables be categorical for the use of chi square was met.

Community volunteer types did not have significant asymptotic values and did not show a significant difference between female and male participation: neighborhood organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .233, $p = .630$, $\lambda < .001$], religious organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .446, $p = .504$, $\lambda < .001$], cultural organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 2.767, $p = .096$, $\lambda < .001$], library organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .162, $p = .687$, $\lambda < .001$], athletic organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .954, $p = .329$, $\lambda < .001$], fine or performing arts organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .428, $p = .513$, $\lambda < .001$], and executive board member for a community organization [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 1.044, $p = .307$, $\lambda < .001$]. Chi square tables are available in Appendix C.

I conducted an independent samples *t*-test to determine if a statistically significant difference emerged in the quantity of community volunteer experiences of New York State elected school board members by gender ($N = 101$, $p < .05$). Observations in this sample were independent and counted once; the assumption of independence was met. The data accrued from a representative sample of the population and met the assumption of a simple random sample. The number of school volunteer experience met the criteria for a ratio variable and the grouping variable, gender, had two categorical values; thus, the scale of variable was met. I examined skew and kurtosis and found ±1; the variables were normal enough for the purpose of a *t*-test, which is robust enough to withstand weak violations of normality (Cooper & Schindler, 2013).

The independent variable, gender, included two groups: female ($M = 1.984$, $SD = 1.443$, $n = 61$) and male ($M = 1.775$, $SD = 1.330$, $n = 40$). Levene's test for equality of variances was not violated $F(2,101) = .217$, $p = .642$. Using the values for equal variances assumed, no statistically significant difference emerged in the quantity of community volunteer experiences between female and male New York State elected school board members in this sample, $t(99) = .733$, $p = .466$. The outcome of the independent samples *t*-test was not statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level. Therefore, I did not reject the null hypothesis. Based on gender, no statistically significant difference emerged in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members.

Table 17

Community Volunteer Experience by Gender Group Statistics

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	Female	61	1.9836	1.44328
	Male	40	1.7750	1.32988

Approximately half of male (47.5%, *n* = 19) and female (42.62%, *n* = 26) school board members reported community volunteer experience in neighborhood organizations. Of men, 47.5% (*n* = 19) and of females 37.7% (*n* = 23) reported community volunteer experience in athletic organizations. Of women, 42.62% (*n* = 26) and of men, 32.5% (*n* =13) reported holding executive board positions in any community organization. Of female participants, 16.39% reported no community volunteer experience (*n* = 10), and 12.5% of their male counterparts reported no community volunteer experience (*n* =5; see Table 18).

Table 18

Number of Community Volunteer Experiences by Gender

		Levene's test for equality of variances		*t*-test for equality of means				
		F	Sig.	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	Equal variances assumed	.217	.642	.733	99	.466	.20861	.28478
	Equal variances not assumed			.745	88.278	.458	.20861	.27993

RQ4: Based on gender, to what extent, if any, is there a difference in the occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members?

H_{04}: Based on gender, no statistically significant difference exists in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members.

H_{a4}: Based on gender, a statistically significant difference exists in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members.

I ran a series of chi square tests to determine how likely the observed distribution of occupational field by gender was due to chance ($N = 101$). The mathematical assumption requiring all variables to be categorical for the use of chi square was met. The following occupational fields had a significant asymptotic value and a significant difference between female and male participation: government [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 4.167, $p = .041$, $\lambda = .071$] and homemaker [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 11.552, $p = .001$, $\lambda < .001$].

The following occupational fields did not have a significant asymptotic value and did not significantly differ between female and male participation: education [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .056, $p = .814$, $\lambda < .001$], business/commerce [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 1.750, $p = .186$, $\lambda < .001$], labor/production [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 2.182, $p = .140$, $\lambda = .045$], transportation [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) < .001, $p = .985$, $\lambda < .001$], farming/fishing/forestry [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 3.112, $p = .078$, $\lambda = .048$], sales [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .016, $p = .899$, $\lambda < .001$], construction [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 3.185, $p = .074$, $\lambda = .064$], professional services (law, medicine, etc.) [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = .436, $p = .509$, $\lambda < .001$], nonprofit [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) =.103, $p = .7488$, $\lambda < .001$], and other employment field [χ^2 (1, $N = 101$) = 2.767, $p = .096$, $\lambda < .001$]. Chi square tables are available in Appendix C.

I conducted an independent samples *t*-test to determine if a statistically significant difference emerged in the employment status of New York State elected school board members by gender ($N = 101$, $p < .05$). Observations in this sample were

independent and counted once; the assumption of independence was met. The data were collected from a representative sample of the population and met the assumption of a simple random sample. The number of school volunteer experiences met the criteria for a ratio variable and the grouping variable, gender, has two categorical values; thus, the scale of variable was met. I examined skewness and found ±1. Kurtosis (-1.190) exceeded the value of ±1 and violated the assumption of normality. The variables were deemed normal enough for the purpose of a *t*-test, which is robust enough to withstand weak violations of normality (Cooper & Schindler, 2013).

The independent variable, gender, included two groups: women ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 2.243$, $n = 61$) and men ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 2.672$, $n = 40$). Levene's test for equality of variances was met $F(2,101) = 3.688$, $p = .058$. Using the values for equal variances assumed, no statistically significant difference emerged in employment status between female and male New York State elected school board members in this sample, $t(99) = -.273$, $p = .785$. The outcome of the independent samples *t*-test was not statistically significant at the predetermined alpha level. Therefore, I did not reject the null hypothesis. Based on gender, no statistically significant difference emerged in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members (see Table 19).

Table 19

Employment Status by Gender Group Statistics

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Employment Status	Female	61	3.07	2.243
	Male	40	3.20	2.672

As revealed in the data, 25% of women reported occupational experience as a homemaker, 13% reported part-time employment, and 15% reported not currently employed without seeking employment. The occupational fields reported most frequently by women and men were education (44%) and business/commerce (28%). The greatest frequency of employment status responses in this study was reported as full-time employment (45%) and retired (22%).

Conclusion. When considered together, types of school volunteer, community volunteer, and occupational experiences were statistically significant predictors of vision, accountability, and board/superintendent relationships. Gender had no statistical significance for any of the Key Work framework five action areas. No statistical significance emerged between the predictors and policy and community leadership. The results of the chi square tests suggested a statistical difference for half of the responses in the type of school volunteer experiences and the independent samples *t*-test suggested a statistical difference in the type of school volunteer experiences. Neither the type nor the number of community volunteer experiences had statistical significance when comparing female and male responses. Based on gender, no statistically significant difference emerged in the numbers and types of community volunteer experiences self-reported by school board members. Based on gender, no statistically significant difference emerged in the occupational experiences self-reported by school board members. I discuss the implications of these findings in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion and Conclusions

In this correlational study, I investigated whether gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences predict preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance (Gemberling et al., 2015). In addition, I investigated to what extent differences arose in the volunteer and occupational experiences of elected New York State school board members, based on gender. I designed Chapter 5 to discuss the possible implications, context, and limitations of the findings and offer recommendations for future research and practice.

Boards of education are charged with hiring and evaluating the superintendent, developing and adopting policies, and shaping the vision of the district (NYSSBA, 2019a). This governing body also adopts the annual budget and classroom textbooks, oversees personnel, curricula, and facility maintenance, and engages with stakeholders in an official capacity (NYSSBA, 2015). Though the interaction between school board members and the student population is indirect, their decisions impact students every day (Honingh et al., 2018).

Nearly half of the school board trustees throughout the United States are women (Hess & Meeks, 2010). Women are elected to school board seats at a greater frequency than to the seat of any other publicly elected official (Deckman, 2007). In this study, female board members represented 60.4% of respondents (n = 61) and male board members represented 39.6% of respondents (n = 40). In the search for participants, gender was an independent variable, perhaps prompting female school board members to respond at higher rates than are represented in the population.

National School Boards Association (n.d.) statistics listed that 75% of board of education trustees hold a bachelor's degree or higher; in comparison, 81% of participants in this study self-reported the same. The number of respondents with doctorates was 13.9% (n = 14), which may be higher than the frequency in the broader population, as board members with that level of educational attainment may be more likely to participate in research. Although candidate eligibility lacks an educational attainment requirement, Bartanen et al. (2018) reported that localized geographic areas with a more educated population had a greater representation on their school boards. Also reported, the researchers reported a higher representation of school board members in localized areas with a higher concentration of school-aged children. In the current study, 95% of participants have at least one child, and 85% had at least one child enrolled in the school system when initially seeking election.

Of those surveyed, 91% serve 3-year terms, and 38% have 3 years or less of experience as a school board trustee. Approximately half of respondents had 5 or fewer years of experience. Alsbury (2008) reported that lower rates of turnover correlated with student achievement, suggesting that more experience contributes to cohesiveness and school board success.

Each trustee has a set of values and ideas based on their past experiences. Political ideology significantly differs by gender and those differences impact the decision-making process (Deckman, 2006). Gender stereotypes are perpetuated through board service, including female trustees in PTA and homemaker roles and male trustees in financial and facility roles (Tallerico, 1992). In a study about perceptions of vocal space by gender, Mountford and Brunner (2010) suggested a need to acknowledge

gender differences in decision-making processes rather than ignoring those differences. The interaction between board members, the school system, the community, and occupational experiences may correlate to different levels of preparedness for school board governance. Understanding and acknowledging differences among board members will help researchers study the predictors of school board governance, promote best practices, and improve effectiveness.

Interpretation of Results

Research Question 1. Participants in this study self-reported preparedness for each of the five action areas on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Responses ranged from not at all prepared to completely prepared. Study findings suggested that gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences predicted the Key Work of school board governance in three of the five action areas: vision, accountability, and board/superintendent relationships. Approximately half of all participants self-reported being completely prepared for each of the five action areas. This preparation may be attributed to NYSSBA-required training or individual research about the roles and responsibilities of trustees.

In a study focused on superintendents and district success, Waters and Marzano (2006) emphasized the importance of vision and accountability in school board governance. As reported in the Chapter 4 findings, each of these action areas had statistical significance by gender, volunteer experience, and occupational experience. In the present study, a 3% difference emerged in the self-reported preparedness between men and women reporting complete preparation in four of five action areas: 65.6% of women (n = 40) and 55% of men (n = 22) reported being completely prepared for

accountability. This statistic may be of importance, as Lorentzen (2013) suggested statistical significance between a focus on accountability and student achievement. VanTuyle and Watkins (2017) found that female board of education presidents reported high rates of self-efficacy, especially in the areas of accountability and community leadership. Findings from the current study reported that women had more school volunteer experiences than men. This may suggest that women have more interaction with teachers and school officials and have a greater understanding of what is measured and how proficiency is reported.

The lowest percentage of respondents who reported being completely prepared was in the area of policy (46.55%). The same action area also had the highest frequency of respondents who selected somewhat prepared or less (24.8%). Although I did not expect or report a statistical difference in this area, I anticipated a lower preparedness score for male and female participants in occupational fields outside of those addressing policy, such as government or professional service, including the field of law. Even though the district lawyer assists with legal jargon and the required structure, understanding policy development and when a lack of policy is appropriate necessitates training. The lack of a stronger significance between those occupations and policy was surprising. Perhaps a larger sample, a specific category for law in occupational fields, or the inclusion of educational attainment would yield targeted data related to this area.

I anticipated and reported a statistically significant difference in the area of vision. Interactions with social institutions—school, community, or occupational—may provide greater insight into organizational structures, promote collaborative effort, and serve as a pipeline or access point to school board election. Such volunteerism may be a

social construct for women and relate to the occupational skillsets of men (Wilson, 2000, 2012). Those who seek candidacy may consider board service as an extension of their volunteer and occupational experiences or as a way to address a specific concern when otherwise uninvolved in the school system. These factors may contribute to the difference in preparation for vision as a component of school board governance.

Though not found in the data analyzed, I anticipated statistical significance in the action area of community leadership, as I expected that those who serve in multiple organizations would possess the social capital necessary to facilitate productive action. However, trustees outside of the organization may have external ties that offset the redundant relationships of those in the organization. Thinking of the school board elections globally, candidates may run unopposed or may need to campaign for election against others for a seat or through an at-large election. Investigating the social capital of school board candidates as predictors for election may enhance understanding of community leadership and school board governance.

The highest percentage of respondents selecting completely prepared (63.6%) was in the area of board/superintendent relationships. The statistical significance between preparedness for board/superintendent relationships and volunteer experiences, occupational experiences, and gender was not entirely surprising. When looking at the significance of each category, business/commerce had strong significance. When working in positions of power and forming professional relationships, interactions with a CEO figure may not be as intimidating as it is for those in other fields.

Research Question 2. The self-reported school volunteer experiences prior to board membership revealed patterns in types and numbers of volunteer experiences

based on gender, corroborating Wilson's (2000, 2012) study of volunteerism. Deckman (2007) also reported that women have a higher representation in school PTAs than their male counterparts. In the current study, not only did female school board members in this sample report a greater variety in the types of school volunteer experiences, their roles were in positions of leadership. Although the overrepresentation of female leaders contrasts with Wilson's (2000) findings, volunteerism activities were in stereotypically female roles.

Approximately half of female respondents reported experience as school PTA president (50.82%, *n* = 31), on the PTA executive board (44.26%, *n* = 27), as a PTA committee member (57.38%, *n* = 35), on a school building committee (45.9%, *n* = 28), on a district committee (49.18%, *n* = 30), or on an interview committee (44.26%, *n* = 27). Contrastingly, the highest frequency of self-reported experiences by male school board members were on district-level committees (30%, *n* = 12), followed by participation on school PTA committees (20%, *n* = 8), as school PTA president (17.5%, *n* = 7), and on the school PTA executive board (15%, *n* = 6).

The data revealed that 1.64% of women reported no school volunteer experience (*n* = 1), and 25% of men reported the same (*n* = 10). Of female participants, 42.62% reported five or more different school volunteer experiences (*n* = 26) whereas 12.5% of male participants reported five or more different school volunteer experiences (*n* = 5). The prevalence of multiple types of reported volunteer work may be a result of possessing the necessary human capital and being asked to serve in a variety of roles. Also, as school-aged children move to new buildings, the contribution of parents and volunteer opportunities may continue to evolve.

In accordance with research findings by Wilson (2000, 2012), women in this study were more likely to engage in experiences driven toward stereotypical gender roles in their volunteerism. However, in contrast to Wilson's work (2000), women in this sample held a greater number of leadership roles in these volunteer experiences than their male counterparts. This experience may suggest that women have a better understanding of daily operations, more frequent interactions with administrative leadership, and increased access to a variety of stakeholders. It is important to note that a desire to volunteer may not equate to the human capital necessary for volunteerism. Furthermore, the availability of and access to volunteer opportunities are subject to the size and structure of each school community.

Research Question 3. No significant differences arose in the types or numbers of community volunteer experiences based on gender. The highest frequencies of reported community volunteer experiences were in neighborhood and athletic organizations. Approximately half of male respondents reported community volunteer experience in neighborhood (47.5%, $n = 19$) and athletic (47.5%, $n = 19$) organizations. In contrast, 42.62% of women reported experience volunteering in neighborhood organizations ($n = 26$) and 37.7% in athletic organizations ($n = 23$). Of women, 42.62% ($n = 26$) and of men, 32.5% ($n = 13$) reported holding executive board positions in any community organization. Again, the overrepresentation of female leadership in community volunteer organizations contrasted with Wilson's (2000) findings. Last, 16.39% of female participants reported no community volunteer experience ($n = 10$), and 12.5% of male counterparts reported the same ($n = 5$).

I expected a higher frequency of male participation in each of the community volunteer categories, viewing men as an extension of occupational experiences promoting success through the development of civic skills (Wilson, 2000). The stereotype of male coaches and involvement in athletic organizations was not evident in the data, though results revealed nearly a 10% difference in athletic volunteerism by gender. Furthermore, the review of prior research suggested greater traditional, conservative, and religious values reported by male school board members (Deckman, 2007) and the prevalence male volunteerism as an extension of "civic skills" developed through occupational experience (Wilson, 2000). Thus, I anticipated a significant difference in community volunteerism based on gender, especially in cultural and religious organizations. The rate of community volunteer experiences in each category may be attributed to the availability of community organizations. Researchers may consider examining the volunteerism of school board members compared with the availability of various community organizations in the future.

Research Question 4. Patterns emerged in occupational fields and employment statuses by gender, despite no statistically significant difference in the analyzed data. As identified in the social relations approach, stereotypical gender roles perpetuate inequities in the distribution of responsibilities (March et al., 1999). Mothers are typically the caretakers, whereas fathers are the breadwinners for the family. Data from this study reinforced these stereotypical gender roles. Of women in this sample, 25% reported experience as a homemaker, 13% reported part-time employment, and 15% reported no current employed without seeking employment. In accordance with findings

reported by Tallerico (1992) and Deckman (2007), women are stereotyped into homemaker and caretaker roles.

The greatest frequency of school board members in this study were employed full-time (45%) or retired (22%). Approximately half of male participants (52.5%, $n = 21$) and a third of female participants (39.34%, $n = 24$) reported full-time employment. For example, 13.11% of women ($n = 8$) reported part-time employment whereas no men reported the same; 14.75% of women ($n = 9$) and 2.5% of men ($n = 1$) reported not seeking employment while unemployed. The lack of significant differences in occupational experiences by gender may be representative of a shift in societal structures, the support of educational attainment for female students, and the increased cost of living, thereby reducing the frequency of households with a homemaker.

The occupational fields most frequently reported were education (44%) and business/commerce (28%). These frequencies exceeded demographic information in the Hess and Meeks (2010) study, wherein researchers reported 27.1% in education and 18.1% in business. In contrast to findings reported by Deckman (2007), a higher percentage of men (45%) in the current study reported experience in education, a female-dominated industry, than their female counterparts (43%). Shober and Hartney (2014) suggested that occupational experience impacted trustees' priorities and understanding of the district. Those with educational experience supported collective bargaining and were more likely to report financial constraints as the most significant barrier to academic success, regardless of the financial status of the district. No correlation arose between business experience and academic success, despite the perception that people in the field have a higher level of accountability and bring about

improvement at all costs. The predominance of education and business/commerce occupational experience reported in this study highlighted findings suggested by Shober and Hartney.

A greater proportion of men reported experience in stereotypically masculine occupations, including labor/production, farming/fishing/forestry, construction, and government. Contrastingly, women had a higher percentage of self-reported professional services, including law and medicine (22.95%, n = 14) than men (17.5%, n = 7) despite gender stereotypes. Variance in the cost of living and job markets throughout New York State may impact the occupational experiences of board members. Continuing to observe changes in society may offer insight into how the experiences of school board members evolve over time.

Limitations

The response rate to the survey determined the sample size of the study and was lower than anticipated, due to the timing of conducting and completing research and mitigating circumstances. The global pandemic known as COVID-19 and the necessity for institutional responses may have limited the number of participants in the study and representativeness of the sample. A smaller sample size than intended limited the statistical impact of the findings.

Volunteer bias threatened external validity, as participants' responses may not represent the opinions and ideology of those who choose not to participate in a survey of this nature. Though data included all survey respondents who met the criteria for this study, the overrepresentation of geographic areas limited the generalizability of the findings. Although the data analysis represented 12 of the 13 NYSSBA geographic

areas, most responses came from Region 11, Nassau county (53.5%, $n = 54$), where my professional networks are based. With so many responses from one region, the findings may not be representative of the population throughout the state. The availability of volunteer experiences, occupational fields, and other regional factors may influence opportunities for engagement. Furthermore, an oversampling of men is needed to balance the overrepresentation of women in school volunteer experience statistics.

Social desirability bias is another limitation of the study. Respondents may have reported a higher level of preparedness for the five action areas to appear more competent. Threats to internal validity were the most significant limitation of this associational research design (Fraenkel et al., 2019). Although relationships were established, I lacked the ability to measure an intervention group against a control group; thus, causation could not be established.

Implications for Future Research

Additional research is necessary to reinforce the findings of this study, as no prior research corroborated the volunteerism data of school board members at the time of publication. Researchers who wish to replicate the study should seek to expand the sample size and diversity of participants and districts. Researchers may also consider expanding the present study to investigate regions outside of the tristate area or between NYSSBA regions more extensively.

The timing of the research was a significant limitation of this study. Beyond the restrictions related to doctoral program timelines, the distribution of this survey instrument at the beginning of March may have contributed to the low response rate. The survey was closed as the governor implemented New York Policies Assure

Uniform Safety for Everyone, as not to skew data involving occupational and volunteer experiences.

Researchers may consider expanding the work of Wilson (2000, 2012) to examine volunteerism as it relates to school board candidacy, social capital, and a school board pipeline. Expanding research methodologies to include quantitative and mixed-methods studies, including focus groups and ethnographic accounts of individual experiences, may promote a better understanding of the development of gendered differences and perceptions of necessary volunteer and occupational experiences prior to candidacy.

Furthermore, connecting district achievement data with preparedness for school board governance, gender, and volunteer and occupational experiences will better determine the importance of these variables, as researchers strive to promote success for all students. Researchers may also consider examining the availability and impact of targeted training opportunities for new and returning board members to address gaps in knowledge, understanding, and skills, based on self-evaluation inventories and performance reviews.

Investigating the encouragement for candidacy by different stakeholder groups will enhance understanding of a school board pipeline and further identify differences in social capital by gender. An examination of differences in the timeline for candidacy consideration by gender through a qualitative approach may also expand knowledge of volunteerism in the school setting. Researchers can also investigate preparedness for school board governance by educational attainment, as Wilson (2012) identified educational attainment as the strongest predictor of volunteerism.

A focus on the relationship between the school board and superintendent may offer additional insight into preparedness and success, once elected to the board of education. Further, an examination of the availability and quality of targeted training opportunities for new and returning board members beyond the initial mandatory training may reveal best practices for continuous improvement for all members.

Implications for Future Practice

Continuous improvement is integral to the advancement of education and necessary to support academic achievement. Acknowledging differences in preparation and experiences by using self-evaluation inventories aligned with workshop offerings may enhance the effectiveness of training opportunities targeted to specific needs. Furthermore, evaluating collective board experiences and conducting a needs assessment may promote a positive group dynamic. The addition of a pre- and post-school year assessment aligned with NYSSBA workshop offerings may promote engagement in continuous improvement efforts. The ultimate goal is to refine best practices and facilitate growth for new and continuing members as they strive to advance student learning.

Though not directly linked to the findings from this study, potential candidates and community members may benefit from a working knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of the school board to better understand the purview of the governing body. Depending on the timeline for candidacy consideration, potential school board members may benefit from increased participation in school matters and a higher frequency of interactions with school personnel. Furthermore, potential candidates may benefit from increased familiarity with the Key Work framework to target learning

opportunities in the areas in which they may be less prepared. For example, female potential candidates may consider an inventory of civic skills, especially if they are not currently employed and not seeking employment. The NYSSBA (2019b) suggested characteristics of successful school board members, including strong communication and listening skills; the ability to build consensus, process information, and make decisions; immersion in the community and leadership skills; and being a supportive member of the team. Potential male candidates may benefit from increased interactions with administrators, teachers, and school volunteer opportunities to enhance their understanding of the organization. These actions promote well-rounded and informed members of the community.

Community members deciding who to endorse may consider which candidate best represents their values and beliefs while investigating how the new school board member would round out the volunteer and occupational experiences of sitting members. Using a "meet the candidates" type forum, stakeholders may consider asking about how the new member and their skillsets developed from those experiences would complement those of the existing governing body. When interacting with the board of education, understanding the roles and responsibilities of the board will promote productive relationships and reduce personal agendas or divisive actions.

Central office administrators can encourage transparent practices, promote the vision of the school and district, and strive to engage male and female board members in school activities and meetings to foster a productive and well-prepared relationships. A strong working relationship between administrators and school board members is beneficial to the organization. Because school board members reported the lowest score

in preparedness for policy, assume responsibility accountability, and must be familiar with operations, administrators may consider strategic presentations, school board member committee assignments, and informative meetings to better prepare new and continuing school board members for governance.

Building leaders, teachers, and other school personnel can promote best practices, clarify measures of accountability in the classroom, and communicate strategic action plans at the macro- and microlevels to help school board members understand the *why* and *how* involved in plans for continuous improvement while maintaining a view of the larger goals. Agencies and corporations interacting with schools may benefit from a better understanding of school board members' experiences to connect with individuals and the collective governing body. Connecting with the vision of the district and aligning with improvement plans while using common language may advance the relationship between outside agencies and school boards. Additionally, understanding the prerequisite volunteer experiences of the membership and demonstrating value to those groups or causes may appeal to individual members.

Students wishing to advocate for themselves and peers may consider directing presentations to the specific audience to facilitate productive action and desired results. Some school boards have also invited a high school student to be a nonvoting member of the school board, to serve as a voice of the students during the decision-making process.

Conclusion

Often unnoticed by the general public, school boards provide a structure that guides practical applications in classrooms and administrative offices throughout the

district. This study supported the researcher's hypothesis that gender, volunteer experiences, and occupational experiences were predictors of preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance and a statistically significant difference emerged in the types and numbers of school volunteer experiences based on gender.

The aim of this study was to further isolate the variables that impact school board effectiveness and contribute to the available literature in the field. With so much at stake, a greater understanding of school board members' experiences and preparation for school board governance may reveal important implications for training opportunities necessary to meet the needs of a diverse population of students. A needs assessment, inventory of preparedness, and evaluation of the membership tools aligned for continuous improvement may promote engagement with training opportunities for new and continuing board members. Supporting the membership and remaining current with best practices will promote success in service of students and the community.

Appendix A

IRB Approval Memorandum

Federal Wide Assurance: FWA00009066

Jan 8, 2020 3:57 PM EST

PI: Kathryn Behr

CO-PI: Rosalba Del Vecchio

Dept: Ed Admin & Instruc Leadership

Re: Initial - IRB-FY2020-338 Preparedness for the Key Work of School Board Governance By Volunteer Experience, Occupation, and Gender

Dear Kathryn Behr:

The St John's University Institutional Review Board has rendered the decision below for Preparedness for the Key Work of School Board Governance By Volunteer Experience, Occupation, and Gender.

Decision: Exempt

PLEASE NOTE: If you have collected any data prior to this approval date, the data needs to be discarded.

Selected Category:

Sincerely,

Raymond DiGiuseppe, PhD, ABPP

Chair, Institutional Review Board

Professor of Psychology

Marie Nitopi, Ed.D.

IRB Coordinator

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

Dissertation Survey

Informed Consent

Dear School Board Member:

My name is Kati Behr, and I am a doctoral student at St. John's University. My dissertation is designed to investigate the relationship between school board governance and volunteer experience, occupation, and gender. To that end, I invite you to participate in a research study to share your personal experiences prior to your election to the Board of Education.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an electronic questionnaire about your background (such as gender, education, work and volunteer history, children, motivation for candidacy), district demographics of the school district in which you serve as a board member (such as size, urban/suburban/rural, board size), and preparedness for the Key Work of school board governance. The survey will require approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

The survey is anonymous, and data will be stored securely. Identifying information will be changed or redacted without changing the nature of the response. Copies of the project will be provided to my dissertation mentor at St. John's University, Dr. Del Vecchio. If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible as you complete the survey at your earliest convenience. Participation is strictly voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the survey at any time. You have the right to skip any questions you prefer not to answer.

Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to better understand preparedness for school board governance by volunteer experience, occupation, and gender. There is no compensation for responding. If there is anything about the study or your participation that is unclear or you do not understand, if you have questions, or wish to report a research-related problem, you may contact me via email at Kathryn.Behr17@my.stjohns.edu or my dissertation mentor, Dr. Del Vecchio, at delveccr@stjohns.edu or 718-990-5277. For questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the University's Institutional Review Board Chair, Dr. Raymond DiGiuseppe, via email at digiuser@stjohns.edu or by phone at 718-990-1955 or Marie Nitopi, IRB Coordinator, via email at nitopim@stjohns.edu or by phone at 718-990-1440.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavors. If you would like a summary copy of this study, please contact me via email at Kathryn.Behr17@my.stjohns.edu.

Completion of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Kati Behr
Kathryn.Behr17@my.stjohns.edu

STJOHNS.EDU

1. Please select your New York State School Boards Association Geographical Area.

Possible responses:

Area 1 - Erie, Genesee, Niagara, Orleans, & Wyoming

Area 2 - Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Seneca, Wayne, & Yates

Area 3 - Allegany, Cattaraugus, & Steuben

Area 4 - Broome, Cayuga, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Onondaga, Schuyler, Tioga, & Tompkins

Area 5 - Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, & Oswego

Area 6 - Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Hamilton, & St. Lawrence

Area 7 - Albany, Columbia, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady, Warren, & Washington

Area 8 - Delaware, Fulton, Montgomery, Otsego, & Schoharie

Area 9 - Dutchess, Greene, Orange, Sullivan, & Ulster

Area 10 - Putnam, Rockland, & Westchester

Area 11 - Nassau

Area 12 - Suffolk

Area 13 - Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, & Richmond

2. Are school board members typically elected or appointed to board seats in the district where you serve?

- Elected
- Appointed

3. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say
- Other

4. What is your ethnicity?

- Hispanic or Latino
- Black or African American
- White or Caucasian
- Asian or Asian American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Other

5. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- Less than a high school diploma
- High school degree or equivalent
- Some college
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate
- Other

6. What is your current employment status?

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Self-employed
- Not currently employed (seeking employment)
- Not currently employed (not seeking employment)
- Student
- Retired

7. Do you have a child or children?

- Yes
- No

8. Was/were your child(ren) enrolled in the district when you were first elected as a trustee?

- Yes, all children enrolled in the district
- No, children attended another K-12 or equivalent placement
- No, children had already graduated or aged-out of the school district
- No, not yet school-aged
- Mixed, one or more attended and one or more not attending
- Other

9. Is/are your child(ren) currently enrolled in the district where you serve as a trustee?

- Yes, all children enrolled in the district
- No, children attended another K-12 or equivalent placement
- No, children had already graduated or aged-out of the school district
- No, not yet school-aged
- Mixed, one or more attended and one or more not attending

10. Which best describes the community of the school district where you serve as a Board of Education trustee?

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural

11. Please select the enrollment range of the school district.

- Fewer than 2,500 students
- 2,500 to 4,999 students
- 5,000 to 7,499 students
- 7,500 to 9,999 students
- 10,000 or more students

12. Including yourself, please indicate the number of men and women on the school board for which you serve. The numbers indicated below should add up to the total number of board members currently serving.

Female ☐

Male ☐

Prefer not to say ☐

Other ☐

13. How long is each full term?

- Fewer than 3 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- More than 5 years

14. Are you compensated as a Board of Education member? This includes salaries, stipends, and per meeting compensation.

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

15. Please describe your platform for candidacy. If you didn't have a platform, please indicate "None" in the space below.

16. Including this school year as one year, how many years have you served as a Board of Education trustee?

Possible responses:

1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 years
8 years
9 years
10 years
11 years
12 years
13 years
14 years
15 years

16 years
17 years
18 years
19 years
20 years
21 years
22 years
23 years
24 years
25 years
26 years
27 years
28 years
29 years
30 or more years

17. Why did you decide to run for the Board of Education?

18. When did you first consider seeking candidacy for the Board of Education?

- Less than one year prior to filing paperwork
- Between one and two years prior to filing paperwork
- Between two and three years prior to filing paperwork
- Between three and four years prior to filling paperwork
- Between four and five years prior to filing paperwork
- More than five years prior to filing paperwork

19. Were you encouraged to seek candidacy? Please select all that apply.

- Yes, by Board of Education trustees
- Yes, by District Personnel
- Yes, by Members of the Community
- Yes, by the Teachers' Union
- No

20. Please indicate your volunteer work (if any) in the school district prior to becoming a Board of Education trustee. Select all that apply. Though labels may vary, please indicate the closest option. If a volunteer experience is not listed, please indicate "Other."

- School Parent-Teacher Association President
- School Parent-Teacher Association non-President Executive Board position
- School Parent-Teacher Association member - participation on committees
- School Parent-Teacher Association member - consistently attend meetings only
- School Parent-Teacher Association member - rarely attend meetings
- School Parent-Teacher Association member - no meetings attended
- School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.
- District-Level Committee, such as Safety
- Interview committee participant
- Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)
- Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)
- District Parent-Teacher Association Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)
- Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)
- Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)
- Theater Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)
- Not Applicable
- Other

21. Please indicate your community volunteer experience (if any) prior to becoming a Board of Education trustee. Select all that apply. Though labels may vary, please indicate the closest option. If a volunteer experience is not listed, please indicate "Other."

- Neighborhood organization
- Religious organization
- Cultural organization
- Library organization
- Athletic organization
- Fine or performing arts organization
- Executive Board Member for community organization
- Not Applicable

22. Please indicate current or previous employment fields.

- Education
- Business/commerce
- Labor/production
- Transportation
- Farming/fishing/forestry
- Sales
- Construction
- Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)
- Nonprofit
- Government
- Homemaker

23. Which of your experiences best prepared you for membership on the Board of Education?

24. Have you considered seeking local political office in the future?

- Yes
- No

25. How did your prior work or volunteer experience(s) impact your desire to seek candidacy for the Board of Education?

26. NYS School Boards Association outlines that generally, school board candidates must be a U.S. citizen, at least 18 years old, qualified voters in the school district and able to read and write. They must be residents of their districts continuously for one year (as little as 30 days or as long as three years in some city school districts) before the election. At the time when the board member takes office, they cannot be employed by the board on which they serve or live in the same household with a family member who is also a member of the same school board. Do you think there should be additional eligibility requirements for Board of Education candidacy beyond the current minimal qualifications outlined by the NYS School Board Association?

- Yes
- No

27. Please describe your thoughts on additional eligibility requirements.

28. According to the National School Boards Association, Vision is described as follows:

Effective school boards establish a clear vision with high expectations for quality teaching and learning that supports strong student outcomes. They establish clear and specific goals to move districts forward.

Please indicate your level of preparedness in the area of Vision.

○	○	○	○	○
Not at all prepared		Somewhat prepared		Completely prepared

29. According to the National School Boards Association, Accountability is described as follows:

High academic standards, transparency, and accountability undergird a world-class education. True accountability depends on open decision making, community engagement and support, and receptivity to new ideas and constructive criticism.

Please indicate your level of preparedness in the area of Accountability.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Not at all prepared Somewhat prepared Completely prepared

30. According to the National School Boards Association, Policy are described as follows:

Policy is how a board sustainably exercises power to serve students. Through policy, school boards establish a set of cohesive guidelines able to transform vision into reality.

Please indicate your level of preparedness in the area of Policy.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Not at all prepared Somewhat prepared Completely prepared

31. According to the National School Boards Association, Community Leadership is described as follows:

Through public advocacy and community engagement, school boards share their concerns and actions with the public. Community leadership that builds public support is vital to implement the board's vision.

Please indicate your level of preparedness in the area of Community Leadership.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Not at all prepared Somewhat prepared Completely prepared

32. According to the National School Boards Association, Board/Superintendent Relationships are described as follows:

Both the school board and the superintendent have essential leadership roles with strong collaboration and mutual trust.

Please indicate your level of preparedness in the area of Board/Superintendent Relationships.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Not at all prepared Somewhat prepared Completely prepared

33. Please share any final thoughts not previously covered.

Appendix C

Tables

Table C1

School Board Member Demographics

Personal Demographics	Frequency	Percent
New York State School Board Association Geographic Area		
Area 1 - Erie, Genesee, Niagara, Orleans, & Wyoming	2	2.0
Area 2 - Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Seneca, Wayne, & Yates	7	6.9
Area 3 - Allegany, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, & Steuben	2	2.0
Area 4 - Broome, Cayuga, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Onondaga, Schuyler, Tioga, & Tompkins	4	4.0
Area 5 - Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, & Oswego	5	5.0
Area 6 - Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Hamilton, & St. Lawrence	2	2.0
Area 7 - Albany, Columbia, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady, Warren, & Washington	5	5.0
Area 8 - Delaware, Fulton, Montgomery, Otsego, & Schoharie	3	3.0
Area 9 - Dutchess, Greene, Orange, Sullivan, & Ulster	5	5.0
Area 10 - Putnam, Rockland, & Westchester	3	3.0
Area 11 - Nassau	54	53.5
Area 12 - Suffolk	9	8.9
Total	101	100.0
Gender		
Female	61	60.4
Male	40	39.6
Total	101	100.0
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.0
Black or African American	1	1.0
White or Caucasian	95	94.1
Asian or Asian American	2	2.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2.0
Total	101	100.0

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
High school degree or equivalent	3	3.0
Some college	9	8.9
Associate's degree	7	6.9
Bachelor's degree	32	31.7
Master's degree	36	35.6
Doctorate	14	13.9
Total	101	100.0
Employment Status		
Employed full-time	45	44.6
Employed part-time	8	7.9
Self-employed	14	13.9
Not currently employed (seeking employment)	2	2.0
Not currently employed (not seeking employment)	10	9.9
Retired	22	21.8
Total	101	100.0
Child(ren)		
Yes	96	95.0
No	5	5.0
Total	101	100.0
Child(ren) Enrolled When First Elected		
Yes, all children enrolled in the district	73	72.3
No, children had already graduated or aged-out of the school district	9	8.9
Mixed, one or more attended and one or more not attending	13	12.9
Other	1	1.0
Total	96	95.0
Child(ren) Currently Enrolled		
Yes, all children enrolled in the district	27	26.7
No, children attend another K-12 or equivalent placement	2	2.0
No, children have graduated or aged-out of the school district	46	45.5
Mixed, one or more still attend and one or more not attending	21	20.8

Table C2

School District Demographics

District Demographics	Frequency	Percent
Urbanicity		
Urban	1	1.0
Suburban	83	82.2
Rural	17	16.8
Enrollment		
Fewer than 2,500 students	32	31.7
2,500 to 4,999 students	44	43.6
5,000 to 7,499 students	20	19.8
7,500 to 9,999 students	2	2.0
10,000 or more students	3	3.0
Total	101	100.0
Number of School Board Trustees		
5	25	24.8
6	1	1.0
7	57	56.4
8	3	3.0
9	14	13.9
14	1	1.0
Total	101	100.0
Full Term Length of School Board Members		
3 years	92	91.1
4 years	5	5.0
5 years	4	4.0
Total	101	100.0
Compensation of School Board Members		
No	101	100.0

Table C3

Candidate Demographics

	Frequency	Percent
Years of Experience		
1 year	9	8.9
2 years	15	14.9
3 years	14	13.9
4 years	5	5.0
5 years	7	6.9
6 years	5	5.0
7 years	5	5.0
8 years	9	8.9
9 years	4	4.0
10 years	2	2.0
11 years	1	1.0
12 years	3	3.0
14 years	4	4.0
15 years	6	5.9
17 years	1	1.0
18 years	3	3.0
21 years	2	2.0
22 years	1	1.0
24 years	2	2.0
25 years	1	1.0
27 years	1	1.0
30 or more years	1	1.0
Candidacy Consideration		
Less than one year prior to filing paperwork	67	66.3
Between one and two years prior to filing paperwork	24	23.8
Between two and three years prior to filing paperwork	5	5.0
Between three and four years prior to filling paperwork	2	2.0
Between four and five years prior to filing paperwork	1	1.0
More than five years prior to filing paperwork	2	2.0
Total	101	100.0

	Frequency	Percent
Candidacy Encouragement		
Yes, by Board of Education trustees	59	58.4
Yes, by District Personnel	27	26.7
Yes, by Members of the Community	69	68.3
Yes, by the Teachers' Union	17	16.8
No	12	11.9

Table C4

Future Political Office Consideration and Additional Board Eligibility Requirements

	Frequency	Percent
Higher Political Office Consideration		
Yes	32	31.7
No	67	66.3
No Response	2	2.0
Additional Eligibility Requirements		
Yes	31	30.7
No	70	69.3
Total	101	100.0

Table C5

Type of School Volunteer Experiences

	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) President	31	7	38
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	27	6	33
School PTA member - participation on committees	35	8	43
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	17	4	21
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	3	5	8
School PTA member - no meetings attended	1	2	3
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	28	5	33
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	30	12	42
Interview committee participant	27	5	32
Athletic Assoc. active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	15	5	20
Athletic Assoc. member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	3	4	7
District PTA	14	4	18
Music Assoc. active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	5	2	7
Music Assoc. member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	2	1	3
Theater Assoc. active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	5	1	6
Other	13	9	22
Not Applicable	1	10	11

Table C6

Number of School Volunteer Experiences

	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
0 School Volunteer Experiences	1	10	11
1 School Volunteer Experience	10	11	21
2 School Volunteer Experiences	11	8	19
3 School Volunteer Experiences	4	3	7
4 School Volunteer Experiences	9	3	12
5 School Volunteer Experiences	7	1	8
6 School Volunteer Experiences	6	2	8
7 School Volunteer Experiences	6	1	7
8 School Volunteer Experiences	3	1	4
9 School Volunteer Experiences	2	0	2
10 School Volunteer Experiences	1	0	1
11 School Volunteer Experiences	1	0	1
Total	61	40	101

Table C7

Type of Community Volunteer Experiences

	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
Neighborhood organization	26	19	45
Religious organization	19	10	29
Cultural organization	14	4	18
Library organization	6	3	9
Athletic organization	23	19	42
Fine or performing arts organization	7	3	10
Executive Board Member for community organization	26	13	39
Not Applicable	9	4	13

Table C8

Number of Community Volunteer Experiences

	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
0 Community Volunteer Experiences	10	5	15
1 Community Volunteer Experience	10	16	26
2 Community Volunteer Experiences	27	9	36
3 Community Volunteer Experiences	4	5	9
4 Community Volunteer Experiences	7	3	10
5 Community Volunteer Experiences	2	2	4
7 Community Volunteer Experiences	1	0	1
Total	61	40	101

Table C9

Occupation

	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
Field			
Education	26	18	44
Business/commerce	14	14	28
Labor/production	1	3	4
Transportation	3	2	5
Farming/fishing/forestry	0	2	2
Sales	5	3	8
Construction	2	5	7
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	14	7	21
Nonprofit	9	5	14
Government	6	10	16
Homemaker	15	0	15
Other (please specify)	14	4	18
Employment Status			
Employed full-time	24	21	45
Employed part-time	8	0	8
Self-employed	8	6	14
Not currently employed (seeking employment)	2	0	2
Not currently employed (not seeking employment)	9	1	10
Retired	10	12	22
Total	61	40	101

Table C10

Preparedness for School Board Governance

		Gender		
		Female	Male	Total
Preparedness for Vision				
Not prepared	Count	0	0	0
	% within Gender	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barely prepared	Count	1	0	1
	% within Gender	1.6%	0.0%	1.0%
Somewhat prepared	Count	10	6	16
	% within Gender	16.4%	15.0%	15.8%
Mostly prepared	Count	17	11	28
	% within Gender	27.9%	27.5%	27.7%
Completely prepared	Count	33	23	56
	% within Gender	54.1%	57.5%	55.4%
Total	Count	61	40	101
Preparedness for Accountability				
Not prepared	Count	1	1	2
	% within Gender	1.6%	2.5%	2.0%
Barely prepared	Count	0	0	0
	% within Gender	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Somewhat prepared	Count	6	6	12
	% within Gender	9.8%	15.0%	11.9%
Mostly prepared	Count	14	11	25
	% within Gender	23.0%	27.5%	24.8%
Completely prepared	Count	40	22	62
	% within Gender	65.6%	55.0%	61.4%
Total	Count	61	40	101

		Gender		
		Female	Male	Total
Preparedness for Policy				
Not prepared	Count	0	0	0
	% within Gender	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barely prepared	Count	0	0	0
	% within Gender	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Somewhat prepared	Count	15	10	25
	% within Gender	24.6%	25.0%	24.8%
Mostly prepared	Count	17	12	29
	% within Gender	27.9%	30.0%	28.7%
Completely prepared	Count	29	18	47
	% within Gender	47.5%	45.0%	46.5%
Total	Count	61	40	101
Preparedness for Community Leadership				
Not prepared	Count	2	1	3
	% within Gender	3.3%	2.5%	3.0%
Barely prepared	Count	2	0	2
	% within Gender	3.3%	0.0%	2.0%
Somewhat prepared	Count	11	9	20
	% within Gender	18.0%	22.5%	19.8%
Mostly prepared	Count	13	7	20
	% within Gender	21.3%	17.5%	19.8%
Completely prepared	Count	33	23	56
	% within Gender	54.1%	57.5%	55.4%
Total	Count	61	40	101
Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships				
Not prepared	Count	2	1	3
	% within Gender	3.4%	2.5%	3.0%
Barely prepared	Count	0	1	1
	% within Gender	0.0%	2.5%	1.0%
Somewhat prepared	Count	9	3	12
	% within Gender	15.3%	7.5%	12.1%
Mostly prepared	Count	11	9	20
	% within Gender	18.6%	22.5%	20.2%
Completely prepared	Count	37	26	63
	% within Gender	62.7%	65.0%	63.6%
Total	Count	59	40	99

RQ1 Preparedness for School Board Governance

Table C11

Descriptive Statistics for Vision Preparedness

	M	*SD*	*N*
Vision	3.38	.786	101
Gender	1.40	.492	101
School PTA President	.38	.487	101
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	.33	.471	101
School PTA member - participation on committees	.43	.497	101
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.21	.408	101
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	.08	.271	101
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.03	.171	101
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.33	.471	101
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.42	.495	101
Interview committee participant	.32	.468	101
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.20	.400	101
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101
District PTA	.18	.385	101
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.03	.171	101
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.06	.238	101
Theater Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.00	.000	101
No School Volunteer Experience	.11	.313	101
Other School Volunteer Experience	.22	.415	101
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	3.3267	2.65371	101
Neighborhood organization	.45	.500	101
Religious organization	.29	.455	101
Cultural organization	.18	.385	101
Library organization	.09	.286	101
Athletic organization	.42	.495	101
Fine or performing arts organization	.10	.300	101

	M	*SD*	*N*
Executive Board Member for community organization	.39	.489	101
No Community Volunteer Experience	.13	.337	101
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	1.9010	1.39646	101
Education	.44	.498	101
Business/commerce	.28	.450	101
Labor/production	.04	.196	101
Transportation	.05	.218	101
Farming/fishing/forestry	.02	.140	101
Sales	.08	.271	101
Construction	.07	.255	101
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.21	.408	101
Nonprofit	.14	.347	101
Government	.16	.367	101
Homemaker	.15	.357	101
Other employment field	.18	.385	101
Employment Status	3.12	2.410	101

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association

Table C12

Preparedness for Vision Model Summary

				Change statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.743a	.552	.265	.673	.552	1.925	39	61	.011

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School Parent-Teacher Association member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School Parent-Teacher Association member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School Parent-Teacher Association member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School Parent-Teacher Association member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District Parent-Teacher Association, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School Parent-Teacher Association President

b. Dependent Variable: Vision

Table C13

Preparedness for Vision ANOVA

	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Regression	34.044	39	.873	1.925	.011b
Residual	27.659	61	.453		
Total	61.703	100			

a. Dependent Variable: Vision

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

Table C14

Preparedness for Vision Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.316	.384		8.642	.000
Gender	-.059	.210	-.037	-.282	.779
School PTA President	-.567	.253	-.351	-2.239	.029
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	-.070	.273	-.042	-.256	.799
School PTA member - participation on committees	-.220	.204	-.139	-1.078	.285
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.461	.255	.239	1.810	.075
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	.139	.304	.048	.457	.649
School PTA member - no meetings attended	1.310	.462	.285	2.834	.006
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.305	.217	.183	1.405	.165
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.086	.187	.054	.459	.648
Interview committee participant	-.139	.218	-.083	-.639	.525
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.441	.279	-.225	-1.585	.118
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.773	.341	.251	2.266	.027
District PTA	-.169	.269	-.083	-.628	.533
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.193	.388	.063	.497	.621
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.003	.594	.001	.005	.996
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.213	.432	.064	.493	.624
No School Volunteer Experience	.195	.303	.078	.644	.522
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.721	.205	-.381	-3.512	.001
Neighborhood organization	.162	.195	.103	.828	.411
Religious organization	.556	.217	.322	2.565	.013
Cultural organization	-.559	.243	-.274	-2.296	.025
Library organization	-.153	.291	-.056	-.528	.599
Athletic organization	.210	.219	.133	.958	.342
Fine or performing arts organization	-.221	.306	-.085	-.724	.472
Executive board member for community organization	.023	.204	.014	.113	.910
No community volunteer experience	-.015	.263	-.006	-.057	.955

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Education	.579	.180	.368	3.220	.002
Business/commerce	-.120	.205	-.069	-.587	.560
Labor/production	-.303	.420	-.076	-.723	.472
Transportation	.407	.393	.113	1.037	.304
Farming/fishing/forestry	-.525	.572	-.094	-.918	.362
Sales	-.097	.345	-.033	-.281	.780
Construction	-.556	.353	-.181	-1.575	.120
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.056	.208	.029	.269	.789
Nonprofit	-.082	.288	-.036	-.286	.776
Government	-.179	.236	-.084	-.758	.451
Homemaker	.572	.300	.260	1.906	.061
Other employment field	-.032	.234	-.016	-.136	.892

Preparedness for Vision with Statistically Significant Variables Descriptive Statistic

	M	*SD*	*N*
Vision	3.38	.786	101
School PTA President	0.38	.487	101
School PTA member - no meetings attended	0.03	.171	101
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends)	0.07	.255	101
Other School Volunteer Experience	0.22	.415	101
Religious organization	0.29	.455	101
Cultural organization	0.18	.385	101
Education	0.44	.498	101

Preparedness for Vision with Statistically Significant Variables Model Summary[h]

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	Change statistics				
					R^2 change	F change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F change
1	.318[a]	.101	.092	.749	.101	11.134	1	99	.001
2	.442[b]	.195	.179	.712	.094	11.496	1	98	.001
3	.489[c]	.239	.216	.696	.044	5.608	1	97	.020
4	.520[d]	.270	.239	.685	.030	4.004	1	96	.048
5	.553[e]	.305	.269	.672	.035	4.842	1	95	.030
6	.578[f]	.334	.291	.661	.028	3.998	1	94	.048
7	.603[g]	.364	.316	.650	.030	4.377	1	93	.039

Note. a. Predictors: (Constant), Education; b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience; c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School Parent–Teacher Association (PTA) member—no meetings attended; d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member—no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.) ; e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member—no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Religious organization; f. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Religious organization, School PTA President; g. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member—no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Religious organization, School PTA President, Cultural organization; h. Dependent Variable: Vision.

Preparedness for Vision with Statistically Significant Variables ANOVA

		Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
1	Regression	6.238	1	6.238	11.134	.001[b]
	Residual	55.465	99	.560		
	Total	61.703	100			
2	Regression	12.061	2	6.030	11.905	.000[c]
	Residual	49.642	98	.507		
	Total	61.703	100			
3	Regression	14.774	3	4.925	10.179	.000[d]
	Residual	46.929	97	.484		
	Total	61.703	100			
4	Regression	16.653	4	4.163	8.872	.000[e]
	Residual	45.050	96	.469		
	Total	61.703	100			
5	Regression	18.838	5	3.768	8.350	.000[f]
	Residual	42.865	95	.451		
	Total	61.703	100			
6	Regression	20.587	6	3.431	7.844	.000[g]
	Residual	41.116	94	.437		
	Total	61.703	100			
7	Regression	22.435	7	3.205	7.591	.000[h]
	Residual	39.268	93	.422		
	Total	61.703	100			

Note. a. Dependent Variable: Vision; b. Predictors: (Constant), Education; c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience; d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) member - no meetings attended; e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.); f. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Religious organization; g. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Religious organization, School PTA President.

Preparedness for Vision with Statistically Significant Variables Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.158	.099		31.852	.000
Education	0.501	.150	.318	3.337	.001
(Constant)	3.270	.100		32.723	.000
Education	0.534	.143	.339	3.733	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-0.583	.172	-.308	-3.391	.001
(Constant)	3.224	.100		32.346	.000
Education	0.587	.142	.373	4.145	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-0.607	.168	-.321	-3.606	.000
School PTA member - no meetings attended	0.979	.413	.213	2.368	.020
(Constant)	3.177	.101		31.490	.000
Education	0.614	.140	.390	4.380	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-0.625	.166	-.330	-3.765	.000
School PTA member - no meetings attended	1.032	.408	.224	2.529	.013
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.541	.270	.176	2.001	.048
(Constant)	3.058	.113		27.118	.000
Education	0.660	.139	.419	4.747	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-0.647	.163	-.341	-3.964	.000
School PTA member - no meetings attended	1.158	.404	.251	2.865	.005
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.605	.267	.197	2.270	.025
Religious organization	0.333	.151	.193	2.201	.030
(Constant)	3.163	.123		25.740	.000
Education	0.652	.137	.414	4.761	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-0.721	.165	-.381	-4.374	.000
School PTA member - no meetings attended	1.077	.400	.234	2.694	.008
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.637	.263	.207	2.421	.017
Religious organization	0.418	.155	.242	2.701	.008
School PTA President	-0.293	.146	-.181	-2.000	.048
(Constant)	3.217	.123		26.065	.000
Education	0.692	.136	.439	5.092	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-0.741	.162	-.391	-4.564	.000
School PTA Association member - no meetings attended	1.153	.395	.250	2.921	.004
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.645	.258	.210	2.496	.014
Religious organization	0.476	.155	.276	3.080	.003
School PTA President	-0.348	.146	-.216	-2.379	.019
Cultural organization	-0.366	.175	-.179	-2.092	.039

Table C15

Descriptive Statistics for Accountability Preparedness

	M	*SD*	*N*
Accountability	3.44	.853	101
Gender	1.40	.492	101
School PTA President	0.38	.487	101
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	0.33	.471	101
School PTA member - participation on committees	0.43	.497	101
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	0.21	.408	101
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	0.08	.271	101
School PTA member - no meetings attended	0.03	.171	101
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	0.33	.471	101
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	0.42	.495	101
Interview committee participant	0.32	.468	101
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.20	.400	101
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.07	.255	101
District PTA	0.18	.385	101
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.07	.255	101
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.03	.171	101
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.06	.238	101
Theater Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	0.00	.000	101
No School Volunteer Experience	0.11	.313	101
Other School Volunteer Experience	0.22	.415	101
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	3.3267	2.65371	101

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association

	M	*SD*	*N*
Neighborhood organization	0.45	0.500	101
Religious organization	0.29	0.455	101
Cultural organization	0.18	0.385	101
Library organization	0.09	0.286	101
Athletic organization	0.42	0.495	101
Fine or performing arts organization	0.10	0.300	101
Executive Board Member for community organization	0.39	0.489	101
No Community Volunteer Experience	0.13	0.337	101
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	1.9010	1.39646	101
Education	0.44	0.498	101
Business/commerce	0.28	0.450	101
Labor/production	0.04	0.196	101
Transportation	0.05	0.218	101
Farming/fishing/forestry	0.02	0.140	101
Sales	0.08	0.271	101
Construction	0.07	0.255	101
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	0.21	0.408	101
Nonprofit	0.14	0.347	101
Government	0.16	0.367	101
Homemaker	0.15	0.357	101
Other employment field	0.18	0.385	101
Employment Status	3.12	2.410	101

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association

Table C16

Preparedness for Accountability Model Summary

				Change statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.712	.507	.192	.767	.507	1.611	39	61	.047

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

Note. a. Dependent Variable: Accountability

Table C17

Preparedness for Accountability ANOVA[a]

	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Regression	36.951	39	.947	1.611	.047b
Residual	35.881	61	.588		
Total	72.832	100			

a. Dependent Variable: Accountability

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

Table C18

Preparedness for Accountability Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.338	.437		7.638	.000
Gender	-.137	.239	-.079	-.572	.569
School PTA President	-.226	.288	-.129	-.786	.435
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	-.405	.311	-.224	-1.302	.198
School PTA member - participation on committees	-.274	.232	-.159	-1.178	.243
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.281	.290	.134	.970	.336
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	-.143	.347	-.046	-.413	.681
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.605	.526	.121	1.149	.255
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.432	.247	.238	1.745	.086
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	-.020	.213	-.012	-.093	.926
Interview committee participant	-.349	.248	-.191	-1.407	.164
Athletic association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.407	.317	-.191	-1.283	.204
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.856	.389	.256	2.202	.031
District PTA	.068	.307	.030	.220	.827
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.259	.442	.077	.585	.561
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.198	.677	.040	.292	.771
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.598	.492	-.167	-1.216	.229
No School Volunteer Experience	-.038	.345	-.014	-.109	.913
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.558	.234	-.271	-2.387	.020
Neighborhood organization	.089	.222	.052	.400	.690
Religious organization	.506	.247	.270	2.052	.045
Cultural organization	-.156	.277	-.070	-.562	.576
Library organization	.090	.331	.030	.271	.787
Athletic organization	.281	.250	.163	1.123	.266

	B	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
Transportation	.227	.447	.058	.507	.614
Farming/fishing/forestry	-1.497	.652	-.246	-2.297	.025
Sales	.042	.393	.013	.106	.916
Construction	-.464	.402	-.139	-1.152	.254
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.200	.237	.095	.843	.402
Nonprofit	-.209	.328	-.085	-.637	.526
Government	-.515	.269	-.221	-1.912	.061
Homemaker	.285	.342	.119	.833	.408
Other employment field	.070	.267	.031	.262	.794
Employment Status	.011	.039	.032	.293	.770
Labor/production	.035	.478	.008	.074	.941

Preparedness for Accountability with Statistically Significant Predictors Descriptive Statistics

	M	*SD*	*N*
Accountability	3.44	.853	101
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101
Other School Volunteer Experience	.22	.415	101
Religious organization	.29	.455	101
No Community Volunteer Experience	.13	.337	101
Farming/fishing/forestry	.02	.140	101

Preparedness for Accountability with Statistically Significant Variables Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
Fine or performing arts organization	.198	.348	.070	.569	.571
Executive Board Member for community organization	.412	.232	.236	1.772	.081
No Community Volunteer Experience	.940	.299	.371	3.142	.003
Education	.406	.205	.237	1.980	.052
Business/commerce	-.184	.234	-.097	-.787	.435

Table C19

Preparedness for Accountability with Statistically Significant Variables Model Summary

				Change statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. R^2	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.324[a]	.105	.096	.811	.105	11.610	1	99	.001
.402[b]	.162	.145	.789	.057	6.627	1	98	.012

a. Predictors: (Constant), Farming/fishing/forestry

b. Predictors: (Constant), Farming/fishing/forestry, No Community Volunteer Experience

c. Dependent Variable: Accountability

Table C20

Preparedness for Accountability with Statistically Significant Variables Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.475	.082		42.607	.000
Farming/fishing/forestry	-1.975	.580	-.324	-3.407	.001
(Constant)	3.395	.085		39.891	.000
Farming/fishing/forestry	-1.895	.565	-.311	-3.357	.001
No Community Volunteer Experience	.605	.235	.238	2.574	.012

Table C21

Descriptive Statistics for Policy Preparedness

	M	*SD*	*N*
Policy	3.22	.820	101
Gender	1.40	.492	101
School PTA President	.38	.487	101
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	.33	.471	101
School PTA member – participation on committees	.43	.497	101
School PTA member – consistently attend meetings only	.21	.408	101
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	.08	.271	101
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.03	.171	101
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.33	.471	101
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.42	.495	101
Interview committee participant	.32	.468	101
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.20	.400	101
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101
District PTA	.18	.385	101
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.03	.171	101
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.06	.238	101
Theater Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.00	.000	101
No School Volunteer Experience	.11	.313	101
Other School Volunteer Experience	.22	.415	101
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	3.3267	2.65371	101
Neighborhood organization	.45	.500	101
Religious organization	.29	.455	101
Cultural organization	.18	.385	101
Library organization	.09	.286	101
Athletic organization	.42	.495	101

	M	*SD*	*N*
Fine or performing arts organization	.10	.300	101
Executive Board Member for community organization	.39	.489	101
No Community Volunteer Experience	.13	.337	101
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	1.9010	1.39646	101
Education	.44	.498	101
Business/commerce	.28	.450	101
Labor/production	.04	.196	101
Transportation	.05	.218	101
Farming/fishing/forestry	.02	.140	101
Sales	.08	.271	101
Construction	.07	.255	101
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.21	.408	101
Nonprofit	.14	.347	101
Government	.16	.367	101
Homemaker	.15	.357	101
Other employment field	.18	.385	101
Employment Status	3.12	2.410	101

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C22

Preparedness for Policy Model Summary

				Change statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.561a	.314	-.124	.869	.314	.717	39	61	.865

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

b. Dependent Variable: Policy

Table C23

Preparedness for Policy ANOVA

	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Regression	21.128	39	.542	.717	.865b
Residual	46.080	61	.755		
Total	67.208	100			

a. Dependent Variable: Policy

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

Table C24

Preparedness for Policy Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.358	.495		6.782	.000
Gender	.029	.271	.018	.108	.914
School PTA President	-.383	.327	-.227	-1.171	.246
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	-.126	.353	-.073	-.358	.721
School PTA member - participation on committees	-.083	.263	-.050	-.316	.753
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.246	.329	.122	.747	.458
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	-.719	.393	-.238	-1.829	.072
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.291	.597	.061	.488	.628
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.283	.280	.163	1.011	.316
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.048	.242	.029	.200	.842
Interview committee participant	-.365	.281	-.208	-1.297	.200
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.224	.360	-.110	-.624	.535
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.228	.440	.071	.517	.607
District PTA	-.270	.348	-.127	-.776	.441
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.831	.501	.259	1.658	.103
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.141	.767	-.029	-.184	.855
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.147	.557	-.042	-.263	.793
No School Volunteer Experience	-.349	.391	-.133	-.892	.376
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.436	.265	-.221	-1.645	.105
Neighborhood organization	.379	.252	.231	1.504	.138
Religious organization	.087	.280	.048	.310	.758
Cultural organization	-.278	.314	-.130	-.884	.380
Library organization	.023	.375	.008	.062	.951
Athletic organization	.170	.283	.103	.600	.550
Fine or performing arts organization	-.222	.394	-.081	-.563	.576
Executive Board Member for community organization	-.090	.263	-.054	-.341	.734

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
No Community Volunteer Experience	.222	.339	.091	.654	.516
Education	.191	.232	.116	.821	.415
Business/commerce	-.518	.265	-.284	-1.957	.055
Labor/production	.170	.542	.041	.315	.754
Transportation	.454	.507	.121	.896	.374
Farming/fishing/forestry	-.080	.738	-.014	-.108	.914
Sales	-.207	.445	-.068	-.464	.644
Construction	-.164	.456	-.051	-.360	.720
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.292	.268	.145	1.087	.281
Nonprofit	-.246	.372	-.104	-.662	.511
Government	-.388	.305	-.174	-1.273	.208
Homemaker	.417	.388	.182	1.075	.287
Other employment field	-.107	.302	-.050	-.353	.725
Employment Status	.022	.044	.065	.504	.616

Preparedness for Community Leadership Descriptive Statistics

	M	*SD*	*N*
Community Leadership	3.23	1.028	101
Gender	1.40	.492	101
School PTA President	.38	.487	101
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	.33	.471	101
School PTA member - participation on committees	.43	.497	101
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.21	.408	101
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	.08	.271	101
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.03	.171	101
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision \. Making, Safety, etc.	.33	.471	101
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.42	.495	101
Interview committee participant	.32	.468	101
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.20	.400	101
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101
District PTA	.18	.385	101
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.255	101

	M	*SD*	*N*
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.03	.171	101
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.06	.238	101
Theater Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.00	.000	101
No School Volunteer Experience	.11	.313	101
Other School Volunteer Experience	.22	.415	101
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	3.3267	2.65371	101
Neighborhood organization	.45	.500	101
Religious organization	.29	.455	101
Cultural organization	.18	.385	101
Library organization	.09	.286	101
Athletic organization	.42	.495	101
Fine or performing arts organization	.10	.300	101
Executive Board Member for community organization	.39	.489	101
No Community Volunteer Experience	.13	.337	101
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	1.9010	1.39646	101
Education	.44	.498	101
Business/commerce	.28	.450	101
Labor/production	.04	.196	101
Transportation	.05	.218	101
Farming/fishing/forestry	.02	.140	101
Sales	.08	.271	101
Construction	.07	.255	101
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.21	.408	101
Nonprofit	.14	.347	101
Government	.16	.367	101
Homemaker	.15	.357	101
Other employment field	.18	.385	101
Employment Status	3.12	2.410	101

Preparedness for Community Leadership Model Summary

			Std. error	Change Statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* Change
.698[a]	.487	.159	.943	.487	1.484	39	61	.082

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

b. Dependent Variable: Community Leadership

Preparedness for Community Leadership ANOVA[a]

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	51.483	39	1.320	1.484	.082[b]
Residual	54.279	61	.890		
Total	105.762	100			

a. Dependent Variable: Community Leadership

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, Education, No School Volunteer Experience, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Executive Board Member for community organization, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), School PTA member - participation on committees, Interview committee participant, District PTA, Homemaker, Athletic organization, School PTA President

Table C25

Preparedness for Community Leadership Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.610	.537		4.857	.000
Gender	.066	.294	.032	.225	.822
School PTA President	.210	.355	.099	.592	.556
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	-.078	.383	-.036	-.203	.840
School PTA member - participation on committees	-.537	.286	-.259	-1.879	.065
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.588	.357	.233	1.647	.105
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	.099	.426	.026	.233	.817
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.055	.647	.009	.085	.933
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared- Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.478	.304	.219	1.572	.121
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.573	.262	.276	2.184	.033
Interview committee participant	-.359	.305	-.163	-1.175	.244
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.160	.390	-.062	-.409	.684
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.785	.478	.195	1.642	.106
District PTA	-.152	.377	-.057	-.403	.688
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.214	.544	-.053	-.393	.696
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.507	.833	-.084	-.608	.545
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.186	.605	.043	.308	.759
No School Volunteer Experience	.717	.424	.218	1.689	.096
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.165	.288	-.067	-.575	.567
Neighborhood organization	.505	.273	.245	1.849	.069
Religious organization	.380	.303	.168	1.251	.216
Cultural organization	-.582	.341	-.218	-1.708	.093
Library organization	.194	.407	.054	.477	.635
Athletic organization	.185	.307	.089	.601	.550
Fine or performing arts organization	.398	.428	.116	.931	.356
Executive Board Member for community organization	.229	.286	.109	.801	.426
No Community Volunteer Experience	.905	.368	.296	2.457	.017

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Education	.193	.252	.094	.767	.446
Business/commerce	-.246	.287	-.107	-.855	.396
Labor/production	.075	.588	.014	.127	.899
Transportation	-.424	.550	-.090	-.771	.444
Farming/fishing/forestry	-.602	.801	-.082	-.751	.456
Sales	-.620	.483	-.164	-1.283	.204
Construction	-.247	.495	-.061	-.500	.619
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	-.122	.291	-.049	-.420	.676
Nonprofit	.062	.404	.021	.154	.878
Government	-.621	.331	-.222	-1.877	.065
Homemaker	.224	.421	.078	.533	.596
Other employment field	-.560	.328	-.209	-1.707	.093
Employment Status	-.012	.047	-.029	-.261	.795

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association

Table C26

Descriptive Statistics for Board/Superintendent Relationships Preparedness

	M	*SD*	*N*
Board/Superintendent Relationships	3.40	.957	99
Gender	1.40	.493	99
School PTA President	.36	.483	99
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	.32	.470	99
School PTA member - participation on committees	.42	.497	99
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.20	.404	99
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	.08	.274	99
School PTA member - no meetings attended	.03	.172	99
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.32	.470	99
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.41	.495	99
Interview committee participant	.31	.466	99
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.20	.404	99
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.07	.258	99
District PTA	.18	.388	99
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.06	.240	99
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.03	.172	99
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.06	.240	99
Theater Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.00	.000	99
No School Volunteer Experience	.11	.316	99
Other School Volunteer Experience	.22	.418	99
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	3.3030	2.66671	99
Neighborhood organization	.45	.500	99
Religious organization	.29	.457	99
Cultural organization	.18	.388	99
Library organization	.09	.289	99
Athletic organization	.42	.497	99

	M	*SD*	*N*
Fine or performing arts organization	.10	.303	99
Executive Board Member for community organization	.38	.489	99
No Community Volunteer Experience	.13	.339	99
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	1.9293	1.39425	99
Education	.42	.497	99
Business/commerce	.28	.453	99
Labor/production	.04	.198	99
Transportation	.05	.220	99
Farming/fishing/forestry	.02	.141	99
Sales	.08	.274	99
Construction	.07	.258	99
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	.21	.411	99
Nonprofit	.14	.350	99
Government	.15	.360	99
Homemaker	.14	.350	99
Other employment field	.18	.388	99
Employment Status	3.15	2.422	99

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association

Table C27

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships Model Summary

				Change Statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* Change
.772a	.596	.330	.784	.596	2.236	39	59	.003

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, No School Volunteer Experience, Education, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, Executive Board Member for community organization, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Homemaker, Interview committee participant, School PTA member - participation on committees, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Athletic organization, District PTA, School PTA President

b. Dependent Variable: Board/Superintendent Relationships

Table C28

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships ANOVA

	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Regression	53.586	39	1.374	2.236	.003b
Residual	36.252	59	.614		
Total	89.838	98			

a. Dependent Variable: Board/Superintendent Relationships

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment Status, School Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) non-President Executive Board position, Library organization, Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Transportation, School PTA member - no meetings attended, Farming/fishing/forestry, Other employment field, Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), No Community Volunteer Experience, Nonprofit, Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Other School Volunteer Experience, School PTA member - rarely attend meetings, Sales, School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc., Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Government, Labor/production, No School Volunteer Experience, Education, Professional services (law, medicine, etc.), Neighborhood organization, Business/commerce, Construction, Fine or performing arts organization, District-Level Committee, such as Safety, Executive Board Member for community organization, School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only, Religious organization, Gender, Cultural organization, Homemaker, Interview committee participant, School PTA member - participation on committees, Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.), Athletic organization, District PTA, School PTA President

Table C29

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships Coefficients

	B	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.306	.460		7.190	.000
Gender	.308	.252	.159	1.223	.226
School PTA President	-.222	.304	-.112	-.730	.468
School PTA non-President Executive Board position	-.398	.321	-.195	-1.238	.221
School PTA member - participation on committees	.178	.252	.092	.706	.483
School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only	.308	.304	.130	1.012	.316
School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	-.202	.356	-.058	-.567	.573
School PTA member - no meetings attended	1.271	.538	.229	2.362	.022
School-Level Committee, such as the Shared- Decision Making, Safety, etc.	.153	.255	.075	.602	.549
District-Level Committee, such as Safety	.017	.229	.009	.072	.943
Interview committee participant	-.396	.260	-.193	-1.521	.134
Athletic Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.484	.332	.204	1.457	.150
Athletic Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	.777	.404	.209	1.924	.059
District PTA	.142	.335	.057	.423	.674
Music Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.629	.543	-.158	-1.160	.251
Music Association member (occasionally attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.613	.695	-.110	-.882	.381
Theater Association active member (consistently attends meetings, volunteers at events, etc.)	-.543	.504	-.136	-1.078	.285
No School Volunteer Experience	.084	.355	.028	.238	.813
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.613	.239	-.267	-2.559	.013
Neighborhood organization	.348	.228	.182	1.526	.132
Religious organization	.199	.254	.095	.783	.437
Cultural organization	-.271	.285	-.110	-.949	.347
Library organization	.524	.346	.158	1.517	.135
Athletic organization	-.042	.257	-.022	-.165	.869
Fine or performing arts organization	.138	.360	.044	.384	.702
Executive Board Member for community organization	.233	.238	.119	.981	.331

	B	*SE B*	β	*t*	*p*
No Community Volunteer Experience	.686	.312	.243	2.200	.032
Education	-.228	.215	-.118	-1.062	.292
Business/commerce	-.727	.239	-.344	-3.040	.004
Labor/production	-.084	.492	-.017	-.171	.865
Transportation	.140	.467	.032	.300	.765
Farming/fishing/forestry	-.262	.668	-.039	-.392	.696
Sales	-.239	.416	-.068	-.575	.567
Construction	-.814	.411	-.219	-1.978	.053
Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	-.437	.245	-.188	-1.785	.079
Nonprofit	-.615	.338	-.225	-1.820	.074
Government	-.613	.296	-.231	-2.072	.043
Homemaker	.707	.366	.259	1.931	.058
Other employment field	-.267	.276	-.108	-.970	.336
Employment Status	.010	.039	.027	.265	.792

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C30

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships with Statistically Significant Variables Descriptive Statistics

	M	*SD*	*N*
Board and Superintendent Relationships	3.40	.957	99
School Parent Teacher Association member - no meetings	.03	.172	99
Other School Volunteer Experience	.22	.418	99
No Community Volunteer Experience	.13	.339	99
Business/commerce	.28	.453	99
Government	.15	.360	99

Table C31

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships with Statistically Significant Variables Model Summary

				Change statistics				
R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. error of the estimate	R^2 change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
.329a	.108	.099	.909	.108	11.752	1	97	.001
.445b	.198	.181	.866	.090	10.767	1	96	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Other School Volunteer Experience

b. Predictors: (Constant), Other School Volunteer Experience, Business/commerce

Table C32

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships with Statistically Significant ANOVA[a]

	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Regression	9.709	1	9.709	11.752	.001b
Residual	80.130	97	.826		
Total	89.838	98			
Regression	17.789	2	8.895	11.851	.000c
Residual	72.049	96	.751		
Total	89.838	98			

a. Dependent Variable: Board and Superintendent Relationships

b. Predictors: (Constant), Other School Volunteer Experience

c. Predictors: (Constant), Other School Volunteer Experience, Business/commerce

Table C33

Preparedness for Board/Superintendent Relationships with Statistically Significant Coefficients[a]

	B	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.571	.104		34.481	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.753	.220	-.329	-3.428	.001
(Constant)	3.745	.112		33.450	.000
Other School Volunteer Experience	-.724	.210	-.316	-3.456	.001
Business/commerce	-.635	.193	-.300	-3.281	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Board and Superintendent Relationships

Table C34

Parent Teacher Association President by Gender

			School PTA President		
			None	School PTA President	Total
Gender	Female	Count	30	31	61
		% within School PTA President	47.6%	81.6%	60.4%
	Male	Count	33	7	40
		% within PTA Association President	52.4%	18.4%	39.6%
Total		Count	63	38	101
		% within School PTA President	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. RQ2 Types and number of school volunteer experiences by gender, PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C35

PTA President by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.428a	1	.001		
Continuity Correctionb	10.053	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	12.117	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.001	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.315	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

PTA President by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.051	.171	.295	.768
		Gender Dependent	.075	.191	.378	.705
		School PTA President Dependent	.026	.203	.128	.898
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.113	.058		.001c
		School PTA President Dependent	.113	.058		.001c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C36

Parent Teacher Association Non-President Executive Board Position by Gender

			School PTA non-president executive board position		
			None	School PTA executive board position	Total
Gender	Female	Count	34	27	61
		% within School PTA Executive Board position	50.0%	81.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	34	6	40
		% within School PTA Executive Board position	50.0%	18.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	68	33	101
		% within School PTA Executive Board position	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C37

Parent Teacher Association Non-President Executive Board Position by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.404[a]	1	.002		
Continuity Correction[b]	8.121	1	.004		
Likelihood Ratio	10.056	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.002	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.311	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C38

Parent Teacher Association Non-President Executive Board Position by Gender

Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Errora	Approx *T*	Approx Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		School PTA Executive Board position Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.093	.052		.002c
		School PTA Executive Board position Dependent	.093	.052		.002c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C39

Parent Teacher Association Member with Participation on Committees by Gender

			School PTA member—Participation on committees		
			None	School PTA committee member	Total
Gender	Female	Count	26	35	61
		% within School PTA committee member	44.8%	81.4%	60.4%
	Male	Count	32	8	40
		% within School PTA committee member	55.2%	18.6%	39.6%
Total		Count	58	43	101
		% within School PTA committee member	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C40

Parent Teacher Association Member with Participation on Committees by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.805a	1	.000		
Continuity Correctionb	12.318	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	14.516	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.668	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.03.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C41

Parent Teacher Association Member with Participation on Committees by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.181	.148	1.155	.248
		Gender Dependent	.150	.176	.790	.429
		School PTA member - participation on committees Dependent	.209	.162	1.160	.246
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.137	.065		.000c
		School PTA member - participation on committees Dependent	.137	.065		.000c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C42

Parent Teacher Association Member—Consistently Attend Meetings by Gender

			School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only		
			None	School PTA member	Total
Gender	Female	Count	44	17	61
		% within School PTA member	55.0%	81.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	36	4	40
		% within School PTA member	45.0%	19.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	80	21	101
		% within School PTA member	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C43

Parent Teacher Association Member—Consistently Attend Meetings by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.684a	1	.030		
Continuity Correctionb	3.662	1	.056		
Likelihood Ratio	5.065	1	.024		
Fisher's Exact Test				.044	.025
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.637	1	.031		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C44

Parent Teacher Association Member—Consistently Attend Meetings by Gender

Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approx T	Approx Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.046	.036		.031c
		School PTA member - consistently attend meetings only Dependent	.046	.037		.031c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C45

School Parent Teacher Association Member—Rarely Attend Meetings by Gender

			School PTA member - rarely attends meetings		
			None	School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	Total
Gender	Female	Count	58	3	61
		% within School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	62.4%	37.5%	60.4%
	Male	Count	35	5	40
		% within School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	37.6%	62.5%	39.6%
Total		Count	93	8	101
		% within School PTA member - rarely attend meetings	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

School PTA Member - Rarely Attend Meetings by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.904a	1	.168		
Continuity Correctionb	1.006	1	.316		
Likelihood Ratio	1.855	1	.173		
Fisher's Exact Test				.259	.158
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.885	1	.170		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C46

School Parent Teacher Association Member—Rarely Attend Meetings by Gender

Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.042	.057	.709	.478
		Gender Dependent	.050	.069	.709	.478
		School PTA member - rarely attend meetings Dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.019	.027		.170[d]
		School PTA member - rarely attend meetings Dependent	.019	.028		.170[d]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C47

School Parent Teacher Association Member—No Meetings Attended by Gender

			School PTA member—No meetings attended		
			None	School PTA member - no meetings attended	Total
Gender	Female	Count	60	1	61
		% within School PTA member - no meetings attended	61.2%	33.3%	60.4%
	Male	Count	38	2	40
		% within School PTA member - no meetings attended	38.8%	66.7%	39.6%
Total		Count	98	3	101
		% within School PTA member - no meetings attended	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C48

School PTA Member - No Meetings Attended by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.947a	1	.331		
Continuity Correctionb	.140	1	.709		
Likelihood Ratio	.923	1	.337		
Fisher's Exact Test				.561	.345
Linear-by-Linear Association	.937	1	.333		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.19.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C49

School PTA Member - No Meetings Attended by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.023	.040	.578	.563
		Gender Dependent	.025	.043	.578	.563
		School PTA member - no meetings attended Dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.009	.019		.333[d]
		School PTA member - no meetings attended Dependent	.009	.019		.333[d]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C50

School-Level Committee by Gender

			School-level committee, such as the shared-decision making, safety, etc.		
			None	School-level committee	Total
Gender	Female	Count	33	28	61
		% within School-Level Committee	48.5%	84.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	35	5	40
		% within School-Level Committee	51.5%	15.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	68	33	101
		% within School-Level Committee	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C51

School-Level Committee by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.252[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	10.781	1	.001		
Likelihood Ratio	13.337	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.131	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C52

School-Level Committee by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.027	.111	.243	.808
		Gender Dependent	.050	.201	.243	.808
		School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc. Dependent	.000	.000	.c	.c
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.121	.057		.000d
		School-Level Committee, such as the Shared-Decision Making, Safety, etc. Dependent	.121	.057		.000d

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C53

District-Level Committee by Gender

			District-level committee, such as safety		
			None	District-Level committee, such as safety	Total
Gender	Female	Count	31	30	61
		% within District-Level Committee	52.5%	71.4%	60.4%
	Male	Count	28	12	40
		% within District-Level Committee	47.5%	28.6%	39.6%
Total		Count	59	42	101
		% within District-Level Committee	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C54

District-Level Committee by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.659[a]	1	.056		
Continuity Correction[b]	2.912	1	.088		
Likelihood Ratio	3.724	1	.054		
Fisher's Exact Test				.066	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.622	1	.057		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C55

District-Level Committee by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		District-Level Committee, such as Safety Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.036	.036		.057c
		District-Level Committee, such as Safety Dependent	.036	.036		.057c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C56

Interview Committee by Gender

			Interview committee participant		
			None	Interview committee	Total
Gender	Female	Count	34	27	61
		% within Interview committee	49.3%	84.4%	60.4%
	Male	Count	35	5	40
		% within Interview committee	50.7%	15.6%	39.6%
Total		Count	69	32	101
		% within Interview committee	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C57

Interview Committee by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.260a	1	.001		
Continuity Correctionb	9.840	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	12.240	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.001	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.148	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C58

Interview Committee by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.014	.115	.120	.904
		Gender Dependent	.025	.205	.120	.904
		Interview committee participant Dependent	.000	.000	.c	.c
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.111	.055		.001d
		Interview committee participant Dependent	.111	.055		.001d

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C59

Athletic Association Active Member by Gender

			Athletic Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.)		
			None	Athletic Association active member	Total
Gender	Female	Count	46	15	61
		% within Athletic Association active member	56.8%	75.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	35	5	40
		% within Athletic Association active member	43.2%	25.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	81	20	101
		% within Athletic Association active member	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C60

Athletic Association Active Member by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.224[a]	1	.136		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.527	1	.216		
Likelihood Ratio	2.333	1	.127		
Fisher's Exact Test				.202	.107
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.202	1	.138		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.92.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Athletic Association Active Member by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Athletic Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.022	.027		.138[c]
		Athletic Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.022	.027		.138[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C61

Athletic Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender

			Athletic Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.)		
			None	Athletic Association member	Total
Gender	Female	Count	58	3	61
		% within Athletic Association member	61.7%	42.9%	60.4%
	Male	Count	36	4	40
		% within Athletic Association member	38.3%	57.1%	39.6%
Total		Count	94	7	101
		% within Athletic Association member	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C62

Athletic Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.967a	1	.325		
Continuity Correctionb	.340	1	.560		
Likelihood Ratio	.942	1	.332		
Fisher's Exact Test				.430	.276
Linear-by-Linear Association	.958	1	.328		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C63

Athletic Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.021	.056	.378	.705
		Gender Dependent	.025	.065	.378	.705
		Athletic Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.000	.000	.c	.c
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.010	.020		.328d
		Athletic Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.010	.020		.328d

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C64

District Parent Teacher Association by Gender

			District PTA		
			None	District PTA	Total
Gender	Female	Count	47	14	61
		% within District PTA	56.6%	77.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	36	4	40
		% within District PTA	43.4%	22.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	83	18	101
		% within District PTA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C65

District Parent Teacher Association by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.767a	1	.096		
Continuity Correctionb	1.953	1	.162		
Likelihood Ratio	2.948	1	.086		
Fisher's Exact Test				.116	.079
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.739	1	.098		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.13.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C66

District Parent Teacher Association by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		District PTA Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.027	.029		.098c
		District PTA Dependent	.027	.029		.098c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Note. PTA = Parent Teacher Association.

Table C67

Music Association Active Member by Gender

			Music Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.)		
			None	Music Association active member	Total
Gender	Female	Count	56	5	61
		% within Music Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.)	59.6%	71.4%	60.4%
	Male	Count	38	2	40
		% within Music Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.)	40.4%	28.6%	39.6%
Total		Count	94	7	101
		% within Music Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C68

Music Association Active Member by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.383a	1	.536		
Continuity Correctionb	.048	1	.827		
Likelihood Ratio	.398	1	.528		
Fisher's Exact Test				.700	.424
Linear-by-Linear Association	.379	1	.538		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C69

Music Association Active Member by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Music Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.004	.011		.538c
		Music Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.004	.011		.538c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C70

Music Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender

			Music Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.)		
			None	Music Association member	Total
Gender	Female	Count	59	2	61
		% within Music Association member	60.2%	66.7%	60.4%
	Male	Count	39	1	40
		% within Music Association member	39.8%	33.3%	39.6%
Total		Count	98	3	101
		% within Music Association member	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C71

Music Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.051a	1	.822		
Continuity Correctionb	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.052	1	.820		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.655
Linear-by-Linear Association	.050	1	.823		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.19.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C72

Music Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Music Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.001	.004		.823[c]
		Music Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.001	.004		.823[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C73

Theater Association Active Member by Gender

			None	Theater Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.)	Total
Gender	Female	Count	56	5	61
		% within Theater Association active member	58.9%	83.3%	60.4%
	Male	Count	39	1	40
		% within Theater Association active member	41.1%	16.7%	39.6%
Total		Count	95	6	101
		% within Theater Association active member	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C74

Theater Association Active Member by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Theater Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.014	.018		.239[c]
		Theater Association active member (consistently attends, volunteers, etc.) Dependent	.014	.019		.239[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C75

Theater Association Active Member by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.403[a]	1	.236		
Continuity Correction[b]	.569	1	.451		
Likelihood Ratio	1.571	1	.210		
Fisher's Exact Test				.398	.232
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.389	1	.239		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.38.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C76

Theater Association Member with Occasional Attendance by Gender

			Theater Association member (occasionally attends, volunteers, etc.)	
			None	Total
Gender	Female	Count	61	61
		% within Theater Association member	60.4%	60.4%
	Male	Count	40	40
		% within Theater Association member	39.6%	39.6%
Total		Count	101	101
		% within Theater Association member	100.0%	100.0%

Table C77

No School Volunteer Experience by Gender

			No school volunteer experience		
			None	Not applicable	Total
Gender	Female	Count	60	1	61
		% within No School Volunteer Experience	66.7%	9.1%	60.4%
	Male	Count	30	10	40
		% within No School Volunteer Experience	33.3%	90.9%	39.6%
Total		Count	90	11	101
		% within No School Volunteer Experience	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C78

No School Volunteer Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.585a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	11.284	1	.001		
Likelihood Ratio	14.343	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.450	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C79

No School Volunteer Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.176	.050	2.818	.005
		Gender Dependent	.225	.073	2.818	.005
		No School Volunteer Experience Dependent	.000	.000	.c	.c
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.135	.049		.000d
		No School Volunteer Experience Dependent	.135	.058		.000d

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C80

Other School Volunteer Experience by Gender

			Other school volunteer experience		
			None	Other (please specify)	Total
Gender	Female	Count	48	13	61
		% within Other School Volunteer Experience	60.8%	59.1%	60.4%
	Male	Count	31	9	40
		% within Other School Volunteer Experience	39.2%	40.9%	39.6%
Total		Count	79	22	101
		% within Other School Volunteer Experience	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C81

Other School Volunteer Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Other School Volunteer Experience Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.000	.003		.888[c]
		Other School Volunteer Experience Dependent	.000	.003		.888[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C82

School Volunteer Experience by Gender Group Statistics

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	Female	61	4.1967	2.64462
	Male	40	2.0000	2.07550

Table C83

School Volunteer Experience by Gender

		Levene's Test for equality of variances						
		F	Sig.	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference
Number of School Volunteer Experiences	Equal variances assumed	4.989	.028	4.432	99	.000	2.19672	.49568
	Equal variances not assumed			4.659	95.723	.000	2.19672	.47154

Table C84

Number of School Volunteer Experiences

N	Valid	101
	Missing	0
Skewness		.737
Std. Error of Skewness		.240
Kurtosis		-.266
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.476

Table C85

Neighborhood Organization by Gender

			Neighborhood organization		
			None	Neighborhood organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	35	26	61
		Expected Count	33.8	27.2	61.0
		% within Neighborhood organization	62.5%	57.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	21	19	40
		Expected Count	22.2	17.8	40.0
		% within Neighborhood organization	37.5%	42.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	56	45	101
		Expected Count	56.0	45.0	101.0
		% within Neighborhood organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. RQ3 Community volunteer experience by gender.

Table C86

Neighborhood Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.233[a]	1	.630		
Continuity Correction[b]	.077	1	.781		
Likelihood Ratio	.232	1	.630		
Fisher's Exact Test				.685	.390
Linear-by-Linear Association	.230	1	.631		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.82.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C87

Neighborhood Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Neighborhood organization Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.002	.010		.631c
		Neighborhood organization Dependent	.002	.010		.631c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C88

Religious Organization by Gender

			Religious organization		
			None	Religious organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	42	19	61
		Expected Count	43.5	17.5	61.0
		% within Religious organization	58.3%	65.5%	60.4%
	Male	Count	30	10	40
		Expected Count	28.5	11.5	40.0
		% within Religious organization	41.7%	34.5%	39.6%
Total		Count	72	29	101
		Expected Count	72.0	29.0	101.0
		% within Religious organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C89

Religious Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.446a	1	.504		
Continuity Correctionb	.196	1	.658		
Likelihood Ratio	.451	1	.502		
Fisher's Exact Test				.653	.331
Linear-by-Linear Association	.442	1	.506		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C90

Religious Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Religious organization Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.004	.013		.506c
		Religious organization Dependent	.004	.013		.506c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C91

Cultural Organization by Gender

			Cultural organization		
			None	Cultural organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	47	14	61
		Expected Count	50.1	10.9	61.0
		% within Cultural organization	56.6%	77.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	36	4	40
		Expected Count	32.9	7.1	40.0
		% within Cultural organization	43.4%	22.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	83	18	101
		Expected Count	83.0	18.0	101.0
		% within Cultural organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C92

Cultural Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.767a	1	.096		
Continuity Correctionb	1.953	1	.162		
Likelihood Ratio	2.948	1	.086		
Fisher's Exact Test				.116	.079
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.739	1	.098		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.13.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C93

Cultural Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Cultural organization Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.027	.029		.098c
		Cultural organization Dependent	.027	.029		.098c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C94

Library Organization by Gender

			Library organization		
			None	Library organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	55	6	61
		Expected Count	55.6	5.4	61.0
		% within Library organization	59.8%	66.7%	60.4%
	Male	Count	37	3	40
		Expected Count	36.4	3.6	40.0
		% within Library organization	40.2%	33.3%	39.6%
Total		Count	92	9	101
		Expected Count	92.0	9.0	101.0
		% within Library organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C95

Library Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.162a	1	.687		
Continuity Correctionb	.002	1	.963		
Likelihood Ratio	.166	1	.684		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.490
Linear-by-Linear Association	.161	1	.688		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.56.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C96

Library Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Library organization Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.002	.008		.688[c]
		Library organization Dependent	.002	.008		.688[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C97

Athletic Organization by Gender

			Athletic Organization		
			None	Athletic organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	38	23	61
		Expected Count	35.6	25.4	61.0
		% within Athletic organization	64.4%	54.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	21	19	40
		Expected Count	23.4	16.6	40.0
		% within Athletic organization	35.6%	45.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	59	42	101
		Expected Count	59.0	42.0	101.0
		% within Athletic organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C98

Athletic Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.954[a]	1	.329		
Continuity Correction[b]	.594	1	.441		
Likelihood Ratio	.952	1	.329		
Fisher's Exact Test				.410	.220
Linear-by-Linear Association	.945	1	.331		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C99

Athletic Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Athletic organization Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.009	.019		.331c
		Athletic organization Dependent	.009	.019		.331c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C100

Fine or Performing Arts Organization by Gender

			Fine or performing arts organization		
			None	Fine or performing arts organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	54	7	61
		Expected Count	55.0	6.0	61.0
		% within Fine or performing arts organization	59.3%	70.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	37	3	40
		Expected Count	36.0	4.0	40.0
		% within Fine or performing arts organization	40.7%	30.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	91	10	101
		Expected Count	91.0	10.0	101.0
		% within Fine or performing arts organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C101

Fine or Performing Arts Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.428a	1	.513		
Continuity Correctionb	.098	1	.754		
Likelihood Ratio	.442	1	.506		
Fisher's Exact Test				.736	.385
Linear-by-Linear Association	.424	1	.515		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.96.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C102

Fine or Performing Arts Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Fine or performing arts organization Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.004	.012		.515c
		Fine or performing arts organization Dependent	.004	.012		.515c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C103

Executive Board Member for Community Organization by Gender

			Executive Board member for community organization		
			None	Executive Board member for community organization	Total
Gender	Female	Count	35	26	61
		Expected Count	37.4	23.6	61.0
		% within Executive Board Member for community organization	56.5%	66.7%	60.4%
	Male	Count	27	13	40
		Expected Count	24.6	15.4	40.0
		% within Executive Board Member for community organization	43.5%	33.3%	39.6%
Total		Count	62	39	101
		Expected Count	62.0	39.0	101.0
		% within Executive Board Member for community organization	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C104

Executive Board Member for Community Organization by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.044a	1	.307		
Continuity Correctionb	.661	1	.416		
Likelihood Ratio	1.054	1	.305		
Fisher's Exact Test				.404	.209
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.034	1	.309		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.45.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C 105

Executive Board Member for Community Organization by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Executive Board Member for community organization Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.010	.020		.309c
		Executive Board Member for community organization Dependent	.010	.020		.309c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C106

No Community Volunteer Experience by Gender

			No community volunteer experience		
			None	Not applicable	Total
Gender	Female	Count	52	9	61
		Expected Count	53.1	7.9	61.0
		% within No Community Volunteer Experience	59.1%	69.2%	60.4%
	Male	Count	36	4	40
		Expected Count	34.9	5.1	40.0
		% within No Community Volunteer Experience	40.9%	30.8%	39.6%
Total		Count	88	13	101
		Expected Count	88.0	13.0	101.0
		% within No Community Volunteer Experience	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C107

No Community Volunteer Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.487a	1	.485		
Continuity Correctionb	.155	1	.694		
Likelihood Ratio	.501	1	.479		
Fisher's Exact Test				.557	.353
Linear-by-Linear Association	.482	1	.487		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C108

No Community Volunteer Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		No Community Volunteer Experience Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.005	.013		.487c
		No Community Volunteer Experience Dependent	.005	.013		.487c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C109

Community Volunteer Experience by Gender Group Statistics

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	Female	61	1.9836	1.44328
	Male	40	1.7750	1.32988

Table C110

Community Volunteer Experience by Gender

		Levene's Test for equality of variances						
		F	Sig.	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference
Number of Community Volunteer Experiences	Equal variances assumed	.217	.642	.733	99	.466	.20861	.28478
	Equal variances not assumed			.745	88.278	.458	.20861	.27993

Table C111

Number of Community Volunteer Experiences

N		
	Valid	101
	Missing	0
Skewness		.877
Std. Error of Skewness		.240
Kurtosis		.999
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.476

Table C112

Education Experience by Gender

			Education		
			0	Education	Total
Gender	Female	Count	35	26	61
		Expected Count	34.4	26.6	61.0
		% within Education	61.4%	59.1%	60.4%
	Male	Count	22	18	40
		Expected Count	22.6	17.4	40.0
		% within Education	38.6%	40.9%	39.6%
Total		Count	57	44	101
		Expected Count	57.0	44.0	101.0
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. RQ4 Types and numbers of occupational experience by gender.

Table C113

Education Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.056[a]	1	.814		
Continuity Correction[b]	.001	1	.976		
Likelihood Ratio	.055	1	.814		
Fisher's Exact Test				.840	.487
Linear-by-Linear Association	.055	1	.815		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.43.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C114

Education Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Education Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.001	.005		.815c
		Education Dependent	.001	.005		.815c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C115

Business/Commerce Experience by Gender

			Business/commerce		
			0	Business/commerce	Total
Gender	Female	Count	47	14	61
		Expected Count	44.1	16.9	61.0
		% within Business/commerce	64.4%	50.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	26	14	40
		Expected Count	28.9	11.1	40.0
		% within Business/commerce	35.6%	50.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	73	28	101
		Expected Count	73.0	28.0	101.0
		% within Business/commerce	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C116

Business/Commerce Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.750a	1	.186		
Continuity Correctionb	1.201	1	.273		
Likelihood Ratio	1.729	1	.189		
Fisher's Exact Test				.256	.137
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.733	1	.188		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C117

Business/Commerce Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx. sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Business/commerce Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.017	.026		.188c
		Business/commerce Dependent	.017	.027		.188c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C118

Labor/Production Experience by Gender

			Labor/production		
			0	Labor/production	Total
Gender	Female	Count	60	1	61
		Expected Count	58.6	2.4	61.0
		% within Labor/production	61.9%	25.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	37	3	40
		Expected Count	38.4	1.6	40.0
		% within Labor/production	38.1%	75.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	97	4	101
		Expected Count	97.0	4.0	101.0
		% within Labor/production	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C119

Labor/Production Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.182a	1	.140		
Continuity Correctionb	.913	1	.339		
Likelihood Ratio	2.154	1	.142		
Fisher's Exact Test				.298	.170
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.160	1	.142		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C120

Labor/Production Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.045	.043	1.005	.315
		Gender Dependent	.050	.049	1.005	.315
		Labor/production Dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.022	.026		.142[d]
		Labor/production Dependent	.022	.028		.142[d]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C121

Transportation Experience by Gender

			Transportation		
			0	Transportation	Total
Gender	Female	Count	58	3	61
		Expected Count	58.0	3.0	61.0
		% within Transportation	60.4%	60.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	38	2	40
		Expected Count	38.0	2.0	40.0
		% within Transportation	39.6%	40.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	96	5	101
		Expected Count	96.0	5.0	101.0
		% within Transportation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C122

Transportation Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.000a	1	.985		
Continuity Correctionb	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	.985		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.661
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.985		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.98.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C123

Transportation Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Transportation Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.000	.000		.985c
		Transportation Dependent	.000	.000		.985c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C124

Farming/Fishing/Forestry Experience by Gender

			Farming/fishing/forestry		
			0	Farming/fishing/forestry	Total
Gender	Female	Count	61	0	61
		Expected Count	59.8	1.2	61.0
		% within Farming/fishing/forestry	61.6%	0.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	38	2	40
		Expected Count	39.2	.8	40.0
		% within Farming/fishing/forestry	38.4%	100.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	99	2	101
		Expected Count	99.0	2.0	101.0
		% within Farming/fishing/forestry	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C125

Farming/Fishing/Forestry Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.112[a]	1	.078		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.069	1	.301		
Likelihood Ratio	3.767	1	.052		
Fisher's Exact Test				.154	.154
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.081	1	.079		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C126

Farming/Fishing/Forestry Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.048	.031	1.428	.153
		Gender Dependent	.050	.034	1.428	.153
		Farming/fishing/forestry Dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.031	.006		.079[d]
		Farming/fishing/forestry Dependent	.031	.022		.079[d]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C127

Sales Experience by Gender

			Sales		
			0	Sales	Total
Gender	Female	Count	56	5	61
		Expected Count	56.2	4.8	61.0
		% within Sales	60.2%	62.5%	60.4%
	Male	Count	37	3	40
		Expected Count	36.8	3.2	40.0
		% within Sales	39.8%	37.5%	39.6%
Total		Count	93	8	101
		Expected Count	93.0	8.0	101.0
		% within Sales	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C128

Sales Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.016[a]	1	.899		
Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.016	1	.899		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.606
Linear-by-Linear Association	.016	1	.900		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C129

Sales Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Sales Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.000	.002		.900[c]
		Sales Dependent	.000	.002		.900[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C130

Construction Experience by Gender

			Construction		
			0	Construction	Total
Gender	Female	Count	59	2	61
		Expected Count	56.8	4.2	61.0
		% within Construction	62.8%	28.6%	60.4%
	Male	Count	35	5	40
		Expected Count	37.2	2.8	40.0
		% within Construction	37.2%	71.4%	39.6%
Total		Count	94	7	101
		Expected Count	94.0	7.0	101.0
		% within Construction	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C131

Construction Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.185[a]	1	.074		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.916	1	.166		
Likelihood Ratio	3.126	1	.077		
Fisher's Exact Test				.110	.085
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.153	1	.076		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C132

Construction Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.064	.053	1.141	.254
		Gender Dependent	.075	.064	1.141	.254
		Construction Dependent	.000	.000	.c	.c
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.032	.033		.076d
		Construction Dependent	.032	.034		.076d

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C133

Professional Experience by Gender

			Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)		
			0	Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	Total
Gender	Female	Count	47	14	61
		Expected Count	48.3	12.7	61.0
		% within Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	58.8%	66.7%	60.4%
	Male	Count	33	7	40
		Expected Count	31.7	8.3	40.0
		% within Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	41.3%	33.3%	39.6%
Total		Count	80	21	101
		Expected Count	80.0	21.0	101.0
		% within Professional services (law, medicine, etc.)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C134

Professional Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.436a	1	.509		
Continuity Correctionb	.168	1	.682		
Likelihood Ratio	.443	1	.506		
Fisher's Exact Test				.619	.345
Linear-by-Linear Association	.432	1	.511		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C135

Professional Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Professional services (law, medicine, etc.) Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.004	.013		.511c
		Professional services (law, medicine, etc.) Dependent	.004	.013		.511c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C136

Nonprofit Experience by Gender

			Nonprofit		
			0	Nonprofit	Total
Gender	Female	Count	52	9	61
		Expected Count	52.5	8.5	61.0
		% within Nonprofit	59.8%	64.3%	60.4%
	Male	Count	35	5	40
		Expected Count	34.5	5.5	40.0
		% within Nonprofit	40.2%	35.7%	39.6%
Total		Count	87	14	101
		Expected Count	87.0	14.0	101.0
		% within Nonprofit	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C137

Nonprofit Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.103a	1	.748		
Continuity Correctionb	.001	1	.979		
Likelihood Ratio	.104	1	.747		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.496
Linear-by-Linear Association	.102	1	.750		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.54.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C138

Nonprofit Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Nonprofit Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.001	.006		.750c
		Nonprofit Dependent	.001	.006		.750c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C139

Government Experience by Gender

			Government		
			0	Government	Total
Gender	Female	Count	55	6	61
		Expected Count	51.3	9.7	61.0
		% within Government	64.7%	37.5%	60.4%
	Male	Count	30	10	40
		Expected Count	33.7	6.3	40.0
		% within Government	35.3%	62.5%	39.6%
Total		Count	85	16	101
		Expected Count	85.0	16.0	101.0
		% within Government	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C140

Government Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.167a	1	.041		
Continuity Correctionb	3.107	1	.078		
Likelihood Ratio	4.075	1	.044		
Fisher's Exact Test				.053	.040
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.125	1	.042		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C141

Government Experience by Gender Directional Measure

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T[b]	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.071	.068	1.005	.315
		Gender Dependent	.100	.095	1.005	.315
		Government Dependent	.000	.000	.c	.c
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.041	.040		.042d
		Government Dependent	.041	.041		.042d

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C142

Homemaker Experience by Gender

			Homemaker		
			0	Homemaker	Total
Gender	Female	Count	46	15	61
		Expected Count	51.9	9.1	61.0
		% within Homemaker	53.5%	100.0%	60.4%
	Male	Count	40	0	40
		Expected Count	34.1	5.9	40.0
		% within Homemaker	46.5%	0.0%	39.6%
Total		Count	86	15	101
		Expected Count	86.0	15.0	101.0
		% within Homemaker	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C143

Homemaker Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.552a	1	.001		
Continuity Correctionb	9.689	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	16.815	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.437	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C144

Homemaker Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
		Homemaker Dependent	.000	.000	.b	.b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.114	.022		.001c
		Homemaker Dependent	.114	.030		.001c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C145

Other Employment Field Experience by Gender

			Other employment field		
			0	Other (please specify)	Total
Gender	Female	Count	47	14	61
		Expected Count	50.1	10.9	61.0
		% within Other employment field	56.6%	77.8%	60.4%
	Male	Count	36	4	40
		Expected Count	32.9	7.1	40.0
		% within Other employment field	43.4%	22.2%	39.6%
Total		Count	83	18	101
		Expected Count	83.0	18.0	101.0
		% within Other employment field	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table C146

Other Employment Field Experience by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.767a	1	.096		
Continuity Correctionb	1.953	1	.162		
Likelihood Ratio	2.948	1	.086		
Fisher's Exact Test				.116	.079
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.739	1	.098		
N of Valid Cases	101				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.13.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table C147

Other Employment Field Experience by Gender Directional Measures

			Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approx T	Approx sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Gender Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
		Other employment field Dependent	.000	.000	.[b]	.[b]
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Gender Dependent	.027	.029		.098[c]
		Other employment field Dependent	.027	.029		.098[c]

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Table C148

Occupational Field by Gender

	Female			Male			Total		
	Count	Expected	% within field	Count	Expected	% within field	Count	Expected	% within field
Education	10	12.1	50.00	10	7.9	50.00	20	20	100
Business/Com	2	3.6	33.30	4	2.4	66.70	6	6	100
Transport	2	1.2	100.00	0	0.8	0.00	2	2	100
Farming/Fishing/Forestry	0	0.6	0.00	1	0.4	100.00	1	1	100
Sales	1	1.2	50.00	1	0.8	50.00	2	2	100
Professional Services	8	6	80.00	2	4	20.00	10	10	100
Nonprofit	2	1.2	100.00	0	0.8	0.00	2	2	100
Government	1	2.4	25.00	3	1.6	75.00	4	4	100
Homemaker	0	0.6	0.00	1	0.4	100.00	1	1	100
Other	8	6	80.00	2	4	20.00	10	10	100
Two or more fields	27	26	62.80	16	17	37.20	43	43	100
Total	61	61	60.40	40	40	39.60	101	101	100

Note. Professional services includes law, medicine, etc.

Table C149

Occupational Field by Gender Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.916a	10	.177
Likelihood Ratio	16.201	10	.094
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.785	1	.182
N of Valid Cases	101		

a. 16 cells (72.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Table C150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.916a	10	.177
Likelihood Ratio	16.201	10	.094
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.785	1	.182
N of Valid Cases	101		

a. 16 cells (72.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Table C151

Employment Status by Gender Group Statistics

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Employment Status	Female	61	3.07	2.243
	Male	40	3.20	2.672

Table C152

Employment Status by Gender

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances						
		F	Sig.	*t*	*df*	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference
Employment Status	Equal variances assumed	3.688	.058	-.273	99	.785	-.134	.493
	Equal variances not assumed			-.263	73.202	.793	-.134	.511

Table C153

Employment Status by Gender Statistics

N	Valid	101
	Missing	0
Skewness		.667
Std. Error of Skewness		.240
Kurtosis		-1.190
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.476

References

Alsbury, T. L. (2008). School board member and superintendent turnover and the influence on student achievement: An application of the dissatisfaction theory. *Leadership and Policy in School, 7*, 202–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760701748428

Bartanen, B., Grissom, J. A., Joshi, E., & Meredith, M. (2018). Mapping inequalities in local political representation: Evidence from Ohio school boards. *AERA Open, 4*(4), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858418818074

Bhandari, H., & Yasunobu, K. (2009). What is social capital? A comprehensive review of the concept. *Asian Journal of Social Science, 37,* 480–510. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853109X436847

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY, US: Greenwood Press.

Bullock, L. M., Gable, R. A., Carrero, K., Lewis, C., Collins, E., Zolkowski, S., & Lusk, M. (2014). Facing the challenges of today and the future: Ensuring successful outcomes for students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, *9*(1), 103–113. https://doi.org/10.1515/mlt-2012-0005

Burt, R.S. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital.* New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Castle, E. N. (2002). Social capital: An interdisciplinary concept. *Rural Sociology, 67*, 331–349. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2002.tb00107.x

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creating of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(S), 95-120.

Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P.S. (2013). *Business research methods* (12th ed.). Boston, MA, US: McGraw-Hill Education.

Deckman, M. (2006). School board candidates and gender: Ideology, party, and policy concerns. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy, 28*(1), 87–117. https://doi.org /10.1300/j501v28n01_05

Deckman, M. (2007). Gender differences in the decision to run for school board. *American Politics Research, 35,* 541–563. https://doi.org/10.1177 /1532673X07299196

Elder, L. (2004). Why women don't run. *Journal of Women and Politics, 26*(2), 27–56. https://doi.org/10.1300/J014v26n02_02

Eraca, J. A. (2016). *Board of education members: A study of motives, membership, and perceptions of influence on education policy* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT, US.

Ford, M. R., & Ihrke, D. M. (2015). Do school board governance best practices improve district performance? Testing the key work of school boards in Wisconsin. *International Journal of Public Administration, 39,* 87–94. https://doi.org/10 .1080/01900692.2014.982293

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York, NY, US: Free Press.

Gemberling, K. W., Smith, C. W., & Villani, J. S. (2000). *The key work of school boards: Guidebook* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.

Gemberling, K. W., Smith, C. W., & Villani, J. S. (2015). *The key work of school boards: guidebook* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Assoc.

Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2006). Does culture affect economic outcomes? *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 20*(2), 23−48. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.20.2.23

Hess, F. M., & Meeks, O. (2010). *School boards circa 2010: Governance in the accountability era.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute. Retrieved from https://www.nsba.org/sites/default/files/SBcirca2010_WEB.pdf

Honingh, M., Ruiter, M., & van Thiel, S. (2018). Are school boards and educational quality related? Results of an international literature review. *Educational Review, 72,* 157–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1487387

Iowa Association of School Boards. (2000). IASB's lighthouse study: School boards and student achievement. *Iowa School Board Compass, 5*(2), 1–12.

Johnson, P. A. (2013). Effective board leadership: Factors associated with student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership, 23,* 456–489. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461302300302

Kabeer, N. (1994). *Reversed realities: Gender hierarchies in development thought*. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.uk/

Leana, C. R., & Pil, F. K. (2006). Social capital and organizational performance: Evidence from urban public schools. Organization Science, 17(3), 353-366. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0742-7301(06)25006-0

Lorentzen, I. J. (2013). *The relationship between school board governance behaviors and student achievement* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Montana: Missoula, MT, US.

March, C., Smyth, I., & Mukhopadhyay, M. (1999). *A guide to gender-analysis frameworks*. Oxford: Oxfam. Retrieved from https://www.oxfam.org

McDermott, K. A. & Jensen, L. S. (2005). Dubious sovereignty: Federal conditions of aid and the no child left behind act. *Peabody Journal of Education, 80,* 39–56. Retrieved from httpa://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8002_3

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., … Barmer, A. (2019). *The condition of education 2019* (NCES 2019-144). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC, US: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov

Meier, K. J. and O'Toole, L. J., Jr. (2003). Public management and educational performance: The impact of managerial networking. *Public Administration Review*, *63*, 689-699. doi:10.1111/1540-6210.00332

Meyer, P. (2004). A board's eye view. *Education Next, 4*(2), 30–37. Retrieved from https://www.educationnext.org

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldäna, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage.

Mountford, M. (2004). Motives and power of school board members: Implications for school-board superintendent relationships. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40,* 704–741. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316X04268843

Mountford, M., & Brunner, C. C. (2010). Gendered behavior patterns in school board governance. *Teachers College Record, 112,* 2067–2117. Retrieved from https://www.tcrecord.org

Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 242–266. https://doi.org/10.2307/259373

National School Boards Association. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions.* Retrieved from https://www.nsba.org/about-us/frequently-asked-questions

National School Boards Association. (2006). *Becoming a better board member: A guide to effective school board service* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA, US: National School Boards Association.

New York State School Boards Association. (2015). *New school board member handbook: A guide to surviving your first year*. Retrieved from https://www.nyssba.org/clientuploads/nyssba_pdf/Events/nsbma-buffalo07152016/New%20Board%20Member%20Handbook%202015%20FINAL%20for%20web.pdfrunning-for-sb-2019-07092018.pdf

New York State School Boards Association. (2019a). *2019 Running for the school board brochure*. Retrieved from https://www.nyssba.org/clientuploads/nyssba_pdf/Brochure/running-for-sb-2019-07092018.pdf

New York State School Boards Association. (2019b). *State-mandated training.* Retrieved from https://www.nyssba.org/education-training/state-mandated-training/

O'Toole, L.R., Jr. (1997.) Treating networks seriously: Practical and research-based agendas in public administration. *Public Administration Review, 57*(1), 45-52. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/976691?seq=1

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work.* Princeton, NJ, US: Princeton University Press.

Rice, A. (2017). Creating a strong school board-superintendent relationship. *Southeast Education Network*, *18*(3), 48–50. Retrieved from http://www.seenmagazine.us

Saatcioglu, A., & Sargut, G. (2014). Sociology of school boards: A social capital perspective. *Sociological Inquiry, 84*, 42–74. https://doi.org/10.111/soin.12025

Salinas, M. F., & Garr, J. (2009). Effect of learner-centered education on the academic outcomes of minority groups. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*(4), 226–237. Retrieved from http://www.projectinnovation.biz/jip.html

Shober, A. F., & Hartney, M. T. (2014). *Does school board leadership matter?* Washington, DC, US: Thomas B. Fordham Institute. Retrieved from https://fordhaminstitute.org

Sonnenfeld, J. (2002). What makes great boards great. *Harvard Business Review*, *80(*9), 106–113. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/

Tallerico, M. (1992). School board membership: Gender issues and women's perspectives. *Urban Education, 26,* 371–389. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085992026004004

Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42*, 35–67. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393808

VanTuyle, V., & Watkins, S. (2017). Self-efficacy of female school board presidents. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, 211,* 1–21. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/211

Waters, J. T., & Marzano, R. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement.* Denver, CO, US: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Psychology, 26,* 215–240. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.215

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41,* 176–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011434558

Wong, K. K., & Shen, F. X. (2013). *Mayoral governance and student achievement: How mayor-led districts are improving school and student performance.* Retrieved from https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2013/03/22/56934/mayoral-governance-and-student-achievement/

Zlotkin, J. (1993). Rethinking the school board's role. *Educational Leadership, 51*(2), 22–25. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/

Vita

Name	*Kathryn Behr*
Baccalaureate Degree	*Bachelor of Science, Syracuse University, Syracuse* *Major: Music Education*
Date Graduated	*May, 2005*
Master's Degree	*Master of Science, Syracuse University, Syracuse* *Major: Music Education*
Date Graduated	*August, 2007*
Professional Certificates	*Professional Diploma in Educational Administration, College of St. Rose, Albany*
Date Graduated	*May, 2013*