

Governance Study Research Questions

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine how New York School Board members who attended their state school board association annual convention describe their school board practices in the areas of board effectiveness, conflict management and teamwork. Approximately 1500 school board members attended the conference and 165 returned a completed survey to the researchers' drop box in the main hall of the conference center.

1. Describe the subjects in the study.

Of the 165 trustees who returned a completed survey, 46 percent came from rural districts, 48 percent came from suburban districts and 6 percent came from city districts (Table 1).

Table 1 Type of District Trustees Represented

Table 1		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-Rural	57	34.5	46.3	46.3
	2-Suburban	59	35.8	48.0	94.3
	3-City	7	4.2	5.7	100.0
	Total	123	74.5	100.0	
Missing	System	42	25.5		
Total		165	100.0		

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:32 PM
Formatted: Left, Tabs: 5.97", Left

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:39 PM
Deleted: took the

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:40 PM
Deleted: 100% participation

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:41 PM
Formatted: Left

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:41 PM
Deleted: Rural area is 47%. Suburban is 48%. City is 6%.

Table 2 Gender comparisons for school board members

Table 2		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-Male	76	46.1	46.9	46.9
	2-Female	86	52.1	53.1	100.0
	Total	162	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		165	100.0		

Male board members comprised 47% of the school board trustees who responded to the survey and 53% were females.

Table 3 Percent of school board members with Children in the public Schools

Table 3		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-No Child	64	38.8	39.0	39.0
	2-Children	100	60.6	61.0	100.0
	Total	164	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		165	100.0		

61% of the school board members presently have children attending school in the district while the other 39% does not.

Each table needs a number and title. See examples above. **exprank**

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:42 PM

Formatted: Left

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:43 PM

Deleted: made up

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:44 PM

Deleted: is made up of

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:44 PM

Formatted: Left

Tablet User 11/25/12 6:45 PM

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0"

Table 4		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1=1-2 yrs	29	17.6	17.9	17.9
	2=3-14 yrs	106	64.2	65.4	83.3
	3=15-more yrs	27	16.4	16.7	100.0
	Total	162	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		165	100.0		

18% of the school board members have school board experience between 1-2 years. 66% of the school board members have school board experience between 3-14 years. 17% of the school board members have school board experience over 15 years.

Edu

Table 6		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-HS	19	11.5	11.6	11.6
	2-Some College	36	21.8	22.0	33.5
	3-College Degree	46	27.9	28.0	61.6
	4-Masters	63	38.2	38.4	100.0
	Total	164	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		165	100.0		

Table xx demonstrates that 12% of the school board members in this study have a high school education, 22% of the school board members report some college education, 28% have a bachelor degree and 39% have a masters degree.

AGE

Approximately, 25% of school board members are between 35-47 years old. Approximately, 25% of school board members are between 48-51 years old and, approximately, 50% of school board members are over 52 years old.

In this study, our second research question asked how do male and female New York State trustees who attend the NYSSBA Conference differ in their descriptions of board practices and effectiveness?

Group Statistics

Table 7	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
BoardEffectiveness1116	1-M	72	21.7083	5.46548	.64411	-.628	153	.531
	2-F	83	22.2771	5.75795	.63202			
Teamwork	1-M	71	47.1408	5.30578	.62968	-.855	142	.394
	2-F	73	48.0137	6.82620	.79895			
Conflict Management	1-M	73	11.3151	2.44879	.28661	-1.751	142	.082
	2-F	71	12.0000	2.23607	.26537			

There is no significance between male and female New York State trustees who attended the NYSSBA Conference and their descriptions of board teamwork, conflict management practices and board effectiveness. Remember to interpret the mean scores. Male and female school board members in this study report that they agree that their boards have teamwork, sometimes they manage conflict and exhibit effective board practices.

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:46 PM
Deleted: .

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:46 PM
Deleted: have

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:46 PM
Deleted: .

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:46 PM
Deleted: s

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:46 PM
Deleted: .

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:48 PM
Deleted: of the school board members h

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:48 PM
Deleted: .

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:48 PM
Deleted: A

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:49 PM
Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:49 PM
Deleted: H

Our third research question asked what relationships are there among New York school board trustee descriptions of school board practices of teamwork and conflict management, and school board effectiveness?

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:55 PM
 Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering
 Deleted: W
 Tablet User 11/25/12 9:55 PM
 Deleted:

Correlations

Table 8		BoardEffectiveness1116	Teamwork	ConflictManagement	Gender	exprank	Exp	Children	Age	Edu
BoardEffectiveness1116	Pearson Correlation	1	.459**	.424**	.051	.253**	.234**	-.117	-.014	.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.531	.001	.003	.144	.863	.469
	N	158	143	143	155	156	156	157	149	157
Teamwork	Pearson Correlation	.459**	1	.208*	.072	.098	.164*	.022	.114	.065
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.014	.394	.242	.049	.791	.180	.434
	N	143	147	139	144	145	145	146	139	147
ConflictManagement	Pearson Correlation	.424**	.208*	1	.145	.031	.022	.063	.059	-.070
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.014		.082	.714	.796	.451	.493	.399
	N	143	139	146	144	143	143	145	139	146
Gender	Pearson Correlation	.051	.072	.145	1	-.073	.006	-.070	-.105	-.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.531	.394	.082		.359	.938	.379	.195	.432
	N	155	144	144	162	159	159	161	153	161
Exprank	Pearson Correlation	.253**	.098	.031	-.073	1	.831**	.372**	.475**	.111
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.242	.714	.359		.000	.000	.000	.162
	N	156	145	143	159	162	162	161	152	161
Exp	Pearson Correlation	.234**	.164*	.022	.006	.831**	1	.456**	.551**	.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.049	.796	.938	.000		.000	.000	.503
	N	156	145	143	159	162	162	161	152	161
Children	Pearson Correlation	-.117	.022	.063	-.070	.372**	.456**	1	.542**	.150
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.144	.791	.451	.379	.000	.000		.000	.056

	N	157	146	145	161	161	161	164	154	163
Age	Pearson Correlation	-.014	.114	.059	-.105	.475**	.551**	.542**	1	.221**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.863	.180	.493	.195	.000	.000	.000		.006
	N	149	139	139	153	152	152	154	155	155
Edu	Pearson Correlation	.058	.065	-.070	-.062	.111	.053	.150	.221**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.469	.434	.399	.432	.162	.503	.056	.006	
	N	157	147	146	161	161	161	163	155	164

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Experience has a small relationship among New York school board trustee descriptions of school board practices and school board effectiveness. Age has no relationship among New York school board trustee descriptions of school board practices and school board effectiveness. Children in school has no relationship among New York school board trustee descriptions of school board practices and school board effectiveness. Teamwork is moderately related to board effectiveness accounting for approximately 19% of the variance in the binary relationship. Conflict management is moderately related to board effectiveness accounting for approximately 17% of the variance in the binary relationship.

Very good.

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:56 PM

Deleted: ve

Tablet User 11/25/12 9:56 PM

Deleted: o

Our fourth research question asked when New York State school board trustees attending the state conference are divided into low, moderate and high experience groups, how do they differ in their descriptions of board practices and board effectiveness?

Table 9		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
BoardEffectiveness1116	1.00	27	19.3333	5.80451	1.11708
	2.00	102	22.2451	5.21315	.51618
	3.00	27	24.0370	5.33841	1.02738
	Total	156	22.0513	5.48993	.43955
Teamwork	1.00	26	47.3077	6.16940	1.20992
	2.00	98	47.4082	6.03228	.60935
	3.00	21	49.4762	4.84375	1.05699
	Total	145	47.6897	5.90964	.49077
Conflict Management	1.00	25	11.2400	2.52124	.50425
	2.00	96	11.8125	2.38995	.24392
	3.00	22	11.4545	2.08686	.44492
	Total	143	11.6573	2.36496	.19777

There was a significant difference in the mean score for school board members with little experience compared with high experience board members. The higher experience board members ranked their board members more effective.

Comparison of low moderate and highly experienced board members

ANOVA

Table 10		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
BoardEffectiveness1116	Between Groups	309.754	2	154.877	5.433	.005
	Within Groups	4361.836	153	28.509		
	Total	4671.590	155			
Teamwork	Between Groups	78.584	2	39.292	1.127	.327
	Within Groups	4950.450	142	34.862		
	Total	5029.034	144			
Conflict Management	Between Groups	7.570	2	3.785	.674	.511
	Within Groups	786.640	140	5.619		
	Total	794.210	142			

There was no significance between the groups for Teamwork and Conflict Management. There was only significant difference for board effectiveness only.

Table 11 Post hoc comparison for Board Effectiveness among three experienced groups

Dependent Variable	(I) exprank	(J) exprank	Mean		
			Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
BoardEffectiveness1116	1.00	2.00	-2.91176	1.23057	.067
		3.00	-4.70370*	1.51768	.009
	2.00	1.00	2.91176	1.23057	.067
		3.00	-1.79194	1.14976	.330
	3.00	1.00	4.70370*	1.51768	.009
		2.00	1.79194	1.14976	.330
		2.00	-.35795	.50740	.859

Between low and moderate experience board members, there was no significant difference in mean scores for Board Effectiveness. There was a significant difference between low and high experience board members for their descriptions of their board effectiveness. The higher experienced board members described their boards as more effective than low experienced board members.

Conclusion

New school board members differ from experienced board members in their descriptions of board effectiveness. Further analysis of the mental models of new and experienced board members regarding the elements of board effectiveness seems warranted for these board members.