A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER OPINIONS REGARDING POTENTIALLY CRITICAL FACTORS IN SCHOOL BOND REFERENDA SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN KANSAS DURING THE YEARS 2004-2007

by

BRIAN W. KRAUS

B.A., Bethany College, 1980
M.S., Kansas State University, 1986

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2009

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze opinions of selected school district stakeholders regarding potentially critical factors in school bond referendum success and failure in Kansas during the years 2004-2007. Of the 72 eligible school districts, one district was randomly selected from each of six groups formed through a stratified random sampling process utilizing district enrollment (small, medium, large) and bond election result (successful, unsuccessful).

Four purposefully selected respondents from each district participated in a mixed methods strategy of inquiry that included completing a 32-item written survey and participating in a personal interview. The survey served as the standardized data collection instrument. Survey data were used to augment and expand upon understanding of the bond referendum process gained from the personal interviews by examining respondents' perceptions of how important campaign strategies were, or would have been, in influencing election results. Frequency distributions were constructed in an attempt to identify relationships between variables identified as important to bond election success. Cross-tabulations and Pearson's chi-square were the statistical treatments chosen to further analyze the survey data.

During the interviews, participants were asked a set of standard questions as well as questions unique to their role in the election process. The questions were designed to elicit in-depth responses about factors critical to the bond's success or failure and to gather useful advice for other districts preparing for a bond election. Interviews were used to discover new data, further develop existing data, and assist in organizing all data sources to construct a 'story' describing bond election experiences in Kansas.

The study findings indicate that unsuccessful districts utilize more campaign strategies and perceive them to be more important than successful districts, but that successful districts are more in tune with patrons. As each district is unique, it was found that strategies that were successful in one district might not be in another. Three factors found to be critical included: having unanimous school board support for the bond referendum, developing an on-going public relations strategy with patrons, and communicating the elements of a bond referendum to all patrons in simple, clear, and honest language.

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER OPINIONS REGARDING POTENTIALLY CRITICAL FACTORS IN SCHOOL BOND REFERENDA SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN KANSAS DURING THE YEARS 2004-2007

by

BRIAN W. KRAUS

B.A., Bethany College, 1980
M.S., Kansas State University, 1986

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2009

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. David C. Thompson

Copyright

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze opinions of selected school district stakeholders regarding potentially critical factors in school bond referendum success and failure in Kansas during the years 2004-2007. Of the 72 eligible school districts, one district was randomly selected from each of six groups formed through a stratified random sampling process utilizing district enrollment (small, medium, large) and bond election result (successful, unsuccessful).

Four purposefully selected respondents from each district participated in a mixed methods strategy of inquiry that included completing a 32-item written survey and participating in a personal interview. The survey served as the standardized data collection instrument. Survey data were used to augment and expand upon understanding of the bond referendum process gained from the personal interviews by examining respondents' perceptions of how important campaign strategies were, or would have been, in influencing election results. Frequency distributions were constructed in an attempt to identify relationships between variables identified as important to bond election success. Cross-tabulations and Pearson's chi-square were the statistical treatments chosen to further analyze the survey data.

During the interviews, participants were asked a set of standard questions as well as questions unique to their role in the election process. The questions were designed to elicit in-depth responses about factors critical to the bond's success or failure and to gather useful advice for other districts preparing for a bond election. Interviews were used to discover new data, further develop existing data, and assist in organizing all data sources to construct a 'story' describing bond election experiences in Kansas.

The study findings indicate that unsuccessful districts utilize more campaign strategies and perceive them to be more important than successful districts, but that successful districts are more in tune with patrons. As each district is unique, it was found that strategies that were successful in one district might not be in another. Three factors found to be critical included: having unanimous school board support for the bond referendum, developing an on-going public relations strategy with patrons, and communicating the elements of a bond referendum to all patrons in simple, clear, and honest language.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

The successful completion of a dissertation requires the guidance and support of a great many people. I wish to express my sincere thanks to all of those individuals who provided their assistance and expertise. First and foremost, I want to thank my major advisor, Dr. David C. Thompson, for the many hours of advice, editing, counsel, and encouragement that he supplied along with high expectations for a quality product. I have learned a great deal from him about what it means to be an educational leader. Without his skilled involvement, the project would never have come to fruition. I also want to express my gratitude to the other members of my committee for their constructive direction and wise counsel throughout the process: Dr. Fred Bradley, Dr. Mary Devin, Dr. Robert Shoop, and Dr. Steven Harbstreit, who served as the outside chair. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Walter Schumm for his expertise in running the statistics and helping me to understand their significance, and to Dr. G. Kent Stewart, who was responsible for recruiting me into the doctoral program.

I am also grateful for the support of the following superintendents who were flexible in granting leave to me so that I could pursue a doctoral degree: Kirk Nielsen with Colby, USD 315, Terry Schmidt and Steve Pegram with Santa Fe Trail, USD 434, and Dean Katt with Ottawa, USD 290. Without the support and encouragement of these district leaders, the completion of the doctoral program of studies and dissertation would not have been possible.

Finally, and most importantly, I am truly blessed to have had the love, support, and encouragement of my wife and best friend, Nanette. In addition to dealing with six years of tuition payments and the many late nights and early mornings spent writing or studying, there were far too many times when the requirements of my program of study forced her to shoulder more than her share of the parenting responsibilities with our children. I also want to thank our

sons, Brandon and Austin, for their patience and understanding of all of the times that I was physically present, but was unavailable to them because I was writing or studying. It is my hope that by observing the process of pursuing a doctorate, they will understand the value of the commitment and perseverance necessary to achieve a goal and apply that lesson to their own lives.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In many communities, local schools are a source of pride, a symbol of local control, and often a hub of social activity. The physical condition of those schools is one indication of the value placed on the education of children by the patrons of that community. It may also be an indication of the real or perceived ability of the community to finance educational facilities. Those districts with the greatest need generally are least able to pay (Honeyman, Wood, Thompson, & Stewart, 1988). Unfortunately, all across the nation, an alarming number of school buildings are badly in need of being replaced or remodeled in order to create a safe and orderly environment in which to learn. A 1995 study by the General Accounting Office concerning school infrastructure reported that one-third of all schools needed extensive repair or replacement and that about 60% had at least one major building feature in need of significant repair. A few years later the situation had not improved, as was evident from the American Society of Civil Engineers 2001 Report Card that stated, "Due to either aging or outdated facilities, or severe overcrowding, 75% of our nation's school buildings are inadequate to meet the needs of school children" (pg. 1). These factors, coupled with the fact that in many states the majority of school infrastructure improvement is funded through a local bond referendum election, make it of paramount importance that school officials and local boards of education be aware of general strategies that increase the likelihood of a successful bond passage.

The deteriorating condition of the infrastructure of the nation's schools has been well documented. More than 75% of schools in the United States were built before 1970

(Lyons, 2001). Many of these buildings are reaching the limits of their life expectancy and should be replaced. However, "their service continues, perpetuating crowded classrooms, outmoded designs, poor communications systems, limited technology, and inadequate security" (Lyons, pg. 1). It was estimated in 2001 that it would take $266.1 billion to bring America's school up to standard (Crampton & Thompson, 2003). This figure did not even take into account the cost to provide schools with technological and communication upgrades. According to Moseley-Braun (1997), the need appears to be greatest in urban schools, with 38% being rated in near-deplorable condition. Although suburban and rural schools fare somewhat better, they still fall close behind with 30% and 29% respectively being found in need of significant renovation (Moseley-Braun, 1997).

There is a growing body of research that reveals a relationship between the condition of the school facility and student achievement. School buildings that are in good physical condition have a positive impact on student achievement (Bowers & Burkett, 1989; Berner, 1993; Earthman, Cash, & Berkum, 1995; Earthman, Cash, & Hines, 1997; LeMasters, 1997; Lyons, 2001). It makes intuitive sense that students would achieve at a higher level in facilities that are cleaner, safer, more aesthetically pleasing, and have sufficient and modern technology. Many older facilities were designed for the lecture format of delivery that dominated the educational landscape for years and lack the flexible physical design necessary to accommodate current teaching techniques utilizing group activities, technology-driven learning, and peer-to-peer interaction. The ramifications of an inferior physical environment can include safety issues, decreased morale among students and staff, and decreased academic performance (Frazier, 1994).

Taking into account the fact that no two school communities are exactly the same, various researchers have identified commonalities in successful and unsuccessful school bond elections. No matter how well a bond issue has been planned and publicized, it will fail if it is not palatable to the voting public. Thus, it behooves school boards and district administrators to assess what is likely to be supported by patrons before they identify the specifics of a bond issue. Gallagher, Bagin, & Kindred (1997) stated that in a bond campaign "an early step should be finding out the community's thoughts and opinions regarding the need for the building" (pg. 276). This insight into the desires and perceptions of the voting populace can help school officials target facility needs in a bond issue that are important to the community and help them avoid areas for which there is no support or that are likely to be contentious, thus jeopardizing the entire bond election.

A number of researchers have long noted that nothing will bring about the failure of a school bond election more quickly than the lack of clear, on-going communication about the identified needs or the perception that school officials are not communicating honestly with the patrons (Chopra, 1988; MacDonald, 1995; Walker, 1996; and Mathison, 1998). Communications from the district to patrons should be written clearly and give clear explanations of what will be included in the bond issue to directly benefit students. It is also important to clearly explain concepts like the tax levy, as the voting populace typically does not have a good understanding of such complex matters. District officials should engage in meaningful conversations with the patrons on a frequent basis to determine the needs of the community. If the only time the district communicates with the community is when it wants to pass a bond, the reaction is not likely to be positive.

How people vote on a bond issue is often reflective of their values. According to Henry (1994), "A person's values are not going to change during a two-month campaign. Changing an entrenched 'No' voter's mind becomes very difficult, if not impossible. Identify supporters and get them to the polls" (pg. 10). Many other researchers have long echoed the sentiment that it is essential to identify and mobilize the 'Yes' voters in the community (Conyers, 1989; Bauscher, 1994; Holt, 1994; Mathison, 1998). Because of this, many bond campaign organizers have determined that their time, energy, and resources are better spent identifying their supporters and arming those supporters with factual information, rather than trying to win the support of every voter.

Barney (1984) found that successful bond passage hinged on wide-ranging involvement from many facets of the community that must be skillfully choreographed by a carefully selected bond issue steering committee. Other researchers have concurred that an active and effective citizen committee is essential to successful passage of a bond issue (Denny & Harris, 1964; Chopra, 1988; Graham, Wise, & Bachman, 1990). It is essential that the bond steering committee include membership from every facet of the community that desires representation. Having a diverse and active citizens' committee ensures that interest in, and support for, the bond issue broadens beyond the scope of the local school administration and the school board.

The importance of unified support for a bond referendum by the board of education cannot be denied. Voters are not likely to wholeheartedly support a bond referendum about which their elected officials are not in total agreement. Henry (1994) stated that a unified board was not only important, but was an "absolute must" (pg. 10). Mattison (1998) suggested that "a board that has a single-minded purpose shows the community that its leadership is strong and committed to a particular direction. A board that is not unified signals the opposite" (pg. 30). A

bond issue presented to a voting community by a board that is less than unanimous in its support is likely to face significant obstacles.

Having a speakers' bureau staffed by influential community members who can skillfully articulate the need for, and benefits of, a school bond referendum has been cited in the research as being a positive factor in bond referenda passage (Weir, 1981; Surratt, 1987; Chopra, 1988; Gallagher, Bagin, & Kindred, 1997). The speakers must be carefully chosen, well trained, and given accurate and appropriate information. The message is more likely to be perceived in a positive manner when it is presented by speakers who already have credibility in the community at large. Having a group of speakers who can speak to various groups improves the odds that all patrons of the district will be exposed to accurate facts about the proposed bond issue.

The problem of increasing infrastructure deficits is endemic to all 50 states and is perhaps most poignant in states with low or non-existent state financial support for education's physical needs. Kansas is among those states. In Kansas, the most recent estimate of needed funding for school modernization was a staggering $4,562,816,736 (Crampton & Thompson, 2008). It becomes essential, then, that school officials and school board members have information available to them that can be utilized to make the passage of a referendum more likely.

The purpose of this research is to provide school officials, board of education members, and community leaders in Kansas and beyond with information that will assist them in assessing the climate of their school districts regarding a proposed bond referendum, help them identify critical factors in a successful referendum election, and empower them to construct successful bond election campaigns.

Statement of the Problem

In many school districts throughout Kansas and the nation, the decision to propose a school bond referendum is not one that school officials and boards of education embrace with enthusiasm, since the patrons of a district typically do not view the prospect of increased school taxes positively. As voters typically do not have the opportunity to vote on many tax increases, a school bond referendum is commonly seen as the perfect occasion to voice their disapproval about taxes in general. When a school bond referendum is defeated, however, it only exacerbates existing school infrastructure problems and makes the prognosis for sufficient future infrastructure improvements even more unlikely due to ever-escalating costs of materials and labor.

As a result, the need to identify essential factors in the success or failure of school bond issues in communities of varying demographics becomes increasingly important, especially in states that require significant local tax participation in school facility projects. The information collected in this study should therefore prove useful to school officials trying to construct a bond campaign that is tailored to their local community.

Research Purpose and Objectives

This study had four purposes:

1. To examine successful and unsuccessful school bond referenda in Kansas by analyzing opinions of selected knowledgeable stakeholders in communities that conducted bond elections between 2004-2007.

2. To evaluate which variables appear to have contributed to the successful passage of school bond elections in three selected Kansas school districts.
3. To evaluate which variables appear to have contributed to the failure of school bond elections in three selected Kansas school districts.
4. To examine what relationship, if any, may have existed among the variables identified as important in these selected Kansas school districts.

Methodology

To carry out these objectives, the following procedure was utilized:

First, information was gathered from the Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB) to determine which Kansas school districts held bond referendum elections between 2004-2007. The identified districts were then categorized as large, medium, or small based on district pupil enrollment. Two districts were then selected from each size category: one that had a successful bond election, and one in which the bond failed.

After selecting these six school districts, the superintendents of the respective districts were contacted to determine willingness to participate in the study. Information was then gathered via a written survey and a personal follow-up interview. Interviewees were the superintendent of schools, a member of the local citizen committee, a local banker, and the editor of the local newspaper. The data from these 24 surveys and 24 interviews were then summarized and descriptively analyzed to help identify essential factors in the success or failure of the bond election in each representative community.

Limitations of the Study

- Only public school districts in Kansas were studied.
- Data were collected only from school districts holding bond elections from 2004-2007.
- Generalizability may be limited to the six school districts selected for this study.

Organization of the Study

This study was constructed around five distinct chapters. Chapter 1 of this study provided an introduction, a statement of the problem, the research purpose and objectives, an overview of methodology, a description of limitations, and definitions of terms used in the study. Chapter 2 provided of a review of literature in search of critical factors thought to determine the success or failure of school bond elections. Chapter 3 identified and described the research methodology utilized in the study. An analysis of data and graphic representation of the results then comprised Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 5 provided a summary of the study, reviewed conclusions drawn from the data, drew out the practical significance of any findings, and offered any recommendations for further study.

Definition of Terms

Assessed valuation: The total value of taxable property within the school district boundaries as determined by the county appraiser.

Bond attorney: A specialized attorney hired by the local board of education to oversee procedures for school bond preparation and sale of bonds. The bond attorney is the legal advisor to the school board throughout, and after, a bond campaign.

Bond consultant: A specialized professional who assists school districts in financial preparation for a school bond election. The bond consultant develops the structure for bonding capacity, tax rates, and bond sales.

Bonding capacity: The maximum amount of dollars a local school district can generate for a bond proposal. In Kansas, a school district's total bond capacity is equal to 14 percent of the district's total property valuation.

Capital projects: Infrastructure projects that generally involve significant repairs to, or replacement of, buildings or sites.

Citizens' committee: Groups of individuals, not funded by school monies, who work for voter approval of a bond election.

Deferred maintenance: Refers to the maintenance necessary to improve school facilities to a good condition. Once deferred maintenance has been satisfied, only routine maintenance should be necessary.

Inadequate learning environments: Instructional settings in which poor physical conditions negatively affect students' ability to receive an appropriate education.

Issuance of bonds: The act of selling bonds to investors to provide necessary funds for capital projects.

Payoff schedule: An amortization schedule for paying off bonded indebtedness that includes principal and interest payments.

Public interest: an improvement that may or may not be of benefit to the individual voter: e.g., a new school is in the public's interest, but may or may not be in a voter's personal interest depending on whether or not the voter has children in the school system.

Public regardingness: a term in the literature referring to the phenomenon which explains when a socioeconomic group votes against its own self-interest and instead votes for the interest of the general public.

Random sampling: a selection technique wherein each member of a given study population has an equal chance of being chosen as a part of the sample to be included in the research.

School bond: an investment certificate issued by a school district for public sale. Bonds are issued in the amount of the principal loan on a capital project. Accrued interest and the principal are paid to the holder of the bond over the life of the bond.

School bond election: also referred to as school bond referendum. A process wherein the local electorate is asked to approve the issuance of bonded indebtedness in order to make major repairs to school buildings, construct new buildings, improve school sites, or purchase new sites.

Side issues: incidents or situations arising during a bond election campaign. Side issues generally are not related to the bond proposal, *per se*, but may distract attention from the central purpose of the actual bond.

School districts (large): defined for purposes of this study as districts having an enrollment of more than 3,000 students.

School districts (medium): defined for the purposes of this study as districts having an enrollment of more than 1,200 students but less than 3,000 students.

School districts (small): defined for purposes of this study as districts having an enrollment of 1,200 students or less.

Sociometrics: the quantitative study of interpersonal relationships in populations, especially the study and measurement of preferences.

Sociotropic voting: voting in which the voter's political behavior seems driven by an evaluation of the collective good, rather than by personal gain.

Stratified random sampling: occurs when subgroups are intentionally identified from a larger population based on certain characteristics (e.g. race, gender, age, etc.); a random sample is then drawn from those subgroups.

Study participants: Individuals from the identified school districts who agree to be interviewed for the purpose of gathering information to inform a study.

Voting or voter behavior: observed patterns of how people vote in an election. In this study, in school bond elections.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

The literature affecting this study can be conceptualized in four basic themes: (1) the need for bond referenda passage to address school infrastructure concerns; (2) the effect of demographic factors in predicting school bond voter behavior; (3) the identification of variables that appear to contribute to the successful passage of school bond referenda; and (4) the identification of variables that appear to contribute to the defeat of such referenda.

Concerns about Current School Infrastructure

If the premise is accepted that the future of the nation rests with children, then it is of paramount importance that school facilities must be provided for every child that ensure safety, adequate space, access to appropriate technology, and an environment free of distraction and conducive to learning. Unfortunately, it has been a growing reality for decades that many of our nation's school districts have serious infrastructure deficiencies in one or more areas (Crampton & Thompson, 2003).

Why is school infrastructure crumbling, and what is to be done about it? Constitutionally, the responsibility for public education falls to the individual states. In many states, the funding of local school facilities is then passed down to the voters of the school district wherein the school is located. Nationally, from 1990 to 1997, annual construction expenditures for elementary and secondary schools increased by 39% (General Accounting Office, 2000). But, although state financial support for school infrastructure has grown in recent

years, the major source of revenue for local school infrastructure improvements has continued to rely on the local voter-approved bond issue. In Kansas, the state aid that is available to school infrastructure requires local tax effort to qualify. As a result, in school districts where local voters will not pass a bond, the district is unable to participate in the state funding program. Therefore, "the lack of voter support for the local bond issue means that school infrastructure needs continue to go unmet" (Sielke, 2003).

Although deferring maintenance may seem fiscally prudent in the short-term, the long-term effect can be devastating. "The consequences of electing to defer maintenance include premature building deterioration, indoor air problems, increased repair and replacement costs, and reduced operating efficiency of equipment" (Frazier, 1994, pg. 8). The problem of deferred maintenance was also addressed by the United States General Accounting Office (1995). A survey estimate by the GAO revealed a projected cost of $112 billion to meet federal mandates and to bring existing schools across the nation up to a rating of 'good overall condition'. A rating of 'good' meant that a school required only minor repairs or routine maintenance. 'Overall condition' referred not only to the plant's physical condition, but also to its ability to adequately provide for current instructional programs. The estimates in the GAO study were limited, at the request of Congress, to deferred maintenance and health, safety, and accessibility issues. A more comprehensive study done in 2001 that included the factors analyzed by the GAO study, as well as needs in the areas of new construction and efforts aimed at reducing class sizes, determined the actual need to be a staggering $266.1 billion nationwide (Crampton, Thompson, & Hagey, 2001). "While the total amount has moved over time in a national context, the issue of genuine need has continued, as in 2008 Crampton and Thompson reported an

aggregate need amount in Kansas of $4.63 billion—an increase of 254% across the period 2001-2008." (AFT, 2008, pg. 15).

Even more troubling, many researchers have studied the effect of a school's physical environment on student achievement. A study by Bowers and Burkett (1989) in Tennessee compared the academic achievement and self-concept scores of fifth and seventh grade students in two schools which were selected because of their age and physical environments. They found that students in the more modern school had levels of achievement that were significantly higher than those of students in the older facility, even after differences in socioeconomic levels were taken into account. In similar fashion, the self-concepts of the students in the modern school building were significantly higher than those of the students in the more outdated building. A final finding of significance was that the students in the modern building had fewer discipline referrals and better attendance rates than the students in the older building.

This same conclusion was drawn by Berner (1993) in a study of the correlation between school building condition and student achievement in the Washington (D.C.) school system. In her study, schools were rated as poor, fair, or excellent in terms of the condition of the building. She found that when a school moved from one category to the next higher rating, there was a corresponding average increase per student of 5.455 points on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). As a result of the study, Berner opined that addressing the basic condition of school facilities could be seen as an impactful means to improve educational performance.

In a synthesis of the results of three previous studies, Cash, Earthman, and Hines (1997) concluded that "the condition of the building directly influences students in how they achieve and behave" (pg. 12). It was also found in the same study that the condition of the building had an effect on the perceptions of parents and school staff who, in turn, influenced students'

opinions. In each instance they studied, there was a positive correlation between better building condition and higher student performance as measured by achievement test scores. Similarly, after reviewing research correlating student achievement and condition of facilities, it was reported to the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International (CEFPI), that "based on our research, there's no doubt that building condition affects academic performance. The issue is not whether it does, but how to best spend the limited funds available to school districts." (Cash, Earthman, & Hines, 1997, pg.14).

In a review of research investigating the correlation between student achievement and the condition of school infrastructure, Lyons (2001) analyzed a number of facility variables including indoor air quality, heating and cooling systems, and acoustics. He found that many schools had infrastructure issues that adversely affected indoor air quality and resulted in asthma attacks in susceptible children and poor concentration and sleepiness in others. Regardless of the severity of reaction by each individual student, learning in such environments was negatively affected. Efficient and effective heating and cooling systems were held to be important because room temperature had the ability to distract students from their learning tasks. Good acoustics were judged to be an important part of the learning environment in that a noisy room made it difficult to concentrate and produced stress in teachers and students alike. All of these environmental issues were seen to have an effect on both teaching and learning. "More specifically, students who attend better buildings have test scores ranging from five to seventeen percentile points higher than students in substandard facilities" (Lyons, 2001, pg 1).

Thus there is strong support from the research literature that deterioration of public school infrastructure, caused by deferred maintenance and the inability of local school districts to

pass bond referenda, has resulted in negative effects on the quality and safety of school facilities, as well as the self-concept, behavior, and academic achievement of students.

The Effect of Demographic Factors in Predicting School Bond Voter Behavior

Over the last 50 years researchers have attempted to determine how individuals would vote on educational referenda based on various demographic factors (e.g. Agger, 1961; Hatley & Burlingame, 1972; Lows, 1987; Chew, 1992; Theobald & Meier, 2002). One of the earliest studies analyzing voter behavior based on demographics was done by Agger (1961). Agger attempted to determine what demographic factors were significant in voter behavior dealing with the topics of public funding for kindergarten and public funding of special education in Springfield and Eugene, Oregon.

In this study, voters defeated a referendum that would have provided public funds for kindergarten by a margin of 3:1. Agger found that social class factors (educational level, income level, and type of occupation) had little predictive value in determining attitudes toward public funding of kindergarten. It was found that only Agger's last occupational category, that of retired people, seemed to be a good predictor of voting behavior. Agger stated, "It is the poorly educated, retired people, in Eugene, who constitute the occupational category most opposed to kindergartens" (pg. 5). When studying attitudes toward increased special education spending, Agger found that a majority of voters in both cities, regardless of educational level, supported increased spending for special education. Income level did not appear to have much of an effect, and the occupation of the patron was of even less consequence when determining attitude toward increased special education funding.

Agger also studied the relationship that age, gender, family structure, and length of residence had on levels of support for kindergarten. He found that increasing age of voters resulted in a decreasing lack of support for kindergarten. This trend remained when the effects of educational level were controlled. No apparent relationship between gender and support for kindergarten or special education funding was discovered. The only finding of significance related to family structure was that families in both cities with pre-school aged children tended to be in support of kindergarten. Similarly, this group was also found to be the most supportive of special education. Other general findings were that people who had lived in the communities less than 12 years were more likely to support kindergarten than people who had lived there longer and that homeowners were less likely to support the initiative than those patrons who rented or were considering buying a home. These same trends were evident in terms of support for increased special education funding.

Finally, Agger investigated the effect of evaluations and attitudes toward the schools, political ideology, and political parties. Not surprisingly, Agger found that voters who gave high ratings to their school system were more likely to support public funding of kindergarten and increased funding for special education than those people who gave the schools low ratings. In Springfield, there was no difference in support for kindergartens between those voters categorized as conservative when compared with their liberal counterparts. However, in Eugene, those of a conservative persuasion were less likely to support public funding of kindergarten than the liberal voters. On the topic of special education, there was no appreciable difference between liberals and conservatives. Finally, there was no difference in support based on political party affiliation in Springfield, whereas in Eugene, Democrats were slightly more supportive of the

initiative than were Republicans. The same general trend occurred when the topic was special education funding.

An interesting finding discovered when surveying eligible voters after the election was that those voters, at all educational levels, who were opposed to the referendum were more likely to actually show up at the voting booth than were those who were in support. In conclusion, Agger stated "The proponents of kindergartens failed to get their supporters to the polls, particularly their poorly educated sympathizers" (pg 17).

Five years later, a study was done of 48 suburban elementary school districts in Cook County, Illinois with the purpose of identifying the "social roots and institutional consequences of conflict in school district politics" (Minar, 1966, pg. 823). Minar looked at variables describing status (social rank, education level, income, and education) and found that the voting habits of people with high levels of those status attributes showed a weak relationship to referendum dissent and an insignificant relationship to participation in the referendum process. It was also found that communities with high levels of homogeneity in the status attributes tended to have lower levels of conflict where school issues were concerned, generally were willing to give more decision-making power to the superintendent and tended to be more willing to hire people who could provide technical assistance to the district. Minar posited that these trends emerged because people in 'high status' communities had better conflict resolution skills and, because of their social similarities, had similar expectations where school issues were concerned.

Carver (1968) studied residents of 12 Wisconsin school districts to determine the effect of education level and family income on expectations of school board members. Results obtained using the variable of education level were very similar to those obtained when family

income was being analyzed, leading Carver to conclude that the two variables were closely related. Carver also concluded that there was a positive correlation between high levels of income and education and high levels of support for schools, including the passage of school bond referenda. A similar conclusion was obtained in a study of voting behavior in Los Angeles elections (Hahn & Almy, 1971), where it was found that "support for school bond and tax raises was directly related to increasing education and income" (pg. 726).

Some conflicting conclusions came from a study that analyzed voting behavior in four Albuquerque school referenda elections (Hatley & Burlingame, 1972). Three of the elections called for school improvements to be made from monies garnered from increased property taxes. In these elections, no positive correlation was found between income and support of the referenda. In the fourth election, where the money was to be raised through an income tax-based surtax, a positive correlation was found between income level and affirmative voting. Hatley & Burlingame also found that longer tenure in the district translated into greater levels of support for the school referenda, and that there was no relationship between political party and voting behavior in any of the elections. Other findings of interest included determining a positive correlation between increasing number of children and support for school bonds, and finding no relationship between ethnicity and voting behavior.

A study done a few years later in Cincinnati, Ohio also investigated the effect of demographic variables on voter behavior as it applied to nonpartisan issues—school tax levies in particular (Philliber, 1977). The demographic variables under scrutiny were race, home ownership, and family income. Philliber found that in the ten years from 1967 to 1976, a sharp decrease in support for school bond elections was found among all demographic categories. African-Americans still tended to support school bond elections at a greater rate than whites, and

homeowners still continued to be the least likely subgroup to support new taxes. In terms of family income, support levels were lowest among the lower-middle income levels and highest among the upper-middle income levels.

Additionally, Philliber studied how the attitudes of voters influenced their behavior at the polls. The attitudinal variables that were analyzed were resistance to taxes, confidence in government, sense of control over government, support for aid to parochial schools, and support for busing. Philliber came to the conclusion that "as demographic subgroups have become more homogeneous in their voting preferences, attitudes of individuals have become important factors in explaining voting tendencies. Voting on tax issues becomes a way of expressing reactions to the quality of services received and to the policies of government officials" (pg. 202).

Hatley and Croskey (1977) conducted a study similar to that of Philliber wherein they analyzed socioeconomic variables and voter attitudes in three Kansas school districts: one classified as rural, one as suburban, and one as urban. Their results indicated that the variables of sex, marital status, number of children, mobility, and educational level had "exploratory and predictive power" (pg. 497). Those variables were determined to have been extremely useful in explaining past bond referendum results and very useful for predicting future referendum results. Of potential importance in a highly rural state, the percentage of variance explained by these factors was by far the highest in the rural district, less pronounced in the suburban district, and even less significant in the urban district. The finding that age and home ownership were viewed as only marginally important for explanation of past election results or prediction of future election results stood in contradiction to other findings. The finding that income and attitudinal variables toward the schools appeared to have very limited explanatory or predictive value was also in direct conflict with other research. These contradictory findings resulted in the

conclusion by Hatley and Croskey that "perhaps voting is largely a very personal, somewhat unpredictable, impulsive behavior lacking conscious rationality on the part of the electorate" (pg. 498).

A study done in Illinois in the late 1980s also investigated the relationship between various demographic variables and the outcome of school bond referenda (Lows, 1987). Lows found that there were 542 school bond referenda put before the voters from 1981 to 1986 and that only 36% had passed. The demographic factors found to be influential in the successful elections included voter turnout rate, party affiliation, race, marital status, and number of children less than 18 years of age in the household. In general, elections where there was a high voter turnout increased the likelihood of passage. Demographically, districts where a high percentage of the voters were white, married Republicans with children under 18 in the household tended to have the greatest chance of passing a school bond election.

Chew (1992) studied the effect of demographic factors on school bond referenda success or failure in Orange County, California. He hypothesized that parents of school-aged children would be more likely than non-parents to support the passage of tax levies for education purposes. Chew looked at the demographic variables of age, gender, parenthood status, income, and educational attainment, and the attitudinal variable of political ideology to assess effect on voting behavior. The findings of his study indicated that parenthood status, educational attainment and political ideology had the strongest relationship to voting behavior. In Chew's study, parents were more likely to support school bond elections than nonparents, people with higher education levels were more likely to be supportive than those voters with less education, and voters of liberal or moderate ideology were more likely than those of a conservative persuasion to vote for tax levies for educational funding. In contrast to other studies, increasing

age was found to correlate only moderately to decreased support of tax initiatives, and income and gender were found to have no significant correlation to voter behavior. Chew concluded that the influence of parenthood status was "distinctly secondary to that of a self-identified ideology. Thus, liberals in the sample expressed more support for increased school taxes than did conservatives, regardless of their parenthood status" (pg. 288). A decade later, Opfer (2002) drew opposite conclusions, opining that the issues underlying an election were more important in determining the results than were the party affiliations of the voting populace. This assertion was in support of the findings of Ragsdale and Rusk, (1995) who had supported the idea that the issues had a significant effect on voter turnout.

These longstanding efforts to analyze voter behavior have continued into the 21st century, but still with a high degree of complex interaction. A recent study analyzed the effect of age, race, and self-interest on the passage of school bond referenda in a large, urban school district (Tedin, Matland, & Weiher, 2001). The researchers found that, for white voters, the likelihood of a vote in support of a school bond decreased with increasing age. This relationship did not hold true for black or Hispanic voters. In fact, among black and Hispanic voters, those aged 65 and older were the most likely to vote in support. Another finding consistent with most previous research was that there was a strong positive correlation, for white voters, between higher levels of education and elevated levels of support for the bond, while the correlation between income and education levels was near zero for black and Hispanic voters. Other findings of interest were that for whites, renters were more likely to support a bond than were homeowners, and married people had a higher probability of being supportive than did single people. Neither home ownership nor marital status was found to be of any predictive value for black voters. It was found, however, that Hispanic females were more likely to vote for the bond than their male

counterparts, and divorced people were more likely to be supportive than were married people. In contrast to the results found by Chew (1992), but in agreement with Opfer (2002), political persuasion was not found to be a significant factor among white voters. Conversely, for African-Americans there was a correlation between being Republican and voting in support, and for Hispanic voters the correlation was between identification with the Democratic party and support for the school bond. A common theme for all three groups was increased likelihood of a supportive vote with increased confidence that the federal government was doing a good job.

A study of 695 school bond elections in the state of Texas was conducted in an attempt to determine the factors that contributed to successful passage (Theobald & Meier, 2002). One finding of interest was that as the percentage of low income students increased, so did the likelihood of referendum passage. The researchers also found no significant effect on election results caused by the demographic factors of age and race. Various researchers have found disparate findings across these two variables. In agreement with Tedin's earlier study, Theobald & Meier (2002) found that renters were more likely to vote affirmatively in school bond elections than were homeowners. They argued this to be a result of renters not seeing a direct and immediate correlation between property tax increases and increases in their rent. A historically high tax rate in a particular district was not determined to necessarily have a negative effect on the probability of tax referenda passage. There were times, the researchers determined, that a history of high taxes indicated a willingness on the part of the voters to pay for government services that they deemed important. Balsdon, Brunner, and Ruedben (2003) found a somewhat different relationship between tax rates and bond support. Their research indicated that communities with lower tax rates were more likely to propose and pass tax referenda. An additional finding was that communities with high tax rates were still likely to support school

referenda, provided they had a high proportion of patrons in the upper income levels. Another variable found to correspond positively with bond passage success was the percentage of teachers in the district's voting population. The study argued that it is reasonable to believe teachers would have a self-interest in referendum passage, as it would result in enhanced working conditions for them in the form of updated facilities and, in many cases, smaller class sizes. Also asserted by the researchers was the belief that teachers would be more likely to vote in a school bond referendum, and that teachers' interactions with community members would be more likely to persuade patrons to vote in an affirmative, rather than oppositional, manner.

Variables Contributing to Successful School Bond Referenda

Although the literature suggests that each school bond referendum is as unique as the community within which it is being proposed, researchers have identified some common elements that appear to contribute to the likelihood of successful passage. The purpose of this section is to describe those elements that commonly appear in successful elections throughout the past five decades.

Know Your Voters

It is self-evident that a tremendous amount of work goes into planning, organizing, and implementing a school bond referendum. Therefore, in order to maximize the potential for a favorable election result, it has been viewed as highly prudent for school district officials to have as accurate a picture as possible of patron attitudes before the details of a bond referendum are developed. Senden (1993) advocated that the school district should conduct a scientific survey

of public opinion about its tax proposal. In order for the survey to be as effective as possible, Senden recommended hiring a professional pollster who would have access to the community demography and to a detailed voting history from recent elections. He believed that a well constructed survey should allow the district to determine if the project under consideration was deemed feasible by the voters, to assess what tax rate would be accepted by the community, and to help the district determine how to focus a public relations campaign to better ensure acceptance of the referendum by district patrons. The survey results would facilitate identification of contentious or divisive issues in the community and allow the district to craft specific, precise answers to the questions and issues most prevalent in voters' minds.

Henry (1994) discussed the importance of focus groups and public opinion surveys in determining the focus of a district's public information program in the view that it would be a waste of time and effort to bring a bond proposal before the voters that did not address the needs they perceived to be present. She noted that one benefit of assessing public opinion was that it allowed the district to identify side issues that required clarification and misperceptions that would be damaging to the success of the campaign. Once the issues had been identified, they could be addressed in written campaign materials and public forums.

An additional finding has been that much planning and analyzing should occur before a bond referendum is proposed to the voters of a school district. Bauscher (1994) recommended that the pre-planning phase should last at least a year and include a committee with broad representation from the community, who would study a wide variety of building alternatives. He echoed the sentiment of Senden (1993) that a thorough analysis of past voter behavior should be completed. He also concurred that it was important to carefully survey the community to

identify side issues and hidden agendas before the bond proposal was constructed so that the proposal would more accurately reflect the wishes of the community.

In a guide written for the Texas Association of School Boards, Koetter and Cannon (1995) suggested that "to determine the thrust of the campaign committee's activities, the district should conduct a community survey to measure what voters already know about the schools' needs, areas of voter resistance, what objections exist, misunderstandings, and unanswered questions" (pg. 18). Knowledge in these areas could help the district focus time and money on the contested issues and not waste resources addressing issues that were not points of contention. Koetter and Cannon believed the survey could be developed by district staff or patrons, while Senden (1993) believed it was important to involve professionals in the development and analysis of the survey. They both believed that, with a properly constructed survey, a sample of 400 would yield results with about a 95% degree of accuracy, regardless of the size of the community.

Finding out the community's thoughts about a bond proposal well in advance of an election was also supported by Gallagher, Bagin, and Kindred (1997). They noted that it was far wiser to find out the views of the community before an election than to assess the reasons for a bond failure after the fact. They supported the opinion that a community survey was useful in helping to determine issues that were important to the patrons so that the bond proposal and campaign materials could address issues pertinent to the voters. Additionally, misinformation identified through the survey could be replaced with factual data. The authors did not take a stance on who should conduct the survey or how it should be administered and to whom. They did indicate their belief that it was important to release the results of a written questionnaire to

the public to avoid the perception that information was being withheld from the community or that suspicious activities were being conducted.

"Even when the board is strongly united behind one option, it may not be confident that the community is ready to support it with their votes" (Mathison, 1998, pg. 32). As supported by Mathison, a public opinion survey can be used to determine if voters are aligned with the opinion of the school board. He suggested that if a district hires someone to conduct the survey, it is important that the pollsters not be local citizens, in order to avoid the perception of bias. If the survey results were viewed as biased, the usefulness of the findings would be diminished, if not negated.

Clear and Honest Communication of the Need

The literature also suggests that nothing will bring about the failure of a school bond election more quickly than the lack of clear, on-going communication about the identified needs or the perception that school officials are not communicating honestly with patrons. Communications from the district should be written in language that patrons will understand and should avoid educational jargon. Since most people have not had frequent opportunity to work with or understand tax levies, those concepts should be clearly spelled out for voters. It is also important to clearly communicate to voters what the proposed bond election will provide for students in terms of items like classroom space, library books, computers, or air conditioning.

In an article about the Shawnee Mission school district in Kansas, Chopra (1988) described the communication process used in that district. He prepared a report detailing the financial shortfall the district was experiencing at that time and described the anticipated effect that budget cuts would have in terms of staff and curriculum. This process resulted in the community rallying around the need and passing a yearly tax increase of $13.5 million to pay for

school operational costs. Just months after voting a tax increase on themselves, the same voters additionally passed a $21.5 million bond for two new elementary schools and renovations and additions to existing schools. Chopra said that the bond proposal was presented in such a way as "to allow people time to accept the need for the bond issue and to realize that the consequences of rejection would be overcrowded neighborhood schools and busing children to schools elsewhere in the school system" (pg. 26). As often happens, opposition to the proposed levy arose, but it was successfully countered by a clear presentation of the facts distributed through various media including newspaper articles, pamphlets, and door-to-door campaigning.

Taking a somewhat different view of communicating the need, MacDonald (1995) advanced the idea of having a citizens' group prepared to meet the challenges caused by the organized opposition that often accompanies school bond proposals. He said, "A citizens' public relations committee can best tell the voters the facts and answer the opposition's arguments on the need for a new school" (pg. 60). Obviously, for such a citizens' group to be effective, members must be armed with accurate information that will be useful in countering the arguments of the opposition and persuasive to voters who have not yet decided how they are going to vote. MacDonald opined that it was important to spell out very clearly what effect passage of the bond referendum would have on the tax rate. He recommended presenting the change in tax rate in terms of the amount per $1,000 assessed valuation, rather than in terms of how much it would cost a family on a daily basis.

An additional finding in the literature has been that the majority of taxpayers care about what goes on in the schools in their community. They may not individually understand the intricacies of developing and implementing an appropriate curriculum or how to effectively maintain a safe and orderly environment, but citizens and patrons have been judged to know that

those things are important. Walker (1996) discussed the importance of communication in paving the way for a successful bond election. He argued that it is essential for a district to communicate clearly and frequently with the community it serves. If the public has been kept informed of the district's needs in a routine manner, it is more likely that community support with be forthcoming when it is requested. It is not as important to show numbers to people as it is to gather broad-based support for facility recommendations and get others to jump on the bandwagon. "More importantly, you should be stressing the benefits of the areas covered under the bond referendum. Show how the addition of a new gym or science labs will improve the quality of education" (Walker, 1996, pg. 33).

Mathison (1998) discussed the importance of identifying, quantifying, and communicating the needs to potential voters as a part of his plan for running a successful bond election. He advocated for a district newsletter as an essential communication tool and suggested that other more creative avenues for communicating the need were available. For instance, he suggested having students create a video that communicated the need or inviting patrons to the schools so that they could see the facilities for themselves. An effective school leader should have a clear idea of the needs in the district by having frequent, meaningful communication with students, staff, parents, and citizen groups. He argued that an open meeting format with all interested community groups would allow for a consensus to be reached about the important items to include in a bond referendum. Using such a format, he held that districts typically found that the resulting bond proposal better reflected the desires of the community and helped secure the support of key community leaders and groups.

Identify and Mobilize Supporters

A significant number of researchers have written about the importance of identifying those patrons likely, or known, to support a school bond issue and ensuring that they show up at the polls to cast their ballot (Lutz, 1980; Barney, 1984; Henry, 1987: Surratt, 1987; Henry, 1994; Holt, 1994; MacDonald, 1995; Gallagher, Bagin, & Kindred, 1997). A synopsis of other research detailing the need to identify and mobilize supporters follows.

In an analysis of positive marketing strategies for a bond issue in Palatine, Illinois, Conyers and Francl (1989) obtained a list of registered voters and phoned each of them to try to gauge their level of support for the proposed bond. The input the district received from the telephone polls was used to help them tailor the bond proposal to more closely meet the needs and desires of the community. Rather than trying to win the support of every voter, they opted to make their supporters the target of the publicity campaign and to arm them with factual information. The ultimate goal of the marketing plan was to make sure that a high percentage of supporters showed up to vote. As a final strategy, they made sure that a volunteer was assigned to each polling place so that known supporters who had not voted by 4:00 p.m. would receive a phone call encouraging them to vote.

Graham, Wise, and Bachman (1990) developed an entire strategy for marketing school levies in order to secure voter approval. The process they recommended contained a number of items pertaining to identifying and mobilizing those in favor of the proposed bond. First, their research indicated that more than 70% of patrons who were not registered to vote were not in favor of the bond issue. As such, they proposed that a massive voter registering campaign would be counterproductive. They found that it was most productive for volunteers to canvass the neighborhood they lived in to try to compile a list of those citizens who were supportive of the

proposed bond. They identified students of voting age and people in the armed services as groups of citizens who were "grossly underrepresented on the voting rolls" (pg. 30) that were typically supportive of school bond issues. It was also found that people who did not own homes were typically supportive of school bond elections, but that they also tended not to be registered to vote. Graham et. al., suggested that an effective marketing strategy for renters was to suggest to them that since they did not pay property taxes, supporting the bond was a way that they could assist others at no cost to themselves. These researchers suggested that it was beneficial for each identified positive voter to receive a call shortly before the election. They also concurred with Conyers and Francl (1989) that having a poll watcher designated to call known supporters on Election Day who had not yet voted was worth the time and energy that it required.

Concentrating on the 'Yes' vote was supported by Thompson and Hartley (1991) in their study of two Mississippi school districts. They identified civic groups and parents of school-aged children as typically supportive elements of the community. They also made a point of mentioning the importance of meeting with school employees. They argued as well that it is dangerous to assume that school employees will automatically vote for a bond issue. As such, it is important to meet with all employees to make sure they have factual information, understand the importance of the bond, know how the money will be used, and are encouraged to get to the polls. Thompson and Hartley not only stressed getting employees to support the bond, but also having them encourage their friends and family to vote, thus expanding their sphere of influence. Calling all known supporters a short time before the election was also identified as important to the success of a referendum.

Telephone surveys, mailings, and interviews were suggested by Bauscher (1994) as effective methods for developing a list of patrons who would support a school bond issue. He

concurred with the majority opinion that time, energy, and resources should be targeted toward making sure that the supportive portion of the voting populace was well-informed and strongly encouraged and reminded to go to the polls. Bauscher concurred with the importance of having a poll-watcher and, as an additional strategy, suggested that the district try to get the polls to remain open for an additional hour to utilize the extra time for calling known supporters who had not yet voted.

The initial communication about an impending bond issue with the voting public was a task found to be largely undertaken by school employees in an analysis of a successful school bond referendum in Olmsted Falls, Ohio (Kreiner, O'Callaghan, & Moore, 1995). In this community, extensive effort was given to educating the staff about district facility needs to enable them to converse effectively with their friends and neighbors. A citizens' group later made calls to every voter in the district to determine their level of support for the referendum. As a somewhat unique strategy, every undecided voter received a personal visit from the superintendent, a building administrator, or a school board member. The purpose of the visit was not to 'sell' the bond, but to listen to the concerns of the patron. The researchers believed this tactic to have been very important to the success of the election, as the word spread through the community that the school officials really cared about patrons' opinions. Additionally, every confirmed supporter received informational and promotional materials in the mail a week before the election. Those voters found to be in opposition to the referendum received no further communication.

In a publication written for the Texas Association of School Boards, Koetter and Cannon (1995) identified elements that they believed were important to the success of school bond elections. They said that "seasoned campaigners agree that the best strategy for winning bond

elections is to identify the 'yes' voters, do everything possible to get them to the polls, concentrate on the 'maybe' voters, and bypass the 'No' voters" (pg. 4). The importance of assessing community attitudes was stressed. The method of assessment was not determined to be critical, but the importance of the survey being carefully constructed and administered effectively was stressed. Koetter and Cannon also addressed the importance of activities conducted on Election Day, including poll watchers, making calls to known supporters who had not voted, and offering transportation and childcare to those identified as being in support of the bond. Finally, in instances where schools are used as polling places, Koetter and Cannon suggested that having a school activity on Election Day and reserving short-term parking places close to the building were effective strategies for getting parents to vote.

Mathison (1998) concurred with the conclusion drawn by earlier researchers about the importance of using the available time and resources on identifying 'Yes' voters. He said that identifying supportive voters in the community who did not have children in the schools was an effective strategy because those people were not seen as having an ulterior motive for supporting the bond. He felt that it was important to identify twice as many supporters as there had been detractors in the previous election. Mathison suggested that if it was difficult to find twice as many supporters as there were previous opponents, that possibly the focus of the referendum was not in line with the desires of the electorate.

Lutz (1980) spoke about the importance of identifying 'Yes' voters and getting them to the polls. He also detailed a theory of voter behavior called cross-pressure. "Briefly, the cross-pressure theory suggests that most voters are already predisposed to vote in one way or the other. Further, given their predispositions before casting ballots, voters tend to seek reinforcement of their prior commitment and attempt to block out information that would convince them to vote

against their predisposition. In other words, the theory suggests that the way to win bond elections is to reinforce the already positive inclinations of supporters to such a degree that the district is sure they will vote, while introducing enough conflicting evidence against opponents' negative views that they will develop a significant enough level of indecisiveness or discomfort that they will not vote at all. Thus, the key to a successful bond election, according to the cross-pressure theory, may be not only to mobilize 'Yes' voters but also to create enough cross-pressure on predisposed 'No' voters that they will not vote at all.

Active Citizens' Committee

In 1964, the Des Moines, Iowa school district suffered a narrow 1% loss in a school bond election. One year later, a similar measure passed by a 64% majority in the largest voter turnout in Des Moines history for a school bond election (Denny & Harris, 1964). Superintendent John H. Harris attributed this result to the efforts of two citizen committees that worked to support the bond issue. One committee was retained from the previous election, and another twenty-member publicity committee was developed to assist with the dissemination of the school bond information. The citizen committees were responsible for raising the funds to design, print, and distribute a wide variety of campaign materials including brochures, reminder postcards, and a four-page newspaper that was sent home with each student in the Des Moines public schools. They also contacted all local civic and service organizations, formed a speakers' bureau, and organized a volunteer telephone campaign. The researchers concluded that "turning defeat to victory within 10 months was done by mobilizing a number of lay citizens as well as involvement of many community organizations" (pg. 22).

In Princeton, New Jersey, positive results were achieved by involving citizens early in the process of deciding what projects being considered by a school board were most needed and

what projects were the most likely to be supported by the community (Houston, 1985). One major advantage in appointing a citizen committee was to broaden the interest in a bond beyond the scope of the administration and the school board. In this case, the citizen committee was large and diverse so as to involve members from every segment of the community. It was the committee's job to decide on how much money to ask for and to prioritize how the money would be allocated to various projects. This prioritization gave board members some direction about what to cut first if the cost estimates were too low and, conversely, what projects should be added first if the cost estimates were too high and extra money became available. This process resulted in each bond committee member having an investment in working to get the bond approved.

In Volusia County, Florida, an active citizens' committee was found to be instrumental in the success of a $112 million bond referendum (Surratt, 1987). Upon making the decision to pursue the bond, a citizens' committee made up of volunteers and community business leaders was formed. The committee's primary purpose was to raise money to fund the campaign. However, the committee was also instrumental in developing and distributing campaign materials, hosting community meetings and speaking to various civic organizations around the community. The Chamber of Commerce also took an active role in promoting the bond within its membership, raising funds for promotional materials, and providing speakers for civic and community organizations. Finally, a group of PTA leaders and members of school advisory committees was mobilized to campaign within the schools, where it was assumed that there would be a high level of support for the bond initiative.

As noted earlier, citizens' committee efforts were credited with passing a $21.5 million bond in Shawnee Mission, Kansas, just months after voters had passed a separate referendum for

an annual tax increase of $13.5 million for school operational expenses (Chopra, 1988). In this situation the major activities of the citizens' committee, which grew from 30 to 75 members between the tax initiative for operating expenses and the bond issue, included fundraising, soliciting support from local civic organizations, and actively campaigning from door-to-door. On weekends, teachers were even visible outside of grocery stores to discuss the upcoming election with the shoppers as they exited the stores. One unique wrinkle in this campaign strategy was that when a community member went on a public speaking engagement, he or she was accompanied by a board member who served as a resource to answer financial questions posed by the audience.

In states like Mississippi that require a 60% majority to pass a bond election, the work of a citizens' committee has become even more important. Thompson and Hartley (1991) studied two separate districts that utilized community members to aid in passing school bond initiatives. In the Houston, Mississippi district, the superintendent formed a twelve-member committee that was broadly representative of the entire community. This group was charged with studying space needs of the district and developing a plan to remedy the situation. In addition, the superintendent enlisted the assistance of a group of community leaders who were instrumental in going door-to-door and raising community support. In the Tupelo school district, community leaders who had attended community meetings volunteered to form an 'advocacy committee'. They raised money to fund campaign activities such as advertising, speaking to civic organizations, writing news articles and organizing telephone campaigns.

In many instances, school bond referenda have been met with organized opposition. The literature suggest that the best way to combat this opposition is to prepare in advance and run a campaign based on the facts and to make sure that the facts are clearly communicated to the

voters. In Schenectady, New York, MacDonald (1995) found that "a citizens' public relations committee can best tell the voters the facts and answer the opposition's arguments on the need for a new school" (pg. 60). In opposition to Houston (1985), who believed that community input was essential from the beginning, MacDonald believed that the school board and administration should determine the need, plan the solution, and then come to the community for approval. After satisfying themselves about the viability of the school board's plan, the citizens' committee in this scenario, which was composed of several related committees, was responsible for the tasks of fact-finding, publicity, and providing speakers to address various groups and organizations. MacDonald believed that it was important to develop a brochure with pictures that could be used to give voters a visual picture of what their tax dollars would provide to the community and to the students of the school district.

Some districts have conducted 'quiet' bond campaigns because they believe that voters already know what the issues are and will be supportive of a bond. This approach has often led to disappointing results. Mathison (1998) believed that "once the board of education decides to place the bond issue on the ballot, it needs a formal organized election campaign" (pg. 32). Mathison stated that the formal group should be comprised of local patrons because a campaign conducted by district employees often is perceived as self-serving. He espoused that the successful campaign is one that is viewed as having a broad base of support within the community and that the citizens' committee must be the driving force behind the campaign, with committee members planning and conducting every aspect of the campaign. In such a scenario, effective committees should break the campaign down into manageable components so that no volunteers become overwhelmed or are asked to extend themselves beyond their comfort level.

Kelly and Zieper (2001) described a six-step strategy that was used successfully to pass bond referenda in Dade County, Florida and also in California. This approach addressed the need for a citizens' committee through the concept of capacity building; the purpose of which they said was to "build a broad base of community-based leadership to assist with the development of the proposed public finance measure" (pg. 28). The campaigning element of Kelly and Zieper's strategy also directly involved the citizens' committee. In each instance, the committee members were involved in fundraising to cover campaign costs including direct mailings, radio and television airtime, newspaper advertisements, and signs and posters. The people on the committees also formed an active speakers' bureau and a volunteer phone bank.

Unified Board of Education

A number of researchers have noted the importance of unified school board support for a referendum (Simpson, 1993; Bauscher, 1994; Henry, 1994; Holt, 1995; Koetter & Cannon, 1995; and Mathison, 1998).

Simpson (1993) discussed the importance of board unity as it applied to a bond referendum in Salem, Missouri by saying, "it was vitally important that the board's vote be unanimous, because a divided board is a death blow to any tax referendum" (pg. 29). Henry (1994) stated that a unified board was not only important, but that is was an 'absolute must'. As such, she asserted that board unity was one of the most critical factors in a bond election resulting in a positive vote. Koetter and Cannon (1995) discussed the effect of a split board on a referendum public relations campaign by saying that even an effectively run campaign could not undo the damage caused by dissention among board members and that a board which cannot agree completely on a building campaign can cause enough doubt among voters to result in a large negative vote or cause many voters not to show up at the polls. Mattison (1998) suggested

that "a board that has a single-minded purpose shows the community that its leadership is strong and committed to a particular direction. A board that is not unified signals the opposite" (pg. 30).

Speakers' Bureau

The availability of a speakers' bureau that can provide presenters to address various community groups and organizations has been cited as a positive factor in successful school bond referenda. "Offer members of the board, the management team, and articulate community leaders as speakers for service clubs, private meetings, and school functions" (pg. 38) was the advice of Weir (1981). Surratt (1987) found that the greatest support for the bond issue came from a group of civic leaders who made presentations to various civic and community groups. In Shawnee Mission, Kansas, Chopra (1988) found that sending out a community leader paired with a board member was an effective combination. The community leader, being known and respected by the audience, had immediate credibility. The board member was able to provide specific information for audience questions that the community leader was not able to answer, thus avoiding any perception that the bond issue was ill conceived. Finally, Gallagher, Bagin, & Kindred (1997) advocated the formation of a speakers' bureau as soon as the decision to pursue a bond election had been made. They discussed the importance of properly selecting, training, and equipping the speakers with appropriate information prior to sending them out to speak.

Variables Contributing to Bond Referenda Defeat

The literature describing variables contributing to school bond referenda failure is far less plentiful than that describing variables contributing to school bond referenda success. It would

seem logical to deduce that the absence of the factors identified by numerous researchers in the previous section as contributing to bond referenda success would contribute to bond referenda failure.

Of immediate apparent negative consequence is the concept that lack of understanding about the wishes of the client base in a school district leads to defeat for a school bond election. People are increasingly inclined to vote 'No' on a tax referendum issue that they feel is not properly designed or that they feel is unnecessary. If a district has not made the effort to get to know its voters, it is less likely that a school bond proposal can be crafted that will be palatable to the electorate. Understanding the wishes of an entire community is not as simple as it might seem, and failure to assess public opinion can result in disaster at the polls. Because of this, Walker (1996) suggested that "taking the pulse of a variety of publics to use as a benchmark before a school bond referendum is essential today" (pg. 33).

Lack of understanding by the public about the need for a school bond election was identified by Henry (1987) as a reason that school districts lost their bond elections. In a study of four South Dakota school districts, Holt (1994) found that the most consistent variable identified in unsuccessful bond election attempts was a lack of understanding among community members and school personnel about the need for the bond. Voters are not likely to support a project that will require their tax money if the need has not been clearly communicated to them. Additionally, if communication from the school district comes only when it is time for a bond election, it is likely to be viewed with mistrust. Thus, communication efforts by the district to keep its constituency informed must be year-round and two-way. Districts that do not consistently practice effective communication techniques are likely to find it difficult to gather financial support when it is needed.

Additionally, failure to identify and mobilize bond supporters has been commonly identified as a factor in unsuccessful bond elections. Even if the majority of patrons are in support of a bond election, their support is of no significance if they do not show up at the polls on Election Day. Successful districts market to their supporters and do what they can to ensure that they actually vote. Districts that fail to participate in activities known to increase voter turnout, including organizing telephone calling trees to known supporters, utilizing poll watchers, and providing transportation and childcare to supporters that need it, tend to be far less successful on Election Day.

The lack of a diverse and active citizens' advisory committee has also been identified as a factor in the failure of school bond referenda (Walker, 1996). In order for a citizens' advisory committee to be effective and influential, it is essential that all of the various constituencies within a community be represented. Failure to achieve widespread representation can result in the perception that the group is exclusionist or self-serving, thus diluting its sphere of influence. Even when a citizens' advisory committee has been formed, it can be rendered ineffective by a lack of skilled facilitation and a clear sense of purpose. Without a strong leader, the group may stray from its intended purpose and run the risk of developing competing factions within the group. The effectiveness of such a group can also be hindered by lack of operating guidelines, the absence of a specific time frame, and insufficient financial resources.

Finally, failure to include representatives on the citizens' advisory committee from all interested groups has been found to lead to the development of organized opposition by those who feel they have not been included and that their ideas have not been considered in the bond development process. Opposition groups that are well organized and well funded have long been a significant factor in the failure of school bond referenda. Their very presence creates doubt in

the minds of some voters and serves to increase the resolve of those voters not in favor of the bond. The impact of these groups is increased if they are able to gain the endorsement of recognized community leaders.

Summary

Since school infrastructure decision-making and funding have remained largely in the hands of the local patrons, the ability to positively influence voters must be viewed as critical to the success or failure of a school bond referendum. Research pertaining to school bond elections has identified some commonalities among voters who tend to be supportive of school bond referenda. Additionally, researchers have identified certain campaign tactics and strategies that seem to appear frequently in both successful and unsuccessful bond elections. Armed with this information, school officials will be better able to construct a bond proposal that will be more likely to result in approval by the voters.

Of significant importance to successful passage of a school bond referendum has been the issue of having an accurate understanding of patron attitudes so that a bond proposal can be crafted that will be palatable to the voters. Of equal importance is the need for a school district to communicate regularly, clearly, and honestly with the electorate about the needs of the district. Nothing spells defeat for a bond election more quickly than when the voters feel they are being misled or do not have an accurate picture of the district's needs.

Much attention in the literature about school bond referenda has also been given to identifying and mobilizing those district patrons who are likely to vote in support of the proposed bond. Thus, it behooves school officials to allocate considerable time, energy, and resources for the purpose of determining which groups or individuals are likely to vote for a school bond in

general, and specifically, what those groups or individuals feel is necessary for the appropriate delivery of educational services to the children in their community.

Additionally, an active, diverse citizens' committee has been identified as a critical factor in bond referenda success by many researchers. Although there are different perspectives on the exact duties a citizens' committee should perform, there are some common themes including the distribution of campaign literature, making contact with undecided voters and known supporters, conducting community events to advertise and raise support for the bond, and employing various methods to get supporters of the bond to the polls. If the citizens' committee is properly selected, well directed, and representative of the community at large, their endorsement of the bond proposal has been found to carry significant weight with the electorate.

Having unanimous support for a bond election from the local board of education has been found to be of paramount importance in order to have a successful result. Dissention among board members signals to voters that the plan is flawed or is not worthy of support. The damage done by lack of unanimous support by the board is difficult to reverse, no matter what campaign strategies are employed. It is unlikely that a community will wholeheartedly support a referendum when its elected officials did not exhibit a unified front.

Finally, there is significant support in the literature for the development of a speakers' bureau in order to facilitate the passage of a bond election. Of critical importance is selection of people who have credibility in the community and who have been trained to accurately disseminate information about the bond. Well-presented speeches by leaders in the community have a powerful impact on determining the results of the election.

Yet because actual experience may be different across populations and locales, additional research is always needed. No recent studies have explored bond referenda behavior in Kansas,

and very few Kansas studies exist at all. Consequently, the remainder of this study is devoted to bond election outcomes in this largely rural Midwestern state.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Introduction

As is true in many states throughout the nation, school districts in Kansas seeking to make infrastructure and other high dollar capital improvements typically must utilize the bonding mechanism to access significant monies—i.e., school districts must engage a bond referendum, thereby precipitating a vote by the relevant constituency to increase the tax levy on real and/or personal property. Particularly relevant to this present study, approval for new construction, renovation of existing facilities, or technology upgrades requires Kansas school districts to seek majority support from the registered voters within that district who choose to vote in a particular election. Conversely, failure to win majority approval inevitably results in a further deterioration of existing school facilities and heightens the problems faced by the school district in properly providing a quality education for all students. This being the case, the need to identify essential factors in successful bond referenda passage becomes increasingly important. Because different election outcomes are sometimes experienced in different locales and different situations, this study investigated three successful bond campaigns and three unsuccessful bond campaigns in Kansas school districts in an attempt to identify critical factors leading to election success and failure in this state.

In this study, the researcher utilized a mixed methods strategy of inquiry. A mixed methods approach may selectively utilize procedures from either quantitative or

qualitative approaches. One benefit of a mixed methods design is that it allows the benefits of both quantitative and qualitative approaches to be captured in a single study. "With the development and perceived legitimacy of both qualitative and quantitative research in the social and human sciences, mixed methods research, employing the data collection associated with both forms of data, is expanding" (Creswell, 2002, pg. 208). Additionally, as stated by Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003), "A major advantage of mixed methods research is that it enables the researcher to simultaneously answer confirmatory and exploratory questions, and therefore verify and generate theory in the same study" (pg. 15).

The practice of mixing quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study is thought to have begun with Campbell and Fiske in 1959 when they used multiple methods while researching the validity of psychological traits. This was the impetus for other researchers to 'mix' methods, and soon quantitative approaches like traditional surveys were being utilized together in the same study with qualitative approaches like open-ended interviews and observations. Researchers conducting mixed methods studies believed that each data-gathering method had weaknesses which could be neutralized by the addition of the unique strengths of other complimentary methods (Sieber, 1973). Eventually, triangulation of data sources developed as a means of merging the data collected through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Denzin (1978) defined triangulation as "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon" (pg. 291). Jick (1979) said of triangulation: "It is largely a vehicle for cross-validation when two or more distinct methods are found to be congruent and yield comparable data" (pg. 602).

This study utilized survey instrumentation, combined with both structured and open-ended interview techniques, to produce an exploratory study that recommends possible course(s)

of action at the policy level to those school districts contemplating a bond issue in Kansas. As such, the purpose of the research is meant to first benefit similarly situated school districts, although potentially offering limited generalizability beyond the parameters of this particular study.

Overview of Methodology

Population and Sample Selection

The initial population for this study was all Kansas school districts that held a bond election from 2004-2007. After procuring a list of all districts holding bond elections during the specified time period from the Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB), the identified districts were stratified according to enrollment size and outcome of the election. Due to a large number of cases (N= 72) making it impossible to utilize personal interviews in all cases, stratified random sampling to determine included subjects was chosen because "sampling variations are lower than that for random sampling, and the stratified sample is more likely to reflect the population" (Fink, 1995, pg. 22).

Stratification by *size* was based on total student enrollment in the school district during the year of the bond election. For the purposes of this study, school districts with a total enrollment of 1,200 students or less were classified as *small*; districts with a total enrollment of 1,201 to 3,000 students were classified as *medium*; and districts with a total enrollment of more than 3,000 students were classified as *large*. This same stratification strategy was used by Corrick (1995) in a study analyzing voter perceptions, voter information, and voter demographics as they impacted school bond referenda in Kansas. In the end analysis,

stratification by student population (i.e., enrollment size) was utilized to assure that Kansas school districts of all sizes were appropriately represented in the sample. Additionally, districts were also stratified by *election outcome* (i.e., passage or failure). Stratification by election outcome was utilized to assure that districts having each result would be appropriately reflected in the sample. This line of reasoning resulted in three groups stratified by district student population having successful bond elections, and three groups stratified by district student population wherein the bond election had failed (see Figure 3.1). Finally, from the six resulting groups in Figure 3.1, one district from each group was randomly selected for in-depth analysis in the study. No attempt was made to manipulate the number of cases naturally occurring in the cells in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1 Determination of School Districts within Categories

ELECTION OUTCOME

		SUCCESSFUL	**UNSUCCESSFUL**
School Size			
	SMALL	**SMALL**	
	MEDIUM	**MEDIUM**	
	LARGE	**LARGE**	

Selection of Subjects

School districts with successful bond elections during the relevant time period are listed in Table 3.1, while districts having unsuccessful elections are listed in Table 3.2. From the total number of individual cases comprising the six categories (see Figure 3.1 earlier), one district was randomly selected from each category (see Figure 3.2 later for number of cases—i.e., number of school districts in each category). The resulting six selected districts therefore purposefully included: one large-size district with a successful bond referendum, one large-size district with an unsuccessful bond referendum, one medium-size district with a successful bond referendum, one medium-size district with an unsuccessful referendum, one small-size district with a successful bond referendum, and one small-size district with an unsuccessful bond referendum.

Using the categorical selection method just described, written survey and personal interview data were gathered from four named respondents from each of the six selected school districts making up the sample (see Figure 3.3 later for identification of survey/interview participants [N= 24] by bond election category). As the purpose of this study was to gain information about critical factors in bond referenda success or failure, named respondents to both surveys and interviews were deliberately chosen based on their likelihood to have substantial knowledge about the phenomenon in question. The selected actual respondents within these categories (successful-large; successful-medium; successful-small; unsuccessful-large; unsuccessful-medium; unsuccessful-small) were: the school district superintendent, a member of the citizens' bond committee, a local newspaper editor, and a local banker. This same selection strategy was used by Holt (1993) in his study of school bond elections in South Dakota and by Lode (1999) in his study of school bond elections in Iowa. The superintendent of each of the six selected districts was then contacted to request participation in the study. Superintendents were

asked to select and obtain agreement for participation in the study from the three other people in their respective communities: a member of the citizens' bond committee, a local newspaper editor, and a local banker. It was assumed that each of these individuals was knowledgeable about the impact of various election strategies on the result of the election in their respective communities.

Each person who agreed to participate received a letter describing the purpose of the study and the assurance of complete confidentiality (the cover letters and requisite forms relating to approval to conduct research involving human subjects are included in Appendix A and Appendix B respectively).

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The data gathered in this study included both numeric information from a 32-item written survey (see Appendix C) and narrative information from closed-end and open-ended interview questions (see Appendix D), as answered by each of the four respondents in the six participating school districts.

The first instrument was a 32-item survey partially influenced by the review of literature (see Chapter 2 earlier) that identified strategies commonly used in bond election campaigns. This survey served as the standardized data collection instrument for the study. The researcher created an initial number of original items for the survey and synthesized the remainder from a pool of items gathered from other research on school bond referenda success or failure (e.g., Nehls, 1991; Lifto, 1995; Stockton, 1996; Lode, 1999; Friedland, 2002; Weathersby, 2002; and

Table 3.1 Kansas School Districts with Successful School Bond Referenda from 2004-2007

Large School Districts (L) Student Population 3,001 or More

USD 229 Blue Valley	USD 231 Gardner Edgerton	USD 233 Olathe	USD 261 Haysville
USD 265 *Goddard	USD 266 Maize	USD 308 Hutchinson	USD 373 Newton
USD 385 Andover	USD 437 Auburn Washburn	USD 443 Dodge City	USD 450 **Shawnee Heights
USD 475 Geary County	USD 497 **Lawrence	USD 512 Shawnee Mission	

Medium School Districts (M) Student Population between 1,201 and 3,000

USD 203 Piper-Kansas City	USD 204 Bonner Springs	USD 263 **Mulvane	USD 267 **Renwick
USD 290 Ottawa	USD 394 Rose Hill	USD 413 Chanute	USD 416 **Louisburg
USD 458 Basehor-Linwood	USD 464 Tonganoxie	USD 469 Lansing	USD 490 El Dorado
USD 491 Eudora	USD 506 Labette County		

Small School Districts (S) Student Population 1,200 or Less

USD 101 Erie	USD 206 Remington-Whitewater	USD 223 Barnes	USD 226 Meade
USD 239 North Ottawa Co.	USD 240 Twin Valley	USD 249 Frontenac	USD 258 Humboldt
USD 323 Rock Creek	USD 335 North Jackson	USD 343 Perry	USD 350 St. John-Hudson
USD 367 Osawatomie	USD 382 Pratt	USD 408 Marion-Florence	USD 410 Durham-Hillsboro-Lehigh
USD 423 Moundridge	USD 440 **Halstead	USD 442 Nemaha Valley	USD 505 **Chetopa-St. Paul

* Passed two elections in the time period under review.
** Passed two bond issues on the same election date.

Table 3.2 Kansas School Districts with Unsuccessful School Bond Referenda from 2004-2007

Large School Districts (L) Student Population 3,001 or More

USD 202 *DeSoto	USD 232 ^Turner-Kansas City	USD 345 Seaman	USD 450 Shawnee Heights

Medium School Districts (M) Student Population between 1,201 and 3,000

USD 267 %Renwick	USD 313 #Buhler	USD 320 Wamego	USD 368 Paola
USD 434 #Santa Fe Trail	USD 446 Independence	USD 458 %Basehor-Linwood	USD 490 %*El Dorado
USD 506 %Labette County			

Small School Districts (S) Student Population 1,200 or Less

USD 101 ^%/Erie	USD 206 +%Remington-Whitewater	USD 237 *%Smith Center	USD 239 +%North Ottawa Co.
USD 240 %Twin Valley	USD 377 Atchison County	USD 417 *Morris County	USD 467 Leoti
USD 479 Crest	USD 508 *Baxter Springs		

^ Had two unsuccessful elections in the time period under review.
% Had a successful election later in the time period under review.
+ Had two unsuccessful elections in one year.
* Had unsuccessful elections in two consecutive years.
# Had three unsuccessful elections in the time period under review.

Figure 3.2 Number of Cases (School Districts) within Determined Categories

		ELECTION OUTCOME
	SUCCESSFUL	**UNSUCCESSFUL**
School Size	**SMALL (N= 20)**	**SMALL (N= 10)**
	MEDIUM (N= 14)	**MEDIUM (N= 9)**
	LARGE (N= 15)	**LARGE (N= 4)**

Faltys, 2006). For each item on the survey, respondents were asked to identify whether or not their district had practiced that particular strategy and then were asked to give their professional and/or personal perception of how important the strategy was, or would have been, in influencing the results of their particular bond election. The written survey thus attempted to ascertain respondents' perceptions across an entire community spectrum of how well the school district: (a) knew its voters, (b) clearly communicated the need for a bond election, (c) identified and mobilized the 'Yes' vote, (d) assembled and utilized an active, diverse citizen group, (e) presented a unified board of education, and (f) trained speakers to make presentations to community groups.

Figure 3.3 Survey/Interview Named Participants within Determined Categories

ELECTION OUTCOME

School Size	SUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL
	SMALL (N= 20) **Superintendent** **Bond committee member** **Newspaper editor** **Banker**	**SMALL (N= 10)** **Superintendent** **Bond committee member** **Newspaper editor** **Banker**
	MEDIUM (N= 14) **Superintendent** **Bond committee member** **Newspaper editor** **Banker**	**MEDIUM (N= 9)** **Superintendent** **Bond committee member** **Newspaper editor** **Banker**
	LARGE (N= 15) **Superintendent** **Bond committee member** **Newspaper editor** **Banker**	**LARGE (N= 4)** **Superintendent** **Bond committee member** **Newspaper editor** **Banker**

To augment and potentially expand understanding gained from the survey, a personal interview was subsequently conducted by the researcher with each survey respondent. The questions contained in the interview ranged along a continuum from highly structured, closed-ended questions to unstructured, open-ended questions. In mixed methods research, it has become increasingly common to synthesize elements of the open and closed-ended formats. "The most common type of combination is a 'funnel interview' in which the researcher starts with very broad questions and gradually limits the scope of the questions to a few focused issues.

This type of interview is directly applicable to the mixed research approach" (Tashakkori & Teddlie, pg. 102). Based on such accepted research design approval, the researcher in this study consequently used the funnel interview format. Given how the 32-item survey served to provide a common data set for this study, the personal interview subsequently served as both follow-up and development of those data and also served as the qualitative data collection instrument for the study.

All interviewees were asked a set of standard questions with open-ended prompts based on the respondent's role in the election process (see Appendix E). Some questions were unique to the respondent's role in the process. For example, the newspaper editor was asked unique questions about the role of the press, while the banker fielded unique questions about the financial status of the business community at the time of the bond election. Standard questions were designed to collect information from respondents about various strategies used by the district during the bond campaign. The unique questions were designed to elicit in-depth responses from respondents about their perceptions of which factors were critical to the bond election passage or failure and to gather advice that could be useful to other districts preparing for a bond election. All data from surveys and interviews were subsequently used to construct a 'story' which drew out characteristics of both successful and unsuccessful bond election experiences in Kansas.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

The written survey instrument and the personal interview protocol were subjected to a review by six district-level or building-level school administrators who had had recent

experience with school bond issues in Kansas. This jurying was conducted to help determine content validity of the instruments. "Content validity is the subjective measure of how appropriate the items seem to a set of reviewers who have some knowledge of the subject matter" (Litwin, 1995, pg. 35). Content validity in a survey is necessary to ensure that the survey addresses the topics it should and that it does not include topics that are not applicable. The jury of administrators utilized in this study was asked to evaluate the items in the survey in light of the following questions: "Do the questions make sense?" "Does each item deal with a strategy commonly found in Kansas school bond election campaigns?" "Are the directions clearly worded?" The jury was also asked to identify items in the survey that they felt were not applicable to the topic of Kansas school bond election strategies and further asked to suggest items that they felt should be added.

A similar review process was undertaken with the items included in the personal interview. The same jury evaluated the questions and possible follow-up prompts for clarity and relevance. Suggestions about word choice were evaluated and incorporated into the survey and interview questions. The review did not result in any items being deleted or the construction of any additional items.

Because responses to the survey items were not always dichotomous in nature, reliability for the survey needed to be established. A principal component analysis was run to determine what scales might be found within the survey items. This resulted in eleven factors that appeared to be related conceptually. The eleven resulting factors were subsequently analyzed using Cronbach's alpha to provide a measure of internal consistency. Internal consistency is an approach to estimating reliability through examination of the individual items on a survey (Borg & Gall, pg. 202). Cronbach's alpha is a method of rational equivalence that can be utilized when

a single administration of the test has been completed (Borg & Gall, 2007). As tested, the coefficient alpha for the individual factors ranged from .844 to .496 (the eleven factors, an abbreviated narrative of the survey items that comprised each factor, and the Cronbach's alpha for each factor are found in Table 3.3; the full narrative of each survey question can be found in Appendix F). Because the interview was significantly open-ended, the decision was made not to further formally establish reliability, especially since the purpose was exploratory in nature and only searched for policy-based opinions about the election process.

Collection of Data

Based on the sampling design described earlier, the superintendent of each selected school district from each of the six stratified categories was contacted to solicit participation in the study. If participation was declined, the researcher randomly selected a replacement from the pool of qualifying school districts. After securing agreement to participate, the researcher asked the superintendent to assist with identifying and contacting three other community members to serve as additional participants (see Appendix A). Subsequently, each of the other subjects identified by the superintendent was also sent a letter inviting and thanking them for their participation, explaining the purpose of the study, and guaranteeing complete confidentiality (see Appendix A).

The four subjects from each of the six participating districts were given the 32- item written survey in which they were asked to rate the impact that various bond election campaign strategies had in the election in their district, or would have had if the strategies had been employed. Additionally, each of the four subjects from each of the six districts participated in an

Table 3.3 Cronbach's Alpha Levels Identified Through Principal Component Analysis

	Cronbach's Alpha	Survey Item #	Item Description
Factor 1	.789	5	Provided detailed information and inservice to citizens working on the bond election campaign.
		14	Had a long-range plan in place before asking for bond
		24	Established a citizens' committee to involve the public in organizing and implementing election activities.
		30	Included citizens on facility planning committee.
		32	Established speakers' bureau to make presentations.
Factor 2	.775	6	Developed and distributed detailed campaign literature.
		7	Focused communication on establishing legitimate need.
		13	Provided information on tax increase for average home.
		15	Provided opportunities to receive & discuss information.
Factor 3	.772	18	Identified yes/no/undecided voters by phone poll
		22	Conducted "Get Out the Vote" activities on Election Day.
		23	Provided early voting opportunities.
Factor 4	.766	3	Assessed controversial issues before calling for bond.
		9 reversed	Attempted to neutralize "no" voters by pointing out negative effects of defeat, causing internal conflict.
		11	Used unpaid media to disseminate bond information.
		16	Identified and contacted special interest groups.
Factor 5	.844	8	Demonstrated responsiveness to the opposition.
		12 reversed	Used paid promotional information to disseminate information about the bond issue.
Factor 6	.791	10	Ongoing public relations campaign in place before bond.
		25	Secured support from local newspapers for the bond.
Factor 7	.602	26	Recruited and involved senior citizens in the campaign.
		31	Obtained unanimous support from the school board.
Factor 8	.630	29	Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.
		1 reversed	Completed a formal or informal voter survey to assess citizens' feelings toward proposal prior to election.
		4 reversed	Surveyed community to assess acceptable tax increase.
Factor 9	.496	17	Registered voters who had children in the schools.
		19	Direct mail campaign to "yes" and "undecided" voters.
Factor 10	.599	2 reversed	Hired a professional campaign consultant to help conduct the bond election.
		21	Made personal contact with "undecided" voters.
Factor 11	.549	20	Ran "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.
		27	Ran special community events to call attention to bond.
		28	Utilized existing organizations to promote the bond.

individual face to face interview with the researcher wherein they responded to eight questions that allowed the respondent to give more in-depth information than was possible through the survey alone. Each respondent was asked two questions designed to elicit their unique perspective based on their role in the bond election process. The other six interview questions were the same for all respondents. All subjects were given the 32-item survey in advance of the personal interview. Each participant was supplied with an advance copy of the interview protocol (see Appendix D). At the actual interview, the researcher had a copy of the questions with additional possible follow-up prompts for each question (see Appendix E). The personal interview format allowed the researcher sufficient flexibility to probe more deeply into the responses given by interviewees to the questions, many times with one question leading to another. The researcher obtained the consent of the interviewees to tape-record the interviews in order to increase the accuracy of reporting the responses. Yin (2003) supported this view in saying, "the tapes certainly provide a more accurate rendition of an interview than any other method" (pg. 86). The researcher also took handwritten notes during the interview process.

Treatment of Data

The purpose of data analysis in this study was to better understand any observable relationship(s) between the presence or absence of identified bond election strategies and the outcome of bond referenda in order to better inform both policy and practice of funding school infrastructure in Kansas and other similarly situated states. The data gathered from the 32-item written surveys were used to examine the four research purposes identified earlier in Chapter 1 (see pg. 6).

Cross-tabulation and Pearson's chi-square were the two major statistical treatments chosen to analyze data gathered from the responses to the survey items. Cross-tabulation was selected because the data collected were largely categorical in nature; was useful in investigating the relationship of multiple variables across those same categories; and lent itself well to the descriptive (policy) nature of this study. More specifically, cross-tabulation was chosen because it is capable of interrelating many observations and expressing the outcome in straightforward fashion for ease of understanding at both lay and policymaking levels. Cross-tabs was particularly chosen for this study given that the technique is useful with any level of data (nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio) since cross-tabs treats all data as if it were nominal; because it describes the distribution of two or more variables simultaneously; and because the data can be presented in table format, expressed in percentage form—a desirable characteristic when recognizing that the purpose of this study is to explore relationships that may inform public policy decisions.

After completing the cross-tabulation analysis, a Pearson's chi-square goodness of fit test was conducted. Since chi-square should not be figured on percentages, the data were converted back to absolute counts before calculating. Pearson's chi-square was selected because it "is a nonparametric test that allows the researcher to determine if the observed frequency distribution for a set of items could be expected to occur by chance" (Salkind, 2004, pg. 262). In the present study, the chi-square was used to analyze whether the frequency of use or non-use of the 32 identified campaign strategies was what a researcher might expect to find if there were no relationship between the variables of the survey. Additionally, the same method of analysis was used to determine whether the distribution of importance ratings across the 32 survey items was likely to have occurred by chance or if the differences in responses were statistically significant.

Results of the cross-tabs and chi-square analyses were therefore used to identify apparent relationships among variables, evaluate suspected relationships, and to construct a descriptive narrative of the findings in straightforward policy language for use by education professionals and other policymakers.

As described earlier, personal interviews were also used to augment the 'story' emerging from cross-tabs and chi-square procedures. Interviews were used to find new data, develop existing data, and to assist in organizing all data sources in such a way that the study paints a narrative picture relative to the issues under study. Creswell (2003) said that, "the process of data analysis involves making sense out of text and image data" (pg. 190). To that end, the researcher in this present study used the following guidelines developed from methods suggested by Creswell (2003) and Stainback and Stainback (1988):

1. Organize and prepare the data for analysis. Prepare transcripts of the interviews and the field notes taken during the interviews.
2. Read through the data in its entirety and look for patterns, categories and themes in the data. Also consider words, phrases, patterns of behavior, and ideas that appear consistently throughout the data.
3. Develop and continue to revise a coding process or classification schemes by which to organize and understand the data.
4. Develop concepts, hypotheses, generalizations and/or theories from the data that can be sorted into recurring patterns. These data can then be compared and contrasted to bring meaning to those themes that occur most frequently.

5. Examine all of the data, including results that don't seem to support an emerging or expected theme.
6. Use the categories and recurring patterns that were developed to make inferences and draw conclusions from the data. Describe how the categories and recurring patterns will be represented in the qualitative narrative.
7. Seek out and consider data and findings available in the literature from related investigations.
8. Use the accumulated data to speculate and formulate ideas, concepts, hypotheses, and assertions.

Based on these established sources, the researcher in this study carried out taped interviews and prepared transcripts of each personal interview and the notes taken during the interviews. From these transcripts, the researcher developed categories for all responses to the interview questions in order to reflect their content as accurately as possible, which were subsequently used to help construct the narrative report of findings. The researcher looked for multiple reports of consistent opinion as a means to sort the responses. Responses were placed into the categories of (a) knowing the district's voters, (b) clearly communicating the need for a bond election, (c) identifying and mobilizing supporters, (d) assembling and utilizing an active, diverse citizen group, (e) presenting a unified board of education, (f) and training speakers to make presentations to community groups. A list of interviewee responses that seemed to lie outside the purposes of the study was also developed. Finally, any other comments by respondents in the interviews which were judged as meaningful by the researcher were recorded and reported in descriptive narrative form.

The net sum of frequency distributions, cross-tabs, chi-square, and closed/open-ended personal interview data allowed construction of a descriptive narrative—i.e., the total intent of this present research—which told the story of the respondents' attitudes and opinions about the factors that were believed to be critical to the success or failure of school bond referenda in their individual school districts.

Summary

Chapter 3 presented an overview of the methodology used in this research, including initial population and final sample selection, selection of actual subjects, data collection instruments, reliability and validity issues, and treatment of resultant data related to critical factors in school bond referenda passage or failure in Kansas from 2004-2007. The reporting and analysis of the data is found in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data

The purpose of this study was to examine successful and unsuccessful school bond referenda in Kansas in an attempt to determine what variables appeared to have contributed to their passage or failure. Four knowledgeable stakeholders from each of six selected districts that held school bond referenda between 2004-2007 participated in a personal interview and responded to a written survey (N=24 respondents). This chapter begins with a review of the methodology that was used in the study and concludes with a presentation and interpretation of the data.

Review of the Methodology

The population for this study consisted of all Kansas school districts that held a bond election from 2004-2007. The resulting pool of 72 school districts was then sorted into groups by total district student population using a stratified random sampling procedure (see Figure 3.2 earlier). Large districts were defined as those having more than 3,000 students. Medium districts were those with a total student enrollment of 1,201 to 3,000 students, while small districts were those comprised of 1,200 students or less. Additionally, districts were also stratified by the election result of passage or failure. This stratification procedure was utilized to ensure that a district from each of the six resulting categories (large/successful, large/unsuccessful, medium/successful, medium/unsuccessful, small/successful, and

small/unsuccessful) was appropriately reflected in the sample. Finally, one district from each stratified group was randomly selected for participation.

Each respondent in the study participated in a personal interview and completed a 32-item survey. Respondents from each of the six selected districts who actually participated were the school district superintendent, a member of the citizen bond committee, a local newspaper editor, and a local banker. As the chief school officer of the district, the superintendent was contacted first and asked by the researcher to select three other potential participants. The other three participants were then contacted by the researcher or the superintendent to solicit their participation. Because they were selected by the superintendent, it was assumed that each of the participants had a significant knowledge of the bond election activities in their community and about the impact of various election strategies on the result of the bond election. Each person who agreed to participate received a cover letter that described the purpose of the study and guaranteed the respondent's confidentiality, a copy of the survey instrument and the questions they would be asked in the personal interview, and a copy of the *Informed Consent Form*. Interviews for the four respondents from each same district were scheduled in advance, on the same day whenever possible, and confirmed by telephone or e-mail. Length of each interview ranged from 20 to 65 minutes and was dictated by the amount of information to be conveyed and the conversational style of the respondent. All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed to ensure accuracy of reporting. The researcher also took notes during the interview to facilitate asking more appropriate follow-up questions.

All interviewees were asked a set of standard questions. Six of the questions were the same for all 24 of the respondents. Two of the standard questions were unique to the role of the respondent in the bond election process. For instance, the citizens' bond committee member was

asked about the communications strategies used to get their message to the voters, whereas the superintendent fielded questions about the unanimity, or lack thereof, of the school board. All interviewees in a particular category (superintendent, citizens' committee member, newspaper editor, and banker) were asked the same eight standardized questions. Subsequent questions following each standardized question were either taken from a previously developed list of prompts or were constructed by the researcher to further investigate unique perceptions related by the respondent. Any unique questions were designed to elicit in-depth responses from respondents about their perceptions of which factors were critical to the bond election passage or failure and to gather advice that could be useful to other districts contemplating or preparing for a bond election. All interview data, when utilized in tandem with the data gathered from the survey, was used to construct a 'story' which identified characteristics prevalent in both successful and unsuccessful bond election experiences in Kansas.

The survey instrument completed by each respondent in the study consisted of 32 items, most of which were synthesized from other survey instruments seeking to gather data on school bond referenda success or failure (see earlier discussion in Chapter 3). The remaining questions were constructed by the researcher. Each of the 32 questions consisted of two parts. The first part asked the respondent to identify whether or not that particular strategy had been utilized in the bond election campaign in their district. Then, respondents were asked to give their perception of how important that strategy was, or would have been, in influencing the results of the bond election. The survey thus attempted to ascertain respondents' perceptions across an entire community spectrum of how well the school district: (a) knew its voters, (b) clearly communicated the need for a bond election, (c) identified and mobilized the 'Yes' vote, (d)

assembled and utilized an active diverse citizens' group, (e) presented a unified board of education, and (f) trained speakers to make presentations to community groups.

Data Analysis

As soon as possible after each interview, a transcript was produced from the recording to facilitate analysis of contents. The resultant narrative information was coded by the researcher into themes that emerged from the data. The themes investigated by the survey (i.e.; how well the school district: [a] knew its voters, [b] clearly communicated the need for a bond election, [c] identified and mobilized the 'Yes' vote, [d] assembled and utilized an active, diverse citizens' group, [e] presented a unified board of education, and [f] trained speakers to make presentations to community groups) were utilized as major themes for the purpose of recording frequency of reporting by the interviewees. Other recurrent themes from the narratives were noted as were 'outliers' that were unique in their content.

The survey data were analyzed in several ways. First, frequency distributions were run to determine if there was a difference in the strategies utilized in districts that had successful bond elections as opposed to those districts that had unsuccessful bond elections. Second, the Likert-type responses from the 32 questions were recorded as averages. Finally, cross-tabulations and chi-square tests were run on all discrete data to determine if there were differences in perception about the importance of the various campaign strategies between respondents from the successful versus unsuccessful districts. The results gleaned from the data are presented in the next section.

Findings and Interpretation of the Data

Personal Interview Data Results

The majority of the data gathered for this study came from the personal interviews conducted with the 24 respondents. The major questions asked of the respondents are presented below with a synopsis of the resulting responses. The six questions entertained by all respondents are presented first, followed by the questions that were unique to a respondent's role in the bond election process.

Question #1

"What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

This question generated many different responses, but common themes definitely emerged. The four that seemed to have the most widespread support were surveying the voters, listening to what the voters were willing to support, identifying the 'hot button' issues, and willingness on the part of the district to adjust its plans to more accurately reflect the voters' wishes.

The need to gather input from as many voters as possible was voiced in some form by every respondent. The preferred method of collection varied between hiring a consultant to conduct a scientific survey, forming a committee whose task was to collect community input, holding a series of formal community meetings, and holding informal meetings at the coffee shop or on the street. Several respondents stressed the importance of being intentional about involving the 'naysayers' in this process. The importance of having electronic means of assessing voter perception, especially that of the younger voters, was stressed by several because

they believed that voters were increasingly unlikely to attend meetings but would participate through a blog or some other form of electronic communication. The importance of determining what the voters perceived to be a 'need' as opposed to what was viewed as a 'want' was stressed by several respondents as well.

While there was widespread support among the respondents for some method of surveying voters, they were unanimous in their assertion that the more important step was an active listening process which resulted in crafting a bond issue that the people would support and were willing to fund. Several respondents voiced the opinion that the majority of voters were supportive of education in general but that they were, as a rule, unwilling to support proposals that they felt were impractical, extravagant, or unnecessary. It was commonly held that the voters would be far more likely to support a bond issue if they felt they had been listened to and that their wishes were reflected in what eventually appeared on the ballot.

It became evident that each community had unique 'hot button' issues that needed to be identified and attended to because they produced a significant emotional response from at least a portion of the voters. Whether to renovate an existing building or to construct a new one was often an emotion-laden topic. Other common themes in this category seemed to be the size and/or location of a new building, whether or not to close a neighborhood or community school, issues surrounding athletic facilities, and how much money, if any, to spend on technology acquisition or enhancement. There was widespread agreement that these issues tended to polarize a community and that skillful resolution of the issues was critical to a bond election's outcome.

The willingness of the district to modify its vision of a bond proposal after assessing the voters' perceptions was identified by many respondents as being an important factor in

constructing a bond proposal that would secure the support of the majority of voters. Respondents from districts that had experienced one or more failed bond issues commonly expressed the sentiment that they felt the district had erred in not being more responsive to the wishes of the electorate in terms of constructing a bond proposal that more accurately reflected the desires of the voters instead of holding to the proposal they felt best met the educational needs of students. One respondent opined that he thought they had lost the last bond election because voters felt things were "being crammed down their throats".

Question #2

How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

This question elicited a wide variety of responses. Successful communication strategies varied significantly from one community to another. Strategies that were successful in one community were identified as counterproductive in other communities. The four major themes that appeared were: contact all groups within the community, communicate through multiple sources of information, present information in an honest, accurate, and simple format, and have answers for the hard questions—before they are asked, if possible.

There are many subgroups within a community, many of whom invariably have different needs and perspectives relating to a bond proposal. All of the districts in the study formed a committee to facilitate the transmission of information about the bond to the community. The consensus was that the group should be representative of the community at large. There did not appear to be a consistent theme in terms of how much district and building administrators should be involved in the process. In some districts it was felt that the citizens should be in the forefront and in others having the administration 'lead the charge' was viewed as essential to the bond's

success. All the districts stressed the importance of reaching every group within the community with information about the bond. The need to gain the support of the entire staff of the district was stressed. Several districts reported learning the hard way that school employees are not automatically in favor of a bond and that they can easily sabotage the campaign if their support of the proposal is not secured.

There was agreement among the respondents that the vehicle for effective communication varied from group to group. Some groups were thought to respond most favorably to an electronic form of receiving information. The districts in the study all utilized their district website to communicate the need for the bond issue. The use of e-mail was also a common communication strategy. Some groups responded favorably to the print media through letters to the editor, informational articles, and paid advertising. Other strategies included radio and television advertising and the production and distribution of an informative video or DVD. All districts involved believed that face-to-face communication was also an integral part of communicating the need to the community. There was a consensus that community-wide meetings were generally not well attended and that it was essential to 'meet the people where they were'. This took various forms in each community and included attending meetings of civic organizations, going to church functions, going door-to-door, and frequenting the restaurants and coffee shops in the community. There was also widespread agreement that some voters needed to actually 'see' the need. This was accomplished primarily through offering tours of district facilities and the development of architectural renderings.

Communicating the need for the bond referendum through an honest, accurate, and simple format was viewed as important by all of the respondents. They agreed that information that was hard to understand or the perception of deception on the part of the school district would

result in defeat at the polls. Exactly how effective communication was to be achieved varied significantly. Some of the respondents touted the effectiveness of hiring an outside consultant to develop and present the communication campaign, whereas other districts felt the need was best communicated by community members who already had credibility with the electorate. All of the districts participating in the study had developed a simple slogan and logo to facilitate awareness of the bond issue.

All of the districts involved dedicated time and effort to trying to anticipate, and having answers for, the hard questions asked by patrons. Many districts developed 'Question and Answer' sections on their website that attempted to address issues deemed to be potentially problematic before they were even raised. The websites were updated frequently to try to address problems or dispel rumors that were surfacing. The speakers who were out in the community making presentations also tried to make sure that the information out in the community was accurate and that they were addressing topics that seemed to be problematic at the time.

Worthy of mention is a particular communication strategy that was identified by all four respondents of one of the districts in the study as being effective in their particular situation. The strategy employed successfully, in the view of the four respondents, involved notifying patrons that the ramifications of a failed bond could include larger class sizes, the addition of modular classrooms, possible boundary changes, and the possibility of a split schedule.

Question 3

What strategies were utilized to identify and mobilize the 'Yes' voters in the community?

The strategies mentioned frequently by respondents concerning how to identify 'Yes' voters were different from those strategies mentioned pertaining to mobilizing the 'Yes' voters. Strategies used to identify supporters fell into two basic categories, while strategies for mobilizing supporters followed three basic themes.

The most frequent responses to how to identify 'Yes' voters all revolved around the strategy of going where the people were. Specific venues mentioned included school and community events (watermelon feeds, ballgames, bonfires, the swimming pool, back to school nights), community organization meetings (Lions Club, Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, PTO/PTA meetings, Chamber of Commerce), church activities, and going door-to-door. The majority of respondents indicated that their district had held community meetings to publicize the bond and answer questions, but that those meetings had been poorly attended. However, they all also indicated that they felt it was still important to provide that avenue for possible community input.

Respondents from all six districts also indicated that they had conducted voter registration activities as a means to identify 'Yes' voters. It was also a common strategy to use voter registration lists as the data base for calling trees to identify bond supporters. Every voter from the most recent election would be called to try to assess whether they were in support of the proposed bond.

The strategies most frequently utilized to mobilize 'Yes' voters included the development of a committee structure, the implementation of Election Day activities, and the development of a communication strategy. Although there were differences in the structure and implementation of these strategies, for the most part, they fell within those three themes.

Every district that participated in the study had a citizens' group that was formed for the purpose of promoting the bond. All of the committees had an identified leader and an internal

structure, although in some instances it was much more loosely configured than in others. In some cases the district administration and/or the school board had a substantial role in the committee activities, and in some cases it was almost entirely patron-organized and driven. The committees that were perceived by the respondents as being more successful were those that met on a regular basis, had a well-defined subcommittee structure with identified leaders and duties, and that choreographed their activities around an adopted timeline. The groups identified as less effective by the respondents were those that were less formally organized and had a small number of people who were responsible for the majority of the activities. Failure to delegate duties, no clear focus, and a lack of internal accountability were identified as weaknesses of these groups.

Every district involved in the study utilized some form of Election Day strategies in an attempt to mobilize 'Yes' voters and get them to the polls. The most common activities included calling all identified supporters on the day before or on the day of the election, offering rides to known supporters to voting locations, and offering babysitting services to parents with young children so they could go vote. Some other less frequently mentioned strategies included sending postcards or an e-mail to known supporters to encourage them to vote, putting out door hangers, organizing a 'Kids Vote' in an attempt to get more parents to the polls, and the strategic timing and placement of 'Vote Yes' signs.

All districts participating in the study utilized planned speaking engagements as a method to mobilize their supporters. Some of the districts felt that it was important for the district administration and board members to participate heavily in this process because they would have the best information and would be viewed as the most credible by the electorate. Other districts opted to deliver their message almost entirely through community members that were viewed as

leaders. Respondents from these districts felt that presentations by district administration would be viewed as self-serving and thus would be counterproductive. All participating districts stressed the importance of reaching as many people as possible through planned speeches.

The importance of obtaining support from the district staff was stressed by several of the districts participating in the study. The importance of meeting with all components of the staff (classified, certified, and administration) was also stressed. The respondents from two of the unsuccessful districts stated that they believed failure to 'get the staff on board' was a major factor in their failure at the polls. Conversely, the respondents from one of the successful districts specifically identified staff support as a major factor in their success.

Question 4

Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

All of the respondents in the study, regardless of the election result in their district or the level of unanimity of their board of education, stressed the importance of having a unified board. Among the respondents from the three participating districts that held successful bond elections, all responses indicated that they believed the board in their district was unified in its support of the bond election. A number of respondents from the successful districts expressed the opinion that they believed it would be hard to get voters to support a bond referendum that their elected officials couldn't even agree on. One respondent expressed this sentiment, "It doesn't bode well for your chances of success if your own board doesn't totally support it. If there is dissension on the board, the public will pick up on that". (citation omitted, anonymity guaranteed).

The assessment of board unanimity was significantly different among respondents from the three districts in the study that were not successful in their elections. In one of the districts,

all four respondents indicated that the board was totally unified in its support of the bond election. In another district, the respondents indicated that the perception was that the board was "not totally on the bandwagon". Another respondent from the same district said that some of the board members were against the proposal initially, but that they supported it after it won majority board support and became the official board recommendation. In that particular respondent's opinion, however, the perception of a unanimous board was already damaged. In the third district with an unsuccessful bond election, the board vote was 6-1 in favor of the proposal, but it was widely known in the community that another board member was not actually in favor of the proposal and was thought to have actively campaigned against the bond.

All of the respondents in the unsuccessful districts indicated that the absence of a unified board had a negative impact on election results. One respondent expressed that the absence of a unified board created a level of mistrust between the board and the voters and resulted in less support at the polls. Other responses indicated the belief that a split board resulted in a split community and that the chance of a successful election was greatly reduced by the presence of a board that lacked unanimity.

Question 5

Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

There was a marked contrast in the responses to this question from the participants whose districts had successful elections as opposed to responses from those participants whose district was unsuccessful in its election attempt. The most common response from the 'successful' group dealt with clearly communicating the need for the referendum to the community.

Following closely in frequency of response was the critical nature of knowing the wishes of the voters in the community and molding the bond referendum to mirror what voters would support. Those two factors accounted for more than two-thirds of the responses to the question. The third most frequently mentioned factor by respondents in the 'successful' group was the formation and training of a speakers' bureau whose purpose was to reach as many people as possible through public speaking engagements.

Of particular significance was the finding that three out of four respondents from one of the districts in the successful category identified the financial situation in their community at the time of the bond election as being a critical factor in their success. This particular factor was not mentioned by any of the other respondents in any of the other districts. Also noteworthy is the fact that having unanimous support from the board was not mentioned by any of the twelve respondents from the successful districts as having a critical impact on the election.

Whereas the majority of responses from the respondents in the successful districts identified two critical factors as impacting the election results, the responses from participants in the unsuccessful districts were far less homogeneous. The most common response from this group spoke of the need for getting the bond proposal 'right' the first time. One of the respondents opined that if the bond proposal didn't accurately reflect the wishes of the voters and had failed once, the chances of continuing to fail were monumental. Clearly communicating the need for the referendum was the second most frequently mentioned factor by those in the unsuccessful group. The formation and training of a speakers' bureau that involved participants from multiple facets of the community was the third most frequently mentioned factor of critical importance.

The respondents from the unsuccessful districts mentioned having the bond election at a time when a high voter turnout could be expected as being a factor of critical importance a number of times. In contrast, this factor was not mentioned by any of the respondents in the successful groups. A related item was a comment from one respondent who felt that it was of critical importance to conduct voter registration drives in an effort to increase voter turnout. Avoiding doing a mail-in election was identified by one respondent as critical to the success of a bond election, as was making sure that deferred maintenance issues were not included in a bond proposal. One respondent from the unsuccessful group also mentioned the following items as being of critical importance: having unanimous board support, involving multiple groups in the distribution of bond materials, and the quality and timing of distribution of bond promotion materials.

Question 6

Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

This was the final question that was asked to all respondents in the study. As was the case with several of the other questions, responses from the participants in the unsuccessful districts were significantly disparate when compared to responses from the participants in successful districts.

The most common theme in the advice offered from participants in the successful districts involved clear communication of the need for the bond election. The reasoning behind this advice seemed to center around the belief that the majority of people would support a bond election if they felt that it was really needed to appropriately educate the children of the

community. Other responses related to this theme included an admonition to those planning a bond referendum in other districts to make sure that what was asked for was really needed. Additionally, participants from the successful districts stressed the importance of including community members in the process of defining the need so that both the district officials and patrons would share a common vision.

The next most commonly identified theme involved advice about the most effective methods for dissemination of bond referendum information to the patrons of the district. Several respondents stressed the need to contact as many people as possible, as many times as possible. For some, the advocated means of contact was through phone calling trees, whereas others touted face-to-face communication as the most advisable method. Other identified communication strategies included telling patrons right from the beginning what the proposal would cost, getting people involved early in the process of disseminating the information, and hiring a bond consultant to help focus the entire communication process by making sure that the campaign committee was well-organized.

An outlier of particular significance that was mentioned by one of the respondents from a successful district was the advice to take all of the items requested and split the entire bond referendum into two or more separate questions. The advisee recommended placing the items on the ballot in such a way that the highest priority items were grouped together, followed by the next most highly needed items and last, the items that were defined as the lowest priority. The rationale behind this advice was that the respondent believed that voters wanted to have something that they could say 'No' to. The respondent believed splitting the ballot into several individual questions that reflected decreasing need increased the likelihood of successful passage

of the most needed items, while allowing those voters so inclined to vote against the question containing the least necessary items.

The most common response expressed by participants from the unsuccessful districts fell into the general theme of 'knowing your voters'. It was advised repeatedly to tailor the elements of the bond referenda to match the desires of the voters. These participants lamented the fact that their districts had been remiss in either not crafting a bond that met the expectations of their electorate or making concessions toward what the voters wanted that were 'too little, too late'. These respondents also stressed the importance of starting the strategic planning process early. Additionally, they recommended conducting a community survey to determine what the voters wanted and stressed that it was essential to follow what the survey said.

As was true of the respondents from districts that had successful elections, the group from the unsuccessful districts also advised making sure that everyone knew the facts. The tone of the comments from this group, however, dealt more with dispelling rumors quickly and conducting damage control when inaccurate information was spread by opponents of the bond. Giving patrons multiple opportunities to hear the information was stressed so that no one could say that they did not have enough information to support the bond. There were also admonitions from the unsuccessful group to keep the message simple and to go slowly to avoid the perception that the district was trying to 'cram something down the voters' throats'.

Having a strong and viable citizens' committee was advised by several participants from the unsuccessful districts. They advised of the need for a 'great' leader with a dynamic personality. Additionally, they spoke of the need for the committee to be well-organized and aggressive and to recruit 'grassroots' support. Other lesser-mentioned topics included the importance of a unified board, planning the bond election in conjunction with a general election,

and making sure to implement the campaign strategies in advance of the absentee balloting period.

The outliers from the unsuccessful group seemed to center around trust issues. One respondent advised other districts to make sure their district had a positive image before asking for a bond referendum. Otherwise, the respondent's opinion was that the community would feel they were only communicated with when the board wanted money. The advice from another participant was to be sure not to make promises that you could not or would not keep. The contention was that voters would remember those broken promises for 'generations' and any future bond would be difficult to pass.

Questions 7 and 8

What role did the media play during the bond referendum campaign in terms of structured campaign activities? Unstructured activities? Was the media invited to cover community events sponsored by the citizens' committee?

The previous two specific questions were only addressed to the newspaper editors from each district. Depending on the direction of the conversation with the respondents in the other three categories (superintendent, citizens' committee, banker), they may also have been asked questions investigating the role and influence of the media in the bond election campaign. Although there was a less clearly defined dichotomy in responses to these questions from the respondents in the successful districts when compared to respondents in the unsuccessful districts, there was still a different flavor to responses from these respective groups.

In only one of the three successful districts did the local newspaper take an official stance in support of the bond. However, the theme of editorials appearing in newspapers of the other

two successful districts expressed support for the bond and encouraged voters to support it. While the newspaper editors from all three districts acknowledged being invited to attend the events sponsored by the citizens' committee and felt that they had covered the bond election well, the editors themselves made several interesting comments relating to the relative impact of the media position and coverage on the result of the election. One editor acknowledged being invited to events sponsored by the citizens' committee, but indicated they (citizens' committee leadership) weren't 'beating down my door' to get me to come. A second editor expressed appreciation of the fact that the district leadership had met personally with the newspaper staff to give an explanation of the whole bond package. Of particular interest was a comment by the education reporter in the third district who stated, "Of all the government entities I cover, school boards are the hardest. They are the least transparent" (citation omitted, anonymity guaranteed).

The newspapers in each of the unsuccessful districts identified varying levels of support for the bond election in their district. In two of the unsuccessful districts, the newspaper reported having a reporter at every board meeting. However, in these two districts, one suggested that there was not a great amount of outreach on the part of the district or the citizens' committee. The other newspaper representative recalled attending all of the board meetings, but did not remember being invited to any other events. This same reporter noted that the newspaper had endorsed parts of the bond, but it was not a 'wholehearted' endorsement. In the third unsuccessful district, the editor reported that, in his opinion, the newspaper had not done a very good job of publicizing the bond. He also opined that, although the newspaper had supported the bond, it had not had much effect because "the voters were very apathetic" (citation omitted, anonymity guaranteed).

Question 9

Please explain your role in the formation of the citizens' committee.

This question was directed to superintendents and elicited very similar responses from all of them. The common theme that was identified dealt with the superintendent's role in helping to select particular patrons who they felt would work effectively in various positions within the citizens' committee. There was a general consensus among the superintendents that their knowledge of the community was important in the facilitation of the composition of the citizens' committee.

One superintendent expressed regret at not being more involved in the selection of committee members because the committee that developed did not necessarily end up having the same focus as the district administration would have liked. Another superintendent reported inviting known detractors of the bond to be a part of the citizens' committee in an attempt to determine what it would take to secure the support of the voters they represented. In one district the board expressed that they did not want the superintendent to be involved in citizens' committee activities during work hours so that there would not be the appearance that district money was being used to support the bond referendum.

Question 10

What was your role in the public meetings that were held to bolster support for the bond?

This question was posed to the superintendent of each of the districts participating in the study. The responses from five of the six superintendents were similar in nature. The common theme identified from the responses to this question was that the superintendent was expected to be present, but was just there to 'be visible' and to provide clarification of information or answer

questions if necessary. In one of the successful districts, however, the superintendent's role was to be the primary speaker and to make presentations at as many community meetings as possible. As noted, this role for the superintendent was not espoused by the other five districts participating in the study.

Question 11

Please explain how your citizens' committee was formed and describe its major activities.

This question was posed to the citizens' committee member from each of the six participating districts. The answers generated by the respondents from the successful districts were similar in nature to the answers provided by respondents from the unsuccessful districts. The responses dealing with formation of the citizens' committees are addressed first, followed by the description of the activities conducted by the various committees.

The responses of the citizens' committee members were very similar to those given by the superintendents when they responded to the question about their involvement in the formation of the citizens' committee. All responses indicated that the superintendent and the board had been instrumental in determining the composition of the leadership of the citizens' committee. In all cases, once the leadership had been established, the citizens' committee members reported that the bulk of recruitment efforts shifted to the committee leadership. Interesting comments of note included the opinion of one respondent that the people on the citizens' committee were the 'same people that do everything else' in the community. One

person indicated that the school board was basically the 'driving force' behind the 'Vote Yes' committee and that they took the lead.

There was no apparent difference in the theme developed from the responses to the question about campaign strategies that were employed in the various communities. Although there were strategies that were unique to each district in the study, the majority of strategies were similar from one district to the next. The following strategies were utilized in all six participating districts: writing letters of support for the bond to the local newspaper, developing and distributing an informational brochure/flyer, producing and displaying architectural renderings of the proposed improvements, holding district-sponsored meetings to give factual information about the bond, holding community meetings with a variety of groups to gather support for the bond, using local media sources to advertize the bond and increase awareness of the need for the bond and what it contained, having impromptu one-on-one meetings with friends and neighbors, and utilizing a calling tree to assess the number of supporters of the bond.

Those campaign strategies identified by four or five of the participating districts included: conducting voter registration drives, offering tours of the district facilities so that patrons could see the needs, producing and strategically placing yard signs encouraging support of the bond, placing factual material on the district website and/or developing a website for the purpose of promoting the bond, and securing the services of a professional consultant. Less commonly mentioned campaign strategies included the development and distribution of a promotional video/DVD, splitting the bond into separate questions, creating a campaign slogan, and purchasing and distributing various promotional campaign tokens like t-shirts, buttons, and pencils.

Question 12

Was a speakers' bureau assembled and trained to make presentations to community groups?

This question, which was expounded upon by the citizens' committee member from each of the six participating districts, yielded a wide variety of responses. There was no obvious difference in responses from the members of successful districts when compared to those participants from unsuccessful districts. One member indicated that he had been the entire speakers' bureau. In one district, the district staff did the vast majority of public speaking, whether or not the meeting was sponsored by the district or by the citizens' committee. Another district had a somewhat unique approach in that the school board members did all of the public speaking at organized meetings, while the citizens' committee members were the 'voice on the street' as they concentrated on visiting with individual community members wherever they met them. A fourth district always had a school employee and a community member speak at any organized gathering. In another district, the speakers' bureau was comprised entirely of community members who had been trained and followed a script during their presentations. Finally, in the sixth district, the administration did all of the public speaking at school-sponsored events while the speakers' bureau conducted other public gatherings on their own without district staff being present.

Question 13

What community events, if any, were designed to engage the business community in the process?

This question was posed to the bankers representing each of the six participating districts. The responses were very homogeneous in nature. All of the bankers, regardless of outcome of the election in their district, indicated that the business community was invited to attend the events sponsored by the citizens' committee and the school district, but that no events had been specifically designed to engage the business community in the process. One respondent indicated that a presentation was made to various civic organizations that were predominantly, but not exclusively, made up of business people. Another remembered a presentation that was made to the Chamber of Commerce, but it was 'strictly informational' in nature.

Question 14

What was the general climate of the business community toward the bond election?

This question was also answered by the bankers from each of the six participating districts. There was no apparent discrepancy in the responses when examined in groups determined by election result. While none of the bankers expressed a belief that the business community as a whole opposed the bond, the most common response, that surfaced in the answer of three of the participants, was that the opinion of the business community mirrored that of the general populace—some were for it and some were against it. Only one of the six business community representatives indicated that the Chamber of Commerce had officially endorsed the bond and encouraged patrons to support it with their votes. One respondent's perception was that the groups that used the schools were more likely to espouse an official position of support for the bond than were the groups that did not use the facilities.

Outlier Data Responses

In order to fully capture the entirety of the data from the personal interviews, this section provides a summary of information volunteered by the respondents that did not fit into the predetermined categories established by the researcher:

- Reasons for opposition to the bond: Respondents from each of the districts identified the increase in taxes as the main reason for opposition to the bond. Other identified factors included the facility being too fancy, excessive, or extravagant, a lack of trust of the administration, lingering bad feelings over consolidations in the 1960's, the use of a project manager from outside of the community, using bond money for technology acquisition, using bond money for deferred maintenance projects, the desire to remodel a 'historic' building rather than build a new school, and additions or improvements to athletic facilities that were viewed as unnecessary.
- Comments from participants from successful districts included: (a.) A lot of public meetings were not needed here because everyone got their information from the district newsletter; (b.) If there is truly a need, bonds always pass here because people feel like it is their civic duty to support the education of children; (c.) The new people in town want to see growth; (d.) This last bond that passed was pretty quiet. There wasn't much discussion about it; (e.) Given good information and true need, our voters will always do what is right for kids.
- Comments from participants from unsuccessful districts included: (a.) We (supporters of the bond) believed in pride. The general public believed in dollars; (b). This is an area that is known for not passing bond elections; (c.) There is no

real community here; (d.) In this district having a unified board was interpreted as them being 'Yes' people for the administration; (e.) The voters here are extremely apathetic.

Summation of Interview Data Analysis

Although the preferred method of communication varied from one district to the next, participants from all districts represented in the current study recognized the importance of effectively communicating the need for the school bond referendum to the public in an accurate, honest, and simple format. Participants from all six districts indicated that they had organized letter-writing campaigns, developed and distributed campaign literature, held district-sponsored informational meetings, organized meetings sponsored by various civic groups and community organizations, and utilized a calling tree to identify supporters of the school bond.

Respondents from every district in the study listed a wide variety of strategies that were utilized to identify and mobilize supporters of the school bond. All districts reportedly formed a citizens' committee to promote the school bond, employed some form of Election Day strategies, and utilized a speakers' bureau in some form to assist with the dissemination of information.

The critical nature of having unanimous support from the school board for the bond proposal was consistently mentioned by respondents from every district. It was clear that the perceived level of support from board members in the successful districts was greater than the perceived level of support from board members in the districts where the bond referendum failed, and that this lack of support and unanimity had a negative effect at the polls.

There was a significant difference in those factors identified as having a critical impact on bond election results by subjects from successful districts as opposed to unsuccessful districts. The majority of respondents from successful districts identified clearly communicating the need

for the referendum and crafting a bond proposal that represented the wishes of the electorate. Participants from unsuccessful districts were far less homogeneous in their responses. The most frequent response from this group addressed getting the bond 'right' the first time. Several participants from the unsuccessful districts also mentioned the importance of having the school bond election when high voter turnout could be expected. This factor was not mentioned at all by respondents from the successful districts.

When asked how they would advise school districts contemplating or planning a bond election, participants from the successful districts focused on clearly communicating the need for the referendum, only asking for what was really needed, and including community members in the process of defining the need so that patrons and school officials would share a common vision. Respondents from the unsuccessful districts most commonly identified knowing the wishes of voters in the districts and stressed the need to tailor the referendum to meet those wishes. Furthermore, they opined that failure to do so had been a significant factor in the failure of the bond election in their districts.

The newspaper editors from the districts represented in the study were consistent in their opinion that, while they were invited to cover campaign activities, no special attempt was made to engage them in the campaign process. A similar sentiment was expressed by the bankers in the participating districts who stated that they were invited at attend campaign activities, but that none were specifically designed to engage the business community in the school bond election process. The respondents did not indicate that this omission was detrimental to the outcome of the election.

Superintendents participating in the study indicated that they exerted varying levels of influence on the formation of the citizens' committee in an attempt to utilize their knowledge of

the patrons in their community to help form an effective committee. In all but one district, the superintendent did not take a lead role in making presentations to community groups.

When discussing opposition to the bond proposal, respondents from all districts indicated that increased taxes were the main issue. There was also consistent opinion that, even when other reasons for opposition were given, tax increases were the underlying issue. Other reasons for opposition included a perception that the proposal was extravagant or unnecessary, trust issues, lingering negativity from previous consolidations in the district, and the desire to remodel existing structures rather than construct a new facility.

Survey Data Results

Following after personal interview analysis, data gathered from the 32-item written survey were analyzed in a number of ways. First, frequency distributions were constructed to determine if there was a difference in strategies utilized by districts that had successful bond elections when compared to those districts that had unsuccessful bond elections. The strategy number, frequency of reported use of each individual strategy by the 24 respondents, and an abbreviated narrative of the strategy is reported in descending order in Table 4.1 (the full narrative of each survey question can be found in Appendix F). Nine of the strategies were reported to have been used by 75-100% of the respondents. Fourteen of the strategies were reported to have been used by 50-74% of the respondents. Another eight strategies were reported to have been used by 25-49% of the respondents. The final strategy was reported to have been used by only four of the 24 respondents, or 16.7%.

Table 4.1 Campaign Strategies Listed in Descending Order of Utilization, as Reported by Survey Respondents from All Bond Election Districts 2004-2007

Strategy #	Strategy Description	*FRU
6	Developed and distributed detailed campaign literature to patrons.	23/24
11	Used unpaid media to distribute information about the bond.	22/24
13	Provided information on tax increase for average home.	22/24
15	Made personal contact with identified "undecided" voters.	21/24
7	Focused communication on establishing legitimate need.	21/24
27	Conducted special community events to call attention to bond election.	19/24
28	Utilized existing school-based organizations to promote the bond.	18/24
30	Included citizens on facility planning commission to provide input.	18/24
24	Established a citizens' committee to involve the community.	18/24
3	Assessed community opinion on issues before calling for bond.	17/24
5	Provided detailed information to citizens working on bond campaign.	17/24
16	Identified and contacted special interest groups to gather support.	17/24
29	Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.	17/24
1	Completed a community voter survey toward the proposed bond.	16/24
17	Registered voters whose children attended district schools.	16/24
12	Provided many opportunities to receive and discuss bond information.	15/24
25	Secured support from local newspapers for the bond election.	15/24
23	Provided early voting opportunities.	13/24
31	Obtained unanimous support from the school board for the bond issue.	13/24
14	Had a long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.	12/24
19	Conducted a mail campaign targeted to "yes" and "undecided" voters.	12/24
22	Conducted Election Day activities to encourage "yes" voters to vote.	12/24
26	Recruited senior citizens and involved them in the campaign process.	12/24
2	Hired a professional campaign consultant to conduct the bond election.	11/24
4	Surveyed community to assess acceptable tax increase.	11/24
10	Had public relations campaign in place before deciding to hold bond.	11/24
21	Made personal contact and gave information to "undecided" voters.	11/24
32	Established speakers' bureau & trained volunteers to do presentations.	11/24
18	Identified "yes", "no", and "undecided" voters by telephone polls.	9/24
8	Demonstrated responsiveness to opposition by modifying referendum.	8/24
9	Attempted to neutralize "no" vote by pointing out effect of defeat.	8/24
20	Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.	4/24

*FRU=Frequency of Reported Use Out of 24 Total Respondents

The researcher then analyzed the frequency of reported use of each strategy by election result. Results are reported in Table 4.2. One finding of importance is that participants from the unsuccessful bond election districts reported the use of more campaign strategies than did their counterparts from successful election districts. The twelve participants from the unsuccessful districts reported the combined use of 261 strategies, or an average reported utilization of 21.75 strategies per participant. Conversely, the twelve participants from the successful districts reported the combined use of 209 strategies, or an average reported utilization of 17.42 strategies per participant. Thus, unsuccessful districts reportedly utilized, on average, 4.33 more campaign strategies than did the successful districts.

When analyzing the pattern of utilization of campaign strategies, the researcher found that respondents from unsuccessful bond election districts reported a higher frequency of utilization for 25 of the 32 campaign strategies. Respondents from the successful districts reported a higher frequency of utilization for four (4) of the 32 campaign strategies. For the remaining three (3) strategies, respondents from both successful and unsuccessful districts reported an equal frequency of utilization.

Of the 32 campaign strategies, only seven (7) had a difference in reported frequency of utilization between successful and unsuccessful districts of four (4) or more. This amount of difference in utilization was judged to be meaningful. Of the seven (7) strategies with meaningful differences in frequency of utilization, six (6) were utilized more frequently by unsuccessful districts (Strategies #1, 10, 17, 19, 28, & 30). The remaining strategy (#31) showed the greatest disparity in frequency of utilization between successful and unsuccessful districts. This strategy had a difference in frequency of utilization of seven (7) and was the only one that

Table 4.2 Survey Participant Responses Concerning which Strategies Were Used, Not Used, or of Unknown Use in Successful and Unsuccessful Bond Election Districts from 2004-2007

*Suc. Dist.			Strategy Number and Description	**Unsuc. Dist.		
Y	N	U		Y	N	U
5	4	3	1. Conducted community survey to assess voter wishes.	11	0	1
6	4	2	2. Hired professional campaign consultant.	5	4	3
8	2	2	3. Assessed community opinion on controversial issues.	9	1	2
5	5	2	4. Surveyed voters to assess acceptable tax increase.	6	4	2
8	1	3	5. Provided detailed inservice for citizens on bond committee.	9	1	2
11	0	1	6. Developed and distributed detailed campaign literature.	12	0	0
10	1	1	7. Focused communication efforts on establishing need.	11	1	0
4	6	2	8. Demonstrated responsiveness to the opposition.	4	6	2
4	6	2	9. Pointed out the negative effects of a failed bond.	4	6	2
3	7	2	10. Had ongoing PR campaign in place before asking for bond	8	2	2
10	1	1	11. Used unpaid media to distribute campaign information.	12	0	0
6	4	2	12. Used paid media to distribute campaign information.	9	2	1
11	0	1	13. Provided information on tax increase for the average home	11	0	1
5	3	4	14. Had long-range facilities plan in place before election.	7	3	2
10	0	2	15. Provided numerous opportunities to receive information.	11	0	1
8	1	3	16. Gained support of special interest groups.	9	0	3
6	2	4	17. Registered voters whose children attended district schools.	10	0	2
3	6	3	18. Identified voter preference through telephone polls.	6	2	4
3	7	2	19. Conducted a direct mail campaign.	9	1	2
1	10	1	20. Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.	3	5	4
6	3	3	21. Made personal contact to identified "undecided" voters.	5	3	4
5	4	3	22. Conducted Election Day strategies for "Yes" voters.	7	1	4
5	4	3	23. Provided early voting opportunities.	8	1	3
8	2	2	24. Established citizens committee to support the bond.	10	1	1
6	3	3	25. Secured support from local newspapers for the bond.	9	3	0
7	3	2	26. Recruited and involved the senior citizens in the bond.	5	3	4
9	2	1	27. Conducted special community events to publicize bond.	10	1	1
7	2	3	28. Utilized existing school organizations to promote bond.	11	0	1
8	1	3	29. Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.	9	1	2
7	3	2	30. Included citizens on the facility planning committee.	11	0	1
10	0	2	31. Obtained a unanimous vote of support from school board.	3	7	2
4	5	3	32. Established and trained a speakers' bureau.	7	2	3
209	102	73	Total "Used", "Not Used" and "Unknown" Responses	261	61	62

*Suc. Dist.= Successful District Y=Used, N=Not Used, U=Unknown Use

**Unsuc. Dist.=Unsuccessful District Y=Used, N=Not Used, U=Unknown Use

was reported to be utilized substantially more in the successful districts than in the unsuccessful districts.

Frequency distributions were also run to determine if there was a difference in the importance of the campaign strategies as rated by the participants in districts that had successful school bond elections as compared to the participants in those districts that had unsuccessful bond elections. First, an *average importance rating* was computed for each of the 32 survey items. The strategy number, average importance ranking of each individual strategy by the 24 respondents, and an abbreviated narrative of the strategy is reported in descending order in Table 4.3 (the full narrative of each survey question can be found in Appendix F).

The 'importance of strategy' averages that were computed from the responses to the survey items supplied by the 24 respondents ranged from a high of 4.50 to a low of 2.46. Ratings were an average of the 24 responses based on the following scale: 5=Critical Importance, 4=Very Important, 3=Average Importance, 2=Somewhat Important, and 1=Not Important. Ten of the strategies had average importance ratings between 4.50 and 4.00. An additional 12 strategies were rated by the respondents between 3.99 and 3.50 in terms of importance in determining the results of the bond election. Seven strategies were given average importance ratings between 3.49 and 3.00 by the participants in the study. Two strategies were ranked between 2.99 and 2.50, while the remaining strategy was ranked between 2.49 and 2.00 by the 24 respondents.

The average importance ratings assigned to survey items were also analyzed by election result in order to search for differences between successful and unsuccessful districts. Of the 32 survey items, the group of participants from districts with unsuccessful bond elections ranked 24

Table 4.3 Campaign Strategies Listed in Descending Order of Importance as Reported by Survey Respondents from All Bond Election Districts 2004-2007

Strategy #	Strategy Description	*AIR
1	Obtained unanimous support from the school board for the bond issue.	4.50
7	Focused communication on establishing legitimate need.	4.46
6	Developed and distributed detailed campaign literature to patrons.	4.42
15	Made personal contact with identified "undecided" voters.	4.29
13	Provided information on tax increase for average home.	4.21
30	Included citizens on facility planning commission to provide input.	4.21
5	Provided detailed information to citizens working on bond campaign.	4.13
24	Established a citizens' committee to involve the community.	4.13
3	Assessed community opinion on issues before calling for bond.	4.08
16	Identified and contacted special interest groups to gather support.	4.00
28	Utilized existing school-based organizations to promote the bond.	3.96
29	Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.	3.92
1	Completed a community voter survey toward the proposed bond.	3.88
11	Used unpaid media to distribute information about the bond.	3.88
17	Registered voters whose children attended district schools.	3.88
25	Secured support from local newspapers for the bond election.	3.88
14	Had a long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.	3.83
10	Had public relations campaign in place before deciding to hold bond.	3.75
27	Conducted special community events to call attention to bond election.	3.71
8	Demonstrated responsiveness to opposition by modifying referendum.	3.67
26	Recruited senior citizens and involved them in the campaign process.	3.67
32	Established speakers' bureau & trained volunteers to do presentations.	3.67
19	Conducted a mail campaign targeted to "yes" and "undecided" voters.	3.46
4	Surveyed community to assess acceptable tax increase.	3.38
18	Identified "yes", "no", and "undecided" voters by telephone polls.	3.38
21	Made personal contact and gave information to "undecided" voters.	3.38
22	Conducted Election Day activities to encourage "yes" voters to vote.	3.29
12	Provided many opportunities to receive and discuss bond information.	3.25
2	Hired a professional campaign consultant to conduct the bond election.	3.00
23	Provided early voting opportunities.	2.83
9	Attempted to neutralize "no" vote by pointing out effect of defeat.	2.79
20	Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.	2.46

*AIR=Average Importance Rating

strategies as more important than the group of participants from districts that had successful bond elections. The respondents from districts in which the bond election passed ranked six (6) strategies as more important than did respondents from districts wherein the bond election had

failed. Two of the strategies were ranked identically by participants from both groups. The average importance ranking of each individual strategy by the twelve respondents from the successful districts is listed in Table 4.4, as is the average importance ranking of each individual strategy by the twelve respondents from the unsuccessful districts, and the strategy number and an abbreviated narrative of the strategy (the full narrative of each survey question can be found in Appendix F).

As noted in Table 4.4, two of the campaign strategies received exactly the same average importance rating from the participants in the successful districts as from the participants in the unsuccessful districts. An additional twelve strategies showed a difference in average importance ratings from the two groups of respondents that were between .01 and .24. Ten strategies showed differences of .25 to .49 in terms of their average importance ratings as compiled from the responses from participants in the successful districts when compared to responses from participants in unsuccessful districts. The differences in these average importance ratings were judged by the researcher not to be meaningful because they represented a difference in perceived importance of less than one-half point.

Six of the campaign strategies received average importance ratings that fell between .50 and .74 (Strategies #1, 10, 14, 20, 23, and 29). Of those six (6) strategies, four (4) were ranked higher by respondents from the unsuccessful districts, while the remaining two were ranked higher by respondents from the unsuccessful districts. One strategy (#19) received an average rating by participants from the unsuccessful districts that was .92 higher than the average rating assigned by participants from the successful districts. The respective average scores for this strategy of 3.92 (unsuccessful) and 3.00 (successful) seem to indicate that the respondents in the unsuccessful districts believed that conducting a direct mail campaign targeted to 'Yes' and

'Undecided' voters was very important, whereas respondents in the successful districts rated the strategy as being of average importance.

The campaign strategy that showed the greatest disparity in average importance rating between respondents from successful and unsuccessful districts was #17: i.e., registered voters whose children attended district schools. This strategy received an average rating of 3.33 from respondents in the successful districts. Conversely, respondents from the unsuccessful districts perspective of the importance of the strategy resulted in an average score of 4.42, for a difference in the average importance rating of 1.09. Clearly, respondents from the unsuccessful districts viewed this strategy as being more important in influencing the results of the bond election than did the respondents from successful districts.

The survey results were also analyzed in terms of average importance rating by district. The average importance ratings by district were analyzed individually (see Appendix G) and also by a group comparison of successful districts to unsuccessful districts (see Table 4.4). As would be expected based on the average importance ratings from individual participants, the average ratings in the unsuccessful districts were higher than those averages in the successful districts. The importance ratings across all districts ranged from 3.30 to 4.20 with an average of 3.73. The range of ratings in successful districts was from 3.30 to 3.88, with an average rating of 3.64. The unsuccessful districts had a range of ratings from 3.55 to 4.20 with an average rating of 3.82 (a full rendering of these results can be found in Appendix G).

Finally, survey results were analyzed by the respondent's position within the district (superintendent, citizens' committee, newspaper editor, banker) to determine if there was a difference in the perceived importance of the strategies' impact on election results (see Appendix H). The average importance rating across all participants was 3.73. Newspaper editors rated the

Table 4.4 Average Importance Ratings of Campaign Strategies as Reported by Survey Respondents from Successful and Unsuccessful Bond Election Districts 2004-2007

*Suc. Dist. AIR	Strategy Number and Description	**Unsuc. Dist. AIR
3.58	1. Completed a community voter survey toward the proposed bond.	4.17
2.83	2. Hired a professional campaign consultant to conduct bond election.	3.17
4.00	3. Assessed community opinion on issues before calling for bond.	4.17
3.33	4. Surveyed community to assess acceptable tax increase.	3.42
4.08	5. Provided detailed information to citizens working bond campaign.	4.17
4.58	6. Developed and distributed detailed campaign literature to patrons.	4.25
4.42	7. Focused communication on establishing legitimate need.	4.46
3.58	8. Demonstrated responsiveness to opposition by modifying proposal.	3.75
2.67	9. Attempted to neutralize "no" vote by pointing out effect of defeat.	2.92
3.50	10. Had public relations campaign in place before deciding on bond.	4.00
3.75	11. Used unpaid media to distribute information about the bond.	4.00
3.08	12. Provided many opportunities to receive & discuss bond inform.	3.42
4.17	13. Provided information on tax increase for average home.	4.25
3.50	14. Had a long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.	4.17
4.25	15. Made personal contact with identified "undecided" voters.	4.33
3.92	16. Identified and contacted special interest groups to gather support.	4.08
3.33	17. Registered voters whose children attended district schools.	4.42
3.17	18. Identified "yes", "no", and "undecided" voters by telephone polls.	3.58
3.00	19. Conducted mail campaign targeted to "yes" & "undecided" voters.	3.92
2.75	20. Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.	2.17
3.33	21. Made personal contact & gave information to "undecided" voters.	3.42
3.08	22. Conducted Election Day activities to encourage the "yes" vote.	3.50
2.58	23. Provided early voting opportunities.	3.08
4.08	24. Established a citizens' committee to involve the community.	4.17
3.75	25. Secured support from local newspapers for the bond election.	4.00
3.67	26. Recruited senior citizens & involved them in campaign process.	3.67
3.92	27. Conducted special community events to call attention to election.	3.50
3.83	28. Utilized existing school-based organizations to promote the bond.	4.08
4.17	29. Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.	3.67
4.25	30. Included citizens on facility planning commission to provide input.	4.17
4.58	31. Obtained unanimous support from school board for the bond issue.	4.42
3.67	32. Established speakers' bureau & trained volunteers to do speeches.	3.67

*Suc. Dist.AIR= Successful District Average Importance Ratings
**Unsuc. Dist. AIR=Unsuccessful District Average Importance Ratings

strategies the lowest at 3.63. They were followed by citizens' committee members at 3.66, and bankers at 3.78. Superintendents ranked the total overall impact of the strategies highest at 3.84. Thus, the range in importance ratings by position within the district was .21, with no group being more than .11 from the mean (a full rendering of the results based on position in the district can be found in Appendix H).

Additionally, cross-tabulations were run on all 64 of the possible distributions. Each of the 64 cross-tabs is presented as a contingency table in a matrix format. The advantage to the cross-tabs is that, while a frequency distribution provides the distribution of one variable, a contingency table describes the distribution of two or more variables simultaneously. Each cell in the contingency table shows how many respondents gave that specific combination of responses. The 32 "A" distributions yielded a 3x2 contingency table comparing utilization of the strategy (use, non-use, or unknown) with election result (successful or unsuccessful). The 32 "B" distributions yielded a 5x2 contingency table comparing perceived importance of strategy (critical, very important, average importance, somewhat important, not important) with election result (successful or unsuccessful).

Cross-tabs yielding meaningful findings are not included in text form (see discussion and Appendix J later) as they were reported in the frequency distribution data as well as being subjected to further analysis through the chi-square test (see Appendix I later). The only exception is that the cross-tabulation data for item A31 ("obtained a unanimous vote of support from the school board on the resolution calling for a bond election") is presented below in Table 4.5. This item appears to be the best example of an item making a difference in that 76% of those districts that obtained a unanimous vote were successful, compared to 50% of the districts where the vote was 'unknown' to the respondents, and 0% of the districts that did not obtain a

unanimous vote. Taken conjointly, all these data suggest that, while the unsuccessful districts tended to utilize more strategies and implement them more frequently than the successful districts, this effort may have been negated by the failure to achieve unanimous board support for the resolution calling for a bond election.

Table 4.5 Cross-tabs Values for Item A31

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	3	10	13
	% within A31	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	83.3%	54.2%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A31	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	7	0	7
	% within A31	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	.0%	29.2%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A31	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following after analysis of the survey data yielded by the various categorizations of frequency distributions and cross-tabulations, a Pearson's chi-square analysis was performed. Two separate analyses were run for each of the 32 survey items. One analysis determined whether the frequency distributions describing the utilization of the 32 campaign strategies were different from what could be expected to occur by chance. These were referred to as the "A" strategies. The second analysis determined whether the frequency distributions describing the average importance ratings between successful and unsuccessful districts were different from what could be expected to occur by chance. These were referred to as the "B" strategies.

Chi-square values obtained from the data on campaign strategies that were less than $p<.05$ were determined to be statistically significant. Campaign strategies yielding chi-square values between .051 and .20 were considered as an 'interesting trend'.

Of the 64 chi-square values generated (32 "A" variables and 32 "B" variables), three (3) were found to be statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level and eleven (11) were found to be in the range between .051 and .20 and were categorized as interesting trends. A brief description of these 14 items, along with the generated chi-square values, is found in Table 4.6 (a full representation of all 64 chi-square values is found in Appendix I).

All three items found to be statistically significant were "A" items, which dealt with the frequency of use of the campaign strategies. Item A1 was found to be statistically significant due to the fact that 11 respondents from the unsuccessful districts indicated that they utilized the strategy of completing a formal or informal community voter survey to assess the citizens' feeling toward the bond proposal prior to the election, while only five respondents from the successful districts indicated utilizing this strategy. The second strategy found to be statistically significant was A19. In this instance, nine (9) respondents from the unsuccessful districts reported conducting a direct mail campaign targeting 'Yes' and 'Undecided' voters as compared to only three (3) respondents from the successful districts. The final strategy found to be statistically significant was A31. In this instance, ten (10) respondents from the successful districts reported that their district obtained a unanimous vote of support from the school board on the resolution calling for a bond election, as opposed to only three (3) of the respondents from the unsuccessful districts.

The remaining 11 chi-square results were, although not statistically significant, items suggesting an 'interesting trend'. All of these items had alpha values ranging from .080 to .167.

Table 4.6 Chi-Square Values for Campaign Strategies Reported as Statistically Significant or an Interesting Trend 2004-2007

Strategy Number and Description	*Stat. Sig. (<.05)	**Int. Trend (.051-.20)
A1. Conducted community survey to assess voter wishes.	.027	
B6. Developed and distributed detailed campaign literature.		.167
A10. Had ongoing PR campaign in place before asking for bond		.080
B14. Had long-range facilities plan in place before election.		.147
B17. Registered voters whose children attended district schools.		.118
A19. Conducted a direct mail campaign.	.024	
A20. Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.		.107
B24. Established citizens committee to support the bond.		.120
A25. Secured support from local newspapers for the bond.		.165
B25. Secured support from local newspapers for the bond.		.070
B26. Recruited and involved the senior citizens in the bond.		.080
A28. Utilized existing school organizations to promote bond.		.143
A30. Included citizens on the facility planning committee.		.121
A31. Obtained a unanimous vote of support from school board.	.005	

*Stat. Sig.=Statistically Significant
**Int. Trend=Interesting Trend

Five of the 11 items were "A" items which dealt with frequency of utilization of a particular strategy. In all five cases, respondents from the unsuccessful districts reported utilizing the strategies substantially more than did the respondents in the successful districts. The other six items were "B" items, which analyzed differences in perceived importance of the strategies and their effect on the results of the bond election. On items B14, B17, B24, and B25, respondents from the unsuccessful districts ranked the corresponding strategies as more important than did their counterparts from successful districts. On item B6, the respondents from the successful districts rated the item about the development and distribution of detailed campaign literature as more important than did the respondents from the unsuccessful districts. The final item (B26)

was rated exactly the same by participants from both groups. Taken conjointly, all these data suggest that the unsuccessful districts in the present study utilized a greater percentage of the campaign strategies, carried them out with greater frequency than the successful districts, and perceived them to be more important, yet experienced defeat at the polls.

Summation of Written Survey Data Analysis

Numerous frequency distributions were run to facilitate analysis of the survey data. It was reported by at least 75% of the respondents that nine of the 32 strategies had been used in their districts. It was found that districts having unsuccessful bond elections utilized an average of 4.33 more campaign strategies than did districts which were successful in passing their bond referendum. Additionally, only one of the seven strategies that showed a meaningful difference in frequency of utilization was utilized more often in successful districts than in unsuccessful districts. That strategy (#31) dealt with the presence of a school board in unanimous support of the school bond proposal.

A frequency distribution was also run to determine the perceived importance of each strategy, in terms of its impact on the election results, as rated by the 24 respondents. The attendant average importance ratings ranged from a high of 4.50 to a low of 2.46. When average importance ratings were analyzed in terms of election result, it was found that participants from unsuccessful districts rated 24 of the campaign strategies of greater importance than did their counterparts in the successful districts. The two strategies having the greatest disparity in ratings pertained to conducting a direct mail campaign targeted to 'Yes' and 'Undecided' voters (#19) and registering voters whose children attended district schools (#17). In both cases, respondents from unsuccessful districts rated the importance of the strategy higher (.92 and 1.09 respectively).

Campaign strategies were also analyzed in terms of their average importance rating by district and the respondent's role in the district. It was found that unsuccessful districts had an average importance rating across all strategies of 3.82, whereas successful districts reported an average importance rating of 3.64. Superintendents, as a group, ranked the importance of the strategies the highest at 3.84. They were followed, in descending order, by bankers at 3.78, citizens' committee members at 3.66, and newspaper editors at 3.63.

Cross-tabulations were also run on all of the 64 possible distributions. Item A31 ("obtained a unanimous vote of support from the school board on the resolution calling for a bond election") appeared to be the best example of an item making a difference in that 76% of those districts that obtained a unanimous vote were successful, compared to 50% of the districts where the vote was unknown to the respondents, and 0% of the districts that did not obtain a unanimous vote.

The chi-square analysis run on the 64 aforementioned distributions yielded three (3) items that were found to be statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level. Eleven items had alpha levels between .051 and .20 and were categorized as interesting trends. Two of the statistically significant items involved conducting a community survey to assess voter wishes and conducting a direct mail campaign. In both of these cases, respondents from unsuccessful districts reported utilizing these strategies significantly more than respondents from successful districts. The third statistically significant item dealt with obtaining a unanimous vote of support from the school board. On this item, significantly more respondents from successful districts reported unanimous board support in their district when compared to respondents from unsuccessful districts.

Overall Summation

Although there are many common elements, bond election campaigns appear to be as unique as the communities in which they are undertaken. The data collected from the 24 respondents from six participating districts during personal interviews and the 32-item written survey were analyzed in search of areas of agreement of perception as well as emerging trends in the responses. In their totality, the data from both sources 'told the story' of the bond referenda experience in the six participating districts.

Based on the data, it was apparent that participants from successful and unsuccessful districts utilized similar strategies. It was also evident that the unsuccessful districts utilized more campaign strategies, and utilized them more often, than did the successful districts in the study. Additionally, respondents from the unsuccessful districts perceived the strategies to be more important than did their counterparts in the successful districts. Interview responses and survey data from respondents from both successful and unsuccessful districts supported the view that clear communication of the need for a bond, knowing the voters of the district, identifying and mobilizing supporters, and garnering unanimous support of the bond proposal from the school board were of critical importance to the success of the referendum.

Having unanimous support from the school board for the bond appeared to have been the most critical factor in the success or failure of the school bond in the six districts represented in the study. This factor surfaced most frequently in the personal interviews and had the highest importance rating of all strategies on the survey. The cross-tabs and chi-square results showed a striking disparity in the presence of this factor between successful and unsuccessful districts.

The collection and analysis of all data provided the background for Chapter 5, which contains a final review of the study and overall discussion of the findings.

CHAPTER 5

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to analyze the opinions of selected stakeholders from school districts regarding potentially critical factors in school bond referendum success and failure in Kansas during the years 2004-2007 and to examine what relationship, if any, may have existed among the variables identified as important. Of the 72 districts that held school bond elections during the years in question, six groups were formed through a stratified random sampling process utilizing student enrollment size (small, medium, large) and bond election result (successful, unsuccessful). One district was randomly selected for study participation from each of the six groups.

Four purposefully selected respondents from each selected district participated in a mixed methods strategy of inquiry which included completing a 32-item written survey and participating in a personal interview with the researcher. The 32-item written survey served as the standardized data collection instrument for the study. The data gathered from survey responses were used to augment and expand upon the understanding of the bond referendum process gained from the personal interviews by examining the respondents' perceptions of how important selected campaign strategies were, or would have been, in influencing the results of their particular bond election. Frequency distributions were constructed from the responses to the survey questions in an attempt to identify relationships between variables identified as important to the success of the bond referendum. Cross-tabulations and Pearson's chi-square were the statistical treatments chosen to further analyze the data gathered from survey responses.

During the personal interviews, all participants were asked a set of standard questions with open-ended prompts, based on the respondent's role in the bond election process. Additionally, respondents were asked some questions that were unique to their role in the bond election process. The questions were designed to elicit in-depth responses from respondents about their perceptions of which factors were critical to the bond election's passage or failure and to gather advice that could be useful to other districts preparing for, or contemplating, a bond election. Interviews were used to discover new data, further develop existing data, and to assist in organizing all the data sources to construct a 'story' which drew out characteristics of both successful and unsuccessful bond election experiences in Kansas.

Findings and Conclusions

The results of this study are likely to be beneficial to school superintendents contemplating whether to recommend a bond election to the board of education, for local school boards as they determine an appropriate course of action tailored to the unique needs of their particular districts, and for district officials and patrons working toward construction of a bond campaign strategy that will most effectively bolster support for the referendum among the patrons in their community. Since in Kansas, as in many other states, the majority of school infrastructure improvement is funded through a local school bond referendum election, the results of this study are likely to be of paramount importance in helping school district officials secure approval from the voters for the funds necessary to provide a safe and orderly environment that is essential in maximizing student achievement. Additionally, the findings of this study are likely to be beneficial in the development, enhancement, or maintenance of an effective communication program between the school district and patrons, which will result in a

common vision of educational needs and priorities and a bond referendum that is more likely to achieve majority approval at the polls.

Analysis of the data yielded considerable support for the six themes identified through the review of literature on variables contributing to successful school bond referenda. The following points illustrate the findings on the six themes:

1. Know your voters

Although the personal interview findings indicated a significant disparity in the preferred method of collecting knowledge of voter perception, all of the respondents in the current study stressed the importance of contacting as many voters as possible. More notably, however, they were unanimous in their assertion that an even more important step was to utilize an active listening process that resulted in the construction of a bond proposal that would be supported by the majority of the voters. A common perspective among respondents was that the voters would be far more likely to support a bond issue that accurately reflected their wishes. It was apparent that the successful districts had a history of ongoing, positive communication with their patrons and that the voters felt like their voice was heard by district officials. Respondents from the unsuccessful districts opined that there had not been enough genuine two-way communication in their districts and that there was a certain level of mistrust between district officials and the voters.

Each district in the study had unique 'hot button' issues that produced a significant emotional response from a portion of the voters. There was widespread agreement that skillful resolution of these issues was critical to the outcome of a school bond issue. This sentiment was supported by the survey data wherein the question about assessing community opinion about controversial issues received an average importance rating of 4.08 out of 5.00. The successful

districts seemed to deal more proactively with these issues than the unsuccessful districts did. Representatives of the successful districts tended to purposefully prepare their public speakers to address the issues in their presentations and to offer answers and solutions to the hard questions on their websites and in the print media. It appeared that representatives of the unsuccessful districts more often were engaged in 'damage control' after the issues had already been raised and had become divisive within the community.

Finally, it was expressed by respondents from successful and unsuccessful districts alike that willingness on the part of district officials to modify their vision of a bond proposal to more accurately reflect the voters' wishes was an important factor in success at the polls. Respondents from the successful districts indicated that the proposal that ultimately showed up on the ballot had often been modified through input from the community. Respondents from districts that had experienced one or more unsuccessful bond election attempts commonly expressed the sentiment that their bond had failed because district officials stuck with their original proposal instead of being more responsive to the wishes of the electorate.

2. Clearly communicate the need for a bond election

The importance of contacting all groups within the community and providing them with factual information that clearly communicated the need for the bond came through in both the interview and survey data. The consensus was that the group selected to communicate the need to the community would be most effective if it were representative of the community as a whole. Four of the five highest average importance ratings, ranging from 4.21 to 4.46 out of 5.00, came from survey items reflecting this theme. It appears that respondents from all districts viewed this theme as important as there was little difference in the average importance ratings when comparing successful districts to unsuccessful districts. Additionally, the five highest utilization

ratings as reported by respondents on the survey came from items in this theme. All five items had reported utilization rates of over 83% and showed little difference when accounting for election result of the district. One additional finding of note is that, as a group, the respondents indicated low utilization of campaign strategies designed to demonstrate responsiveness to the opposition or attempting to neutralize their position by pointing out the negative effects of defeat of the bond proposal.

The results of the study indicated that different communication forms were necessary to reach different elements of the constituency. The general consensus among respondents was that there was an increasing need for electronic communication (e-mail, websites, blogs, etc.) with younger voters, while face-to-face communication was judged to be more effective with older constituents of the community. The importance of presenting the information, regardless of format, in an honest, accurate, and simple way was deemed to be of critical value. Many respondents indicated that the perception of deception on the part of the school district would result in defeat at the polls. Finally, respondents from all of the districts in the study indicated that significant amounts of time and effort were expended in responding to, or anticipating, the 'hot button' issues in each district.

3. Identify and mobilize the 'Yes' vote

The most frequent responses concerning how to identify 'Yes' voters revolved around the strategy of going where the people were. Specific venues mentioned included school and community events, community organization meetings, church activities, and going door-to-door. There was significant agreement that district-sponsored community meetings were not effective in reaching voters because they were poorly attended, but respondents believed it was still important to provide that avenue for potential community input and to negate the claim that

information concerning the bond had not been readily available. Respondents from every district in the study indicated that voter registration activities had been utilized to identify and recruit additional 'Yes' voters.

Every district involved in the study attempted to mobilize 'Yes' voters and get them to the polls by utilizing some form of Election Day strategies. The most common activities identified included phone calls just prior to the election, offering rides to polling locations, and offering babysitting to parents with young children so they could go vote. It is noteworthy that the six survey questions assessing this theme placed among the lowest ten strategies in terms of utilization rate and also accounted for four of the seven lowest average importance ratings. Two of the survey items merit individual discussion. First, the strategy dealing with running a 'vote by mail' election to increase voter turnout received the lowest average importance rating and lowest reported utilization rating of any item on the survey. Second, the strategy dealing with conducting a direct mail campaign targeted to 'Yes' and 'Undecided' voters was deemed to be very important (3.92 of 5.00) by respondents from unsuccessful districts, but only of average importance (3.00 of 5.00) by respondents from successful districts. The same strategy was also utilized substantially more by unsuccessful districts than successful districts. Since wide distribution of bond information was espoused by all districts in the study, it must be assumed that the successful districts chose a different method of distribution.

4. Assemble and utilize an active, diverse citizens' group

All of the districts represented in the study formed a citizens' committee to facilitate the transmission of information about the bond to the community. The consensus was that the committee should be representative of the community at large and that it is essential to reach every element of the community. There were widely disparate views of whether the committee

should be citizen-driven or if an outside consultant, district administration, or local school board members should be in the forefront. All of the committees had an identified leader and varying levels of internal structure. The most effective groups were described as those that met on a regular basis, had a well-defined subcommittee structure, and choreographed their activities around an adopted timeline. Those committees identified as less effective lacked formal organization, actively involved a small number of citizens, failed to delegate duties, and lacked a clear focus and internal accountability. There was no apparent relationship identified from either the interview or survey data linking election result with committee structure or perceived effectiveness. Having a highly effective committee did not necessarily guarantee a victory at the polls, nor did having a committee of limited effectiveness necessarily result in defeat.

The seven survey items measuring this theme had moderate to high average importance ratings (3.67 to 4.21 out of 5.00) and similar reports of utilization among the respondents of the study. One interesting note is that the survey item dealing with recruiting the senior citizen vote and involving them in the bond election campaign received the lowest average importance rating of any item assessing this theme (3.67 of 5.00) and was also reportedly the least utilized strategy. Considering that this age group is steadily increasing in numbers, it might behoove districts seeking to pass a bond referendum to devote more time, energy, and attention to this element of the community.

5. Present a unified board of education

All of the respondents in the study, regardless of election result in their districts, stressed the importance of having unified school board support for the proposed bond issue. There was a significant difference in the effect of unanimity of support by the school board, or at least the perception thereof, between the successful and unsuccessful districts in the study. In the one

unsuccessful district that actually had a unanimous board, several respondents believed the unanimity was seen in a negative light by patrons of the district because of feelings of mistrust between the board and the voters. In another of the unsuccessful districts, several board members were originally opposed to the bond proposal but supported it once it became the official board recommendation. In one respondent's opinion, however, the perception of a unanimous board had already been damaged. Other responses from participants in unsuccessful districts indicated their belief that a split board resulted in a split community and that the chances of winning a bond election under those conditions were minimal.

The survey item measuring the theme of unanimous board support had an average importance rating of 4.50 out of 5.00. This was the highest rating of any item on the survey. Additionally, this item was the only one on the survey that was reportedly utilized at a substantially higher rate by successful districts than unsuccessful districts. Also noteworthy is the fact that having unanimous board support for the referendum was not mentioned by any of the twelve respondents from the successful districts as having a critical impact on the election, even though those same respondents ranked board support higher in importance on the survey than any other question. Based on responses given during the personal interviews, it is the researcher's opinion that it almost seemed to be taken for granted by respondents from the successful districts that the board would unanimously support a bond proposal.

Additional evidence for the importance of board support for bond elections was found in the chi-square analysis. This analysis showed that the disparity in board unanimity between successful and unsuccessful districts was found to be statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level in that ten (10) respondents from the successful districts reported that their district obtained a

unanimous vote of board support on the resolution calling for a bond election, as opposed to only three (3) of the respondents from the unsuccessful districts.

6. Train speakers to make presentations to community groups

All districts participating in the present study utilized a speakers' bureau in some form to communicate the need for a bond referendum and to identify and mobilize supporters. There was widespread support from respondents for the view that presentations should be made to as many groups as possible, regardless of their size. Failure to reach any segment of the population was deemed to be detrimental to the chances of a successful bond election. Some districts utilized respected community leaders almost exclusively to make the presentations because it was felt that they would have instant credibility with the electorate. Respondents from these districts feared that district administrators and board members would be viewed as having a vested interest and would be perceived as self-serving. In other districts, an opposing view was espoused, as it was believed that the district administration and board members were the obvious choice to make the presentations because they would have the most accurate information and thus would be viewed as the most credible by the voters.

It is interesting to note that while respondents from both successful and unsuccessful districts ranked the importance of establishing a speakers' bureau and training volunteers to make presentation to local community organizations exactly the same (3.67 of 5.00), only 33% of the respondents from successful districts reported utilizing the strategy as opposed to 58% of the respondents from the unsuccessful districts. This could simply be an indication that not as many public presentations were made in the successful districts, or it could mean that successful districts were more likely to have district officials or board members make the presentations.

The analysis of the personal interview and/or survey data yielded other interesting findings worthy of note:

1. Unsuccessful districts in this study did not lose their elections due to lack of effort.

During the personal interviews, respondents from unsuccessful districts, although expressing frustration and disappointment at the failure of the bond election, were equally passionate about the schools in their community as were respondents from successful districts. It was obvious to the researcher that all districts had invested a great deal of time, effort, and emotion into the bond election process in their respective districts. Unsuccessful districts were uniformly steadfast in their determination to continue to pursue passage of a bond election that would provide the educational facilities that they believed the children in their districts needed and deserved. In fact, in some ways it appeared that study participants from the unsuccessful districts may have worked harder than their counterparts in the successful districts. This view is supported by the survey data on campaign strategy utilization that showed that unsuccessful districts utilized 25 of the 32 strategies more often than successful districts did. Additionally, on average, the unsuccessful districts reported using 21.75 campaign strategies as opposed to 17.42 for the successful districts, for a difference of 4.33 strategies per district.

2. Respondents from successful districts appear to be more in tune with patrons.

Respondents from all of the districts participating in the study recognized the importance of assessing the wishes of their voters, but the successful districts appeared to do a better job of developing a common vision of the educational needs of the community. Respondents from the successful districts believed that the majority of their patrons would support any reasonable bond election, even if it meant increasing taxes, if they saw the need and felt it was necessary to appropriately educate the children of the community. Respondents from the unsuccessful

districts talked about the importance of getting the bond proposal 'right' the first time and opined that bond elections in their districts had failed because of a lack of a common vision.

Based on participant responses, patrons of unsuccessful districts appeared to have a greater mistrust of district administration and board members than patrons of successful districts. Respondents from unsuccessful districts stressed the importance of an ongoing public relations campaign prior to the resolution calling for a bond election so that it would not be perceived that the district only communicated with the public when they wanted money. Additional evidence of mistrust in unsuccessful districts is that they also stressed the importance of not making promises that could not or would not be kept, because the voters would remember those broken promises 'for generations'. Whether those allegations of broken promises were real or perceived was not within the scope of the present study. It was also common to hear from respondents in unsuccessful districts that there were lingering ill feelings among older residents of the district concerning consolidations that happened during the 1960s.

3. Every district is unique.

While that statement would seem obvious, the researcher was surprised at how differently communities reacted to the same campaign strategies. The most poignant example of this dealt with the importance of having a unified school board in respect to support of the resolution for a bond election. While this factor received the highest importance rating of all 32 items on the survey, the perception of respondents from one of the unsuccessful districts was that, in their district, having a unified school board was interpreted negatively by at least a segment of the patrons. These patrons reportedly believed this unanimity signaled that the board was a 'rubber stamp' for the district administration's wishes. Respondents from this same district also reported a certain level of mistrust of the district by the patrons.

Another issue that varied significantly from one district to the next was the issue of who should take the lead in running the bond election campaign. On one extreme was a successful district in which the vast majority of public speaking engagements were undertaken by the district administration, which voters in that district seemed to view as a positive strategy. In another district, it was deemed critical that the school board members be the 'face of the bond' and should be the ones to do all public speaking. On the other extreme was an unsuccessful district where the superintendent played a very small part in the district-sponsored community meetings and played virtually no part in any other community meetings concerning the bond election. The perception in that particular district was that all of the community meetings should be patron-driven. Most of the districts had a more centrist position in which the superintendent was the main presenter at district-sponsored meetings, but served mainly as a resource person in other community meetings and was active behind the scenes in organizing the composition of the citizens' committee and directing campaign activities.

A third issue illustrating the sharp contrast between districts in this study is the history of bond referenda success or failure in individual districts. One of the districts in this study had a history of passing almost every school bond referendum brought before the voters. Respondents from this district believed their patrons had a strong sense of community and felt it was their civic duty to support education. On the other end of the spectrum was an unsuccessful district that had a history of rarely passing a bond issue. This was a district wherein the respondents reported a significant amount of lingering bad feelings over past consolidation efforts. Giving hope to district leaders in typically non-supportive districts, one district in the study had an extended number of years where almost every bond election failed. However, in recent years,

their track record has been very successful. The remaining three districts had a history indicative of a fairly equal number of bond referenda successes and failures.

Recommendations

The present study sought (a) to examine successful and unsuccessful school bond referenda in Kansas by analyzing opinions of selected knowledgeable stakeholders in communities that conducted bond elections between 2004-2007; (b) to evaluate which variables appeared to have contributed to the successful passage of school bond elections in three selected Kansas school districts; (c) to evaluate which variables appeared to have contributed to the failure of school bond elections in three selected Kansas school districts and; (d) to examine what relationship, if any, may have existed among the variables identified as important in these selected Kansas school districts.

The present study was undertaken to address the growing need in Kansas, and nationally, for improvements to public school infrastructure. There is strong support from the research literature that deterioration of school infrastructure, caused by deferred maintenance and the inability of local school districts to pass bond referenda, has had a negative impact on the quality and safety of school facilities, as well as the self-concept, behavior, and academic achievement of students.

The results of this study are meant to assist local school district officials and school board members in understanding the range of variables that appear to be common factors in successful/unsuccessful school bond elections, particularly in Kansas. The following findings from this study are deemed to be critically important for persons interested in conducting a successful bond referendum campaign in their school district:

1. Having unanimous school board support for the motion calling for a bond referendum is of critical importance. This factor was deemed to be the most important of any factor addressed in the current study. Although passing a school bond referendum without unanimous board support is possible, the chances are greatly diminished when board support is less than unanimous. District officials should seriously consider modifying the bond proposal, if necessary, in order to achieve a unanimous vote of support before taking the proposal to the electorate, or at least be proactive in developing communication and campaign strategies to address the damage likely to be caused by having a board that is less than unanimous.

2. School district officials must develop an on-going public relations strategy with patrons that will result in a shared vision of the educational needs of the community. Respondents from both successful and unsuccessful districts stressed repeatedly the necessity for school officials to have an accurate knowledge of the voters in their community. Failure to do so was linked with lack of success at the polls, which resulted in an exacerbation of the deterioration of infrastructure of the district facilities. Good relationships with the community take years to develop, but can be destroyed very quickly. The time and energy spent actively listening to community members pays significant dividends.

3. The elements of a school bond referendum proposal must be communicated to all community subgroups in a simple, clear, and honest manner. If information is presented that is difficult to understand or gives the perception of deception by the district, it will have a negative effect at the polls. Strategies that are successful with one subgroup may have a detrimental effect on another. Therefore, it is important to understand the preferences of different subgroups and tailor campaign materials to meet individual needs. It is important to be aware of the 'hot

button' issues in each community and have a plan for diffusing those issues or they will quickly divide the community.

4. Every community is made up of a number of smaller constituencies, often with varying needs and priorities relating to a bond proposal. A school bond referendum is more likely to be successful if a wide cross-section of the community is involved in the planning of the referendum and in carrying out the campaign activities. If the citizens' committee in charge of planning and implementing the campaign is reflective of the composition of the community as a whole, it is more likely that communication strategies and campaign activities will be developed that will effectively reach each group.

Recommendations for Further Study

As the problem of crumbling school infrastructure continues to grow, there is an obvious need for additional research to identify strategies that will consistently result in bond referendum success. Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations for future study are made:

1. Analyze the dynamics of school board decision-making in an attempt to equip superintendents with strategies to effectively achieve unanimous board support on a resolution calling for a bond election.

2. Research the qualities of superintendents and school boards who are able to effectively construct a shared vision for education with the community.

3. Study the opinions of community members to determine what attributes result in feelings of mistrust of school administration and school boards.

4. Explore the factors that facilitate the effective communication of bond information to patrons.

5. Determine what qualities are present in citizens' campaign committees that function effectively.

Especially with the grim economic outlook currently prevalent in Kansas and the nation, it is unlikely that any significant new source of government funding for improving school infrastructure will be forthcoming in the foreseeable future. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that school officials, local boards of education, and citizens working on school bond election committees be apprised of bond campaign strategies that have been effective in other communities. It is also imperative that school officials and local boards be equipped to engineer effective public relations and communication strategies so that the likelihood of bond referenda success is enhanced.

Bibliography

Agger, R. E. (1961). The politics of local education: A comparative study of community decision making. *Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 4*(11), 1-34.

American society of civil engineers: 2001 report card for America's infrastructure. (2002). Retrieved June 2nd, 2008, from http://www.asce.org/reportcard

Balsdon, E., Brunner, E., & and Rueben, K. (2003). Private demands for public capital: Evidence from school bond referenda. *Journal of Urban Economics, 54*(3), 610-638.

Barney, M. L. (1984). Successful bond issue organization. *School Business Affairs, 50*(7), 52-53.

Bauscher, R. H. (1994). School bond election steps for winning at the polls. *Educational Facility Planner, 32*(1), 16-17.

Berner, M. (1993). Building conditions, parental involvement, and student achievement in the District of Columbia public school system. *Urban Education, 28*(1), 6-29.

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). United States of America: Pearson Education Inc.

Bowers, J. & Burkett, C. (1989). Effects of physical and school environment on students and faculty. *Educational Facility Planner, 27*(1), 28-29.

Mosely-Braun, C. (1997). Education, infrastructure, and America's future. *School Planning and Management, 36* (1), *10-11.*

Carver, F. D. (1968). Education level and family income of citizens and expectations for the role of the school board. *The Journal of Educational Research, 61*(10), 442-446.

Cash, C., Earthman, G., & Hines, E. (1997). Environment tied to successful learning. *School Planning and Management, 36*(1), 12-14.

Chew, J. (1992). The demographic erosion of support for public education: A suburban case study. *The Sociology of Education, 65*(4), 280-292.

Chopra, R. (1988). How we passed a school bond issue hard on the heels of a tax hike. *The American School Board Journal*, June, 26-29.

Conyers, J. G., & Francl, T. (1989). We turned to Madison Avenue for tips on selling our $64 million bond issue. *The American School Board Journal, 176*(10), 27-28.

Corrick, C. C. (1995). *Voter perceptions, information, and demographic characteristics as critical factors in successful and unsuccessful bond referenda in selected Kansas school districts: 1988-1990.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University.

Crampton, F. E., Thompson, D. C., & Hagey, J. M. (2001). Creating and sustaining school capacity in the twenty-first century: Funding a physical environment conducive to student learning. *Journal of Education Finance, 27*(Fall 2001), 633-652.

Crampton. F. E., & Thompson, D. C. (Eds.). (2003). *Saving America's school infrastructure.* Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Crampton, F. E., & Thompson, D. C. (2008). Building minds, minding buildings: School infrastructure funding need. Retrieved October 21, 2009, from http://www.aft.org/topics/building-conditions/downloads/BMMB_Funding.pdf

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Denny, R. R., & Harris, J. H. (1964). 'Active citizens' committee wins school-bond election.'. *American School Board Journal, 149*(3), 21-22.

Dorweiler, PG. J., & Bittle, E. H. (1992). Anatomy of a school bond issue. *School Business Affairs, 58*(2), 19-23.

Earthman, Glen I., Cash, Carol S., & Van Berkum, Denny (1995). A statewide study of student achievement and behavior and school building condition. *Annual Meeting of the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International*, Dallas, Texas.

Faltys, D. J. (2006). *Factors influencing the successful passage of a school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navosota independent school district in Texas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University.

Fink, Arlene (1995). *How to sample in surveys.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Frazier, L. M. (1994). Deteriorating school facilities and student learning. *The Iowa School Board Dialogue, 44*(5), 8-9.

Friedland, H. A. (2002). *The ecology of school bond elections: Factors associated with election results in New Jersey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Gallagher, D. B., Bagin, D., & and Kindred, Leslie W. (1997). *The school and community relations.* (6th Edition). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

General Accounting Office: School facilities, condition of America's schools. (February 1995). Retrieved March 3rd, 2008, from http://www.gao.gov.

Graham, G. T., Wise, G. L., & Bachman, D. L. (1990). In Burleson D. L. (Ed.), *Successful strategies for marketing school levies*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Hahn, H., & Almy, T. (1971). Ethnic politics and racial issues: Voting in Los Angeles. *The Western Political Quarterly, 24*(4), 719-730.

Hatley, R. V., & Burlingame, M. (1972). Voting behavior in four Albuquerque school financial referenda. *Education and Urban Society, 4*(3), 293-311.

Hatley, R. V., & Croskey, F. L. (1977). Socioeconomic variables as predictors of school financial referenda voting behavior. *Journal of Education Finance, 24*(Spring), 481-498.

Henry, J. M. (1987). Help for passing bond referenda. *School Business Affairs, 53*(12), 25-27.

Henry, J. M. (1994). Successful bond campaigns require total community involvement. *The Iowa School Board Dialogue., 44*(5), 10-11.

Holt, C. (1993). *Factors affecting the outcomes of school bond elections in South Dakota.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.

Holt, C. R. (1994). Critical factors that affect the passage of school bond elections. *School Business Affairs, 60*(8), 33-37.

Honeyman, D. S., Wood, R. C., Thompson, D. C., & Stewart G. Kent. (1988). The fiscal support of school facilities in rural and small schools. *Journal of Education Finance, 13*, 227-239.

Houston, PG. D. (1985). School bond issues get a boost when taxpayers help set priorities. *The American School Board Journal, 172*(4), 34-35.

Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(4), 602-611.

Kelly, M., & Zieper, M. (2001). Strategies for passing a school bond referendum. *Government Finance Review, 17*(3), 27-29.

Koetter, B., & and Cannon, T. (1995). *Going to the polls: A guide to successful school bond elections.* Austin, Texas: Texas Association of School Boards.

Kreiner, R. P., O'Callaghan, William G. Jr., & Moore, D. P. (1995). The miracle on Bagley road. *The School Administrator., 52*(11), 281-30.

Lemasters, L. (1997). *A synthesis of studies pertaining to facilities, student achievement, and student behavior.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Lifto, D. E. (1995). *Factors affecting the outcome of successful and unsuccessful bond referenda in four school districts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Litwin, Mark S. (1995). *How to measure survey reliability and validity*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lode, M. D. (1999). *Factors affecting the outcomes of school bond elections in Iowa.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota).

Lows, R. L. (1987). School tax referenda: A case study of the relationship between referenda outcomes and demographic variables. *Journal of Education Finance, 12*(1), 30-44.

Lutz, F. W. (1980). For referendum success: Convince your friends and confound your foes before they vote. *The American School Board Journal, 167*(2), 21-24.

Lyons, J. B. (2001). Do school facilities really impact a child's education? *Council of Educational Facility Planners, International,* Scottsdale, Arizona. 1-7.

Mathison, T. R. (1998). Successful bond elections. *School Business Affairs, 64*(1), 30-33.

McDonald, B. I. Jr. (1995). How to win bond issues and influence voters. *The School Executive, 74*(April), 60-63.

Minar, D. W. (1966). The community basis of conflict in school system politics. *American Sociological Review, 31*(6), 822-835.

Nehls, Robert Louis, Jr. (1991). *Election planning and campaign strategies affecting success or failure of public school bond measures in California.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco.

Nelson, T. E., Oxley, Z. M., & and Clawson, Rosalee A. (1997). Toward a psychology of framing effects. *Political Behavior, 19*(3), 221-246.

Opfer, V. D., & Wong, K. K. (2002). The politics of elections and education. *Educational Policy, 16*(12), 5-14.

Philliber, W. W. (1977). Why not? an analysis of support for school taxation. *Urban Education, 12*(2), 189-203.

Ragsdale, L., & Rusk, J. (1995). Candidates, issues, and participation in senate elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly, 20*(3), 305-327.

Salkind, N. (2004). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Saving America's school infrastructure.(2003). In Crampton F. E., Thompson D. C. (Eds.), Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Senden, B. (1993). Success at the ballot box. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 23*, 37-39.

Sieber, S. D. (1973). The integration of fieldwork and survey methods. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1335-1359.

Simpson, J. (1993). The 81-cent solution. *The American School Board Journal, 180*, 28-30.

Stainback, Susan B., & Stainback, William C. (1988). *Understanding and conducting qualitative research.* Dubuque, Iowa*:* Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Stockton, D. J. (1996). *Influences contributing to the successful passage of a school bond referendum in the Conroe independent school district.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University.

Surratt, J. (1987). Passing a bond issue. *Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators,* New Orleans, Louisiana. 1-8.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tedin, Kent L., Matland, Richard E., & Weiher, Gregory R. (2001). Age, race, self-interest, and financing public schools through referenda. *The Journal of Politics, 63, (1), 270-294.*

Theobald, N., & Meier, K. (2002). The politics of school finance: Passing school bonds. *National Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association,* Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

Thompson, R., & Hartley, C. (1991). Winning taxpayers' support. *The American School Board Journal, 178,* A5-A7.

Walker, P. A. (1996). Passing a bond referendum starts here. *School Business Affairs, 62,* (9), 32-35.

Weathersby, C. L. (2002). *Investigation of strategies used in passing bond issues in Mississippi school districts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University.

Weir, Robert W. Jr. (1981). Four key suggestions for winning bond elections. *American School Board Journal, 168*(2), 37-38.

Yin, Robert K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods. (3rd ed.),* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications, Inc.

Appendix A

Letters to Participants

Letter to Superintendents

December 2008
Superintendent of Schools
Any School
Any Town, KS 66666

Dear Superintendent:

My name is Brian Kraus and I am a doctoral student in the College of Education at Kansas State University. I am currently working on my dissertation which is entitled, "A Descriptive Analysis of Selected Community Stakeholder Opinions Regarding Potentially Critical Factors in School Bond Referenda Success or Failure in Kansas During the Years 2004-2007." Since your district has undertaken a bond referenda campaign during that time period, I am writing to inquire if you would be willing to share your insight of the process and identify factors you believe were critical in determining the outcome of the bond referendum in your district.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a 32-item survey and participate in a personal interview with me. I have enclosed a copy of the survey and the personal interview questions for you to examine. Since you are most familiar with your community, in addition to interviewing you, I would like to procure your assistance in identifying and securing agreement to participate from three other community members who could provide valuable insight into your bond referendum process. Specifically, I would like to gather a survey from, and interview, a member of your citizens' committee, a local banker, and a local newspaper editor. Each interview will last thirty minutes or less. With the permission of the interviewee, I will tape record the interview for the purpose of insuring accuracy of reporting. All responses will be kept confidential and no district or individual will be identified in any way. Each participant will receive an Informed Consent document which will explain the study and detail the procedures to be followed and the conditions of their participation.

Thank you for your time in reading this letter and considering my request. I am hopeful that you will choose to participate, as I truly believe the information gained will be beneficial to others who are considering or planning for a bond issue. If you have questions or would like more information, I can be contacted at 785-594-2466 (Home), 785-229-8010 (Work), or by e-mail at krausb@usd290.org. I will contact you soon to inquire about your willingness to participate in the study.

Sincerely,

Brian Kraus
Doctoral Student

Letter to Community Participants

December 2008

Local Patron
Any School
Any Town, KS 66666

Dear Local Patron:

Your school superintendent, Dr. Superintendent, gave me your name as a person who was willing to participate in my dissertation research. Thank you for your willingness to participate. My dissertation is entitled, "A Descriptive Analysis of Selected Community Stakeholder Opinions Regarding Potentially Critical Factors in School Bond Referenda Success or Failure in Kansas during the Years 2004-2007". Since your district has undertaken a bond referenda campaign during that time period, I am hoping to capture your insight of the process and identify factors you believe were critical in determining the outcome of the bond referendum in your district.

Since you are very familiar with your community, I would ask that you complete a 32-item survey and allow me to interview you in person to gather a more in-depth perspective on what factors you believe were critical in the recent bond referendum in your community. I anticipate that each interview will last approximately twenty minutes. With your permission, I will tape record the interview for the purpose of insuring accuracy of reporting. All responses will be kept confidential and no district or individual will be identified in any way. Along with the survey I have included a copy of the interview questions and an Informed Consent document which will explain the study and detail the procedures to be followed and the conditions of your participation.

Thank you again for being willing to participate in my research project. I truly believe the information gained will be beneficial to others who are considering or planning for a bond issue. If you have questions or would like more information, I can be contacted at 785-594-2466 (Home), 785-229-8010 (Work), or by e-mail at krausb@usd290.org.

Sincerely,

Brian Kraus
Doctoral Student

Appendix B

IRB Research Approval

Informed Consent Form

PROJECT TITLE: A Descriptive Analysis of Selected Community Stakeholder Opinions Regarding Potentially Critical Factors in School Bond Referenda Success or Failure in Kansas during the Years 2004-2007.

APPROVAL DATE OF PROJECT: 9-22-08 **EXPIRATION DATE OF PROJECT:**

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr. David Thompson

CO-INVESTIGATOR(S): Brian Kraus

CONTACT NAME AND PHONE FOR ANY PROBLEMS/QUESTIONS: Dr. David Thompson (785) 532-5766

IRB CHAIR CONTACT/PHONE INFORMATION*:*
 Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 1 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224.
 Jerry Jaax, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and University Veterinarian, 1 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224.

SPONSOR OF PROJECT: None

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH: The purpose of this study is to identify campaign strategies that have been found to be of critical importance in bond referenda success and failure in Kansas communities of various sizes.

PROCEDURES OR METHODS TO BE USED: A list was compiled of all Kansas school districts that held bond elections between 2004 and 2007. The schools were then stratified by election result and by total district student enrollment into six groups. Then, one school district was randomly selected from each of the six stratified groups. The superintendent from each selected school district will be contacted to secure agreement for participation in the study. In addition to being a participant in the study, the superintendent will further be asked to help secure the participation of three community members. Each participant will be asked to complete a 32-item survey and participate in a personal interview. For each item on the survey, respondents will be asked identify whether or not their district practiced that particular strategy and then will be asked to give their professional and/or personal perception of how important the strategy was, or would have been, in influencing the results of the bond election. The personal interview will consist of eight unstructured questions about the bond campaign process that will allow the respondent to give more in-depth information than is possible on the survey alone.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES OR TREATMENTS, IF ANY, THAT MIGHT BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO SUBJECT: None

LENGTH OF STUDY: The estimated time to complete the survey is 10 minutes. The estimated time to complete the personal interview is 30 minutes. Each respondent should spend approximately 40 minutes total.

RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS ANTICIPATED: None

BENEFITS ANTICIPATED: Taking into account the current condition of school infrastructure in Kansas, results of this study are believed to be beneficial and timely. This information should prove valuable to school leaders and community members who are trying to construct a bond campaign that is tailored to their individual community, and therefore more likely to pass. A successful bond campaign which will result in improved facilities that provide an enhanced academic environment and increased

student performance. Additionally, results may be useful to other interested parties such as the Kansas State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Kansas Association of School Boards.

EXTENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY: The six participating school districts will not be identified in any way, nor will the four individual respondents from each district. Data collected from the survey only deal with the absence or presence of various bond referenda campaign strategies and, as such, do not yield individually identifiable information. Although two of the questions in the personal interview will ask for an assessment of individual community situations, the responses will not be identifiable because the individual districts will not be identified and there are numerous districts in each category from each year covered by the study. Surveys and individual interviews will not reveal respondent names and tape recordings of personal interviews will be destroyed after accurate transcripts are produced. Only the researcher will have access to the returned survey documents and the personal interview responses.

IS COMPENSATION OR MEDICAL TREATMENT AVAILABLE IF INJURY OCCURS: No

PARENTAL APPROVAL FOR MINORS: There are no minors involved in this study.

TERMS OF PARTICIPATION: I understand this project is research, and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled. I further understand that my responses to the personal interview questions will be tape recorded for the purpose of accurate reproduction of answers and that the tapes will be destroyed upon production of an accurate transcript.

I verify that my signature below indicates that I have read and understand this consent form, and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described, and that my signature acknowledges that I have received a signed and dated copy of this consent form.

Participant Name: _____

Participant Signature: _____

Date : _____

Appendix C

Survey

Practiced by District			Directions	Importance of Strategy				
Yes	No	Unknown	Below is a list of 32 strategies sometimes used in bond election campaigns. For each item, indicate on the left whether or not that campaign strategy was practiced by your school district in the last bond election campaign. In the right-hand column, indicate from your observation how important each of the strategies was, **or would have been**, in the bond election.	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Average Importance	Very Important	Critical
			Completed a formal or informal community voter survey to assess the citizens' feelings toward the proposal prior to the election.					
			Hired a professional campaign consultant to help conduct the bond election.					
			Assessed community opinion about controversial local school issues before calling for a bond issue.					
			Surveyed the community to assess what increase in the tax rate would be acceptable.					
			Provided detailed information and in-service to citizens working on the bond election campaign.					
			Developed detailed campaign literature filled with facts about the bond and what it would provide and distributed it to the community.					
			Focused communication efforts on establishing a legitimate need.					
			Demonstrated responsiveness to the opposition, diffused their platform, gained their support by modifying the referendum, incorporated their ideas.					
			Attempted to neutralize "No" voters by pointing out negative effects of defeat, thereby causing internal conflict.					
			Had an ongoing, positive public relations program in place before deciding to hold a bond election.					
			Made use of unpaid media coverage to disseminate information about the bond issue (letters to the editor, interviews, etc.).					

Practiced by District			Directions	Importance of Strategy				
Yes	No	Unknown	For each item below, indicate on the left whether or not that campaign strategy was practiced by your school district in the last bond election campaign. In the right-hand column, indicate from your observation how important each of the strategies was, **or would have been**, in the bond election.	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Average Importance	Very Important	Critical
			Made use of paid promotional information to disseminate information about the bond issue (television, radio, newspaper ads etc.).					
			Provided information on tax increase for the average home.					
			Had a long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.					
			Provided numerous opportunities for patrons to receive and discuss information about the bond election.					
			Identified and contacted internal and external special interest groups to gain their support and endorsements.					
			Registered voters whose children attended district schools.					
			Identified potential yes/no/undecided voters by telephoning individuals listed in voter registration records.					
			Conducted a direct mail campaign targeted to "Yes" and "Undecided" voters.					
			Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.					
			Made personal contact and provided information to identified "undecided" voters.					
			Conducted active "Get Out the Vote" activities for identified "Yes" voters at the end of the campaign and on Election Day. (poll watcher, providing transportation, etc.)					
			Provided early voting opportunities.					

Practiced by District			Directions	Importance of Strategy				
Yes	No	Unknown	For each item below, indicate on the left whether or not that campaign strategy was practiced by your school district in the last bond election campaign. In the right-hand column, indicate from your observation how important each of the strategies was, **or would have been**, in the bond election.	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Average Importance	Very Important	Critical
			Established a citizens' committee to involve the public in organizing and implementing election activities.					
			Secured support from local newspapers via positive editorials and news coverage of the bond election proposal.					
			Recruited the senior citizen vote and involved them in the bond election campaign.					
			Conducted special community events to call attention to the bond election.					
			Utilized existing school-based organizations such as PTA or parents' club in assessing, planning, and promoting the bond issue.					
			Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.					
			Included citizens on the facility planning committee to provide input into the building project.					
			Obtained a unanimous vote of support from the school board on the resolution calling for a bond election.					
			Established a speakers' bureau and trained volunteers to make presentations to local community organizations.					

Appendix D

Interview Protocol

Superintendent Interview Questions

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?
2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?
3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?
4. Please explain your role in the formation of the citizens' committee.
5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?
6. What was your role in the public meetings that were held to bolster support for the bond?
7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.
8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Citizens' Committee Member Interview Questions

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

4. Please explain how your citizens' committee was formed and describe their major activities.

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

6. Was a speakers' bureau assembled and trained to make presentations to community groups?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Newspaper Editor Interview Questions

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

4. What role did the media play during the bond referendum campaign in terms of structured campaign activities? Unstructured activities?

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

6. Was the media invited to cover community events sponsored by the citizens' committee?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Banker Interview Questions

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

4. What campaign activities, if any, were designed to engage the business community in the process?

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

6. What was the general climate of the business community toward the bond election?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Appendix E

Interview Protocol with Prompts

Superintendent Interview Questions with Possible Follow-Up Prompts

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

   Which of those strategies, if any, do you believe to have been most critical in determining the result of the election?

   Were there significant results from the survey data that influenced the content or timing of the election?

   Did the survey results influence how the bond election campaign was designed? If so, how?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

   Which communication strategy do you think was the most effective? Why?

   In retrospect, what could have been done differently to more effectively communicate the need to the community?

   Did providing information to "No" voters have any tangible effect? Information to "Undecided" voters?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

   Which strategy do you believe was the most effective? Least effective? Why?

   What strategies were employed just prior to the election or on Election Day? How effective were they?

   In retrospect, what would you have done differently, if anything, to identify and mobilize the "Yes" vote?

4. Please explain your role in the formation of the citizens' committee.

   Approximately how many people were involved?

   Was the group representative of the community at large?

What activity or activities conducted by the citizens' committee do you feel were most influential in determining the outcome of the election? Why?

Having been through the election process, what would you do differently next time?

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

Was the board perceived as unified by the community?

How important was that perception in determining the result of the election?

6. What was your role in the public meetings that were held to bolster support for the bond?

Was a speakers' bureau formed?

How effective were the speakers in disseminating information?
How much influence did the speakers' bureau have on the outcome of the election?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Citizens' Committee Member Interview Questions with Possible Follow-Up Prompts

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

   Which of those strategies, if any, do you believe to have been most critical in determining the result of the election?

   Were there significant results from the survey data that influenced the content or timing of the election?

   Did the survey results influence how the bond election campaign was designed? If so, how?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

   Which communication strategy do you think was the most effective? Why?

   In retrospect, what could have been done differently to more effectively communicate the need to the community?

   Did providing information to "No" voters have any tangible effect? Information to "Undecided" voters?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

   Which strategy do you believe was the most effective? Least effective? Why?

   What strategies were employed just prior to the election or on Election Day? How effective were they?

   In retrospect, what would you have done differently, if anything, to identify and mobilize the "Yes" vote?

4. Please explain how your citizens' committee was formed and describe their major activities.

   Approximately how many people were involved?

   Was the group representative of the community at large?

What activity or activities conducted by the citizens' committee do you feel were most influential in determining the outcome of the election? Why?

Having been through the election process, what would you do differently next time?

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

Was the board perceived as unified by the community?

How important was that perception in determining the result of the election?

6. Was a speakers' bureau assembled and trained to make presentations to community groups?

How effective were the speakers in disseminating information?

How much influence did the speakers' bureau have on the outcome of the election?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Newspaper Editor Interview Questions with Possible Follow-Up Prompts

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

   Which of those strategies, if any, do you believe to have been most critical in determining the result of the election?

   Were there significant results from the survey data that influenced the content or timing of the election?

   Did the survey results influence how the bond election campaign was designed? If so, how?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

   Which communication strategy do you think was the most effective? Why?

   In retrospect, what could have been done differently to more effectively communicate the need to the community?

   Did providing information to "No" voters have any tangible effect? Information to "Undecided" voters?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

   Which strategy do you believe was the most effective? Least effective? Why?

   What strategies were employed just prior to the election or on Election Day? How effective were they?

   In retrospect, what would you have done differently, if anything, to identify and mobilize the "Yes" vote?

4. What role did the media play during the bond referendum campaign in terms of structured campaign activities? Unstructured activities?

   Did the newspaper take an official position?

   What was the reaction of the community at large?

What activity or activities conducted by the citizens' committee do you feel were most influential in determining the outcome of the election? Why?

Having been through the election process, what would you do differently next time?

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

Was the board perceived as unified by the community?

How important was that perception in determining the result of the election?

6. Was the media invited to cover community events sponsored by the citizens' committee?

What effect did the media coverage have on the outcome of the election?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Banker Interview Questions with Possible Follow-Up Prompts

1. What strategies did the district use to assess the voters' perceptions about the bond issue?

   Which of those strategies, if any, do you believe to have been most critical in determining the result of the election?

   Were there significant results from the survey data that influenced the content or timing of the election?

   Did the survey results influence how the bond election campaign was designed? If so, how?

2. How did the district go about communicating the need for the referendum to the public?

   Which communication strategy do you think was the most effective? Why?

   In retrospect, what could have been done differently to more effectively communicate the need to the community?

   Did providing information to "No" voters have any tangible effect? Information to "Undecided" voters?

3. What strategies were implemented to identify and mobilize "Yes" voters in the community?

   Which strategy do you believe was the most effective? Least effective? Why?

   What strategies were employed just prior to the election or on Election Day? How effective were they?

   In retrospect, what would you have done differently, if anything, to identify and mobilize the "Yes" vote?

4. Please explain how your citizens' committee was formed and describe their major activities.

   Approximately how many people were involved?

   Was the group representative of the community at large?

What activity or activities conducted by the citizens' committee do you feel were most influential in determining the outcome of the election? Why?

Having been through the election process, what would you do differently next time?

5. Was the school board unified in its support for the bond election?

Was the board perceived as unified by the community?

How important was that perception in determining the result of the election?

6. Was a speakers' bureau assembled and trained to make presentations to community groups?

How effective were the speakers in disseminating information?

How much influence did the speakers' bureau have on the outcome of the election?

7. Beginning with the most critical, please identify the factors you perceive as having a critical impact on the bond election results.

8. Looking back over the entire bond election process, what advice would you give another district that was preparing for a bond issue campaign?

Appendix F

Legend of Survey Questions

Legend of Survey Questions

1. Completed a formal or informal community voter survey to assess the citizens' feelings toward the proposal prior to the election.
2. Hired a professional campaign consultant to help conduct the bond election.
3. Assessed community opinion about controversial local school issues before calling for a bond issue.
4. Surveyed the community to assess what increase in the tax rate would be acceptable.
5. Provided detailed information and inservice to citizens working on the bond election campaign.
6. Developed detailed campaign literature filled with facts about the bond and what it would provide and distributed it to the community.
7. Focused communication efforts on establishing a legitimate need.
8. Demonstrated responsiveness to the opposition, diffused their platform, gained their support by modifying the referendum, incorporated their ideas.
9. Attempted to neutralize "No" voters by pointing out negative effects of defeat, thereby causing internal conflict.
10. Had an ongoing, positive public relations program in place before deciding to hold a bond election.
11. Made use of unpaid media coverage to disseminate information about the bond issue (letters to the editor, interviews, etc.).
12. Made use of paid promotional information to disseminate information about the bond issue (television, radio, newspaper ads etc.).
13. Provided information on tax increase for the average home.
14. Had a long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.
15. Provided numerous opportunities for patrons to receive and discuss information about the bond election.
16. Identified and contacted internal and external special interest groups to gain their support and endorsements.
17. Registered voters whose children attended district schools.
18. Identified potential yes/no/undecided voters by telephoning individuals listed in voter registration records.
19. Conducted a direct mail campaign targeted to "Yes" and "Undecided" voters.
20. Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.
21. Made personal contact and provided information to identified "Undecided" voters.
22. Conducted active "Get Out the Vote" activities for identified "Yes" voters at the end of the campaign and on Election Day. (poll watcher, providing transportation, etc.)
23. Provided early voting opportunities.
24. Established a citizens' committee to involve the public in organizing and implementing election activities.
25. Secured support from local newspapers via positive editorials and news coverage of the bond election proposal.
26. Recruited the senior citizen vote and involved them in the bond election campaign.
27. Conducted special community events to call attention to the bond election.
28. Utilized existing school-based organizations such as PTA or parents' club in assessing, planning, and promoting the bond issue.
29. Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.
30. Included citizens on the facility planning committee to provide input into the building project.
31. Obtained a unanimous vote of support from the school board on the resolution calling for a bond election.
32. Established a speakers' bureau and trained volunteers to make presentations to local community organizations.

Appendix G

Mean Importance of Campaign Strategies by Individual District

Mean Importance of Campaign Strategy by Individual District

	Dist. A	Dist. B	Dist. C	Dist. D	Dist. E	Dist. F	Total
1. Community survey to assess voter wishes	4.25	3.25	3.25	4.25	3.75	4.50	3.88
2. Hired professional campaign consultant	2.25	2.25	4.00	3.25	2.50	3.75	3.00
3. Assessed opinion on controversial issues	4.25	4.25	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.08
4. Surveyed to assess acceptable tax increase	4.00	2.75	3.25	4.00	3.50	2.75	3.38
5. Detailed inservice for citizens on bond comm.	4.25	3.75	4.25	4.00	3.75	4.75	4.13
6. Distributed detailed campaign literature	4.25	4.75	4.75	3.75	4.00	5.00	4.42
7. Focused communication on establishing need	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.25	4.50	4.46
8. Demonstrated responsiveness to opposition	2.50	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.67
9. Pointed out negative effects of a failed bond	2.00	2.25	3.75	2.00	3.50	3.25	2.79
10. Ongoing, positive PR campaign in place	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.75
11. Used unpaid media to distribute information	3.25	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.25	4.75	3.88
12. Used paid media to distribute information	3.00	2.50	3.75	3.25	2.50	4.50	3.25
13. Information on tax increase on average home	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.21
14. Had long-range plan in place before election	4.00	3.25	3.25	4.25	4.25	4.00	3.83
15. Numerous opportunities to receive information	4.25	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.75	4.29
16. Gained support of special interest groups	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.00
17. Registered parents of school-aged children	4.00	2.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.75	3.88
18. Identified voter preference by telephone polls	4.00	1.75	3.75	3.50	3.00	4.25	3.38
19. Conducted a direct mail campaign	3.50	1.75	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.46
20. Ran vote by mail campaign to increase turnout	2.75	2.50	3.00	2.50	1.75	2.25	2.46
21. Personal contact to "undecided" voters	3.50	2.75	3.75	3.75	2.75	3.75	3.38
22. Conducted Election Day strategies	4.00	1.75	3.50	3.75	3.25	3.50	3.29
23. Provided early voting opportunities	3.50	1.25	3.00	2.75	3.00	3.50	2.83
24. Established citizens' committee to support bond	4.25	3.50	4.50	3.50	4.25	4.75	4.13
25. Secured support from local newspapers	4.00	3.00	4.25	3.75	3.50	4.75	3.88
26. Recruited and involved the senior citizens	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.75	2.75	4.50	3.67
27. Conducted community events to publicize bond	3.50	3.75	4.50	3.00	3.25	4.25	3.71
28. Utilized school organizations to promote bond	3.75	4.25	3.50	3.50	4.25	4.50	3.96
29. Involved community leaders in campaign	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.50	3.92
30. Included citizens on facility planning committee	4.50	4.00	4.25	3.75	4.00	4.75	4.21
31. Obtained unanimous support of school board	4.50	5.00	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.75	4.50
32. Established and trained a speakers' bureau	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.25	3.25	4.50	3.67
Average Ranking by District	3.73	3.30	3.88	3.70	3.55	4.20	3.73

Districts A-C=Successful Districts Average Ranking 3.64
Districts D-F=Unsuccessful Districts Average Ranking 3.82

Appendix H

Mean Importance of Campaign Strategies by Position within the District

Mean Importance of Campaign Strategies by Position within the District

Survey Question	Supt.	Cit. Com.	News	Banker	Total
1. Community survey to assess voter wishes	4.17	3.17	4.00	4.17	3.88
2. Hired professional campaign consultant	3.50	3.50	1.67	3.33	3.00
3. Assessed opinion on controversial issues	3.83	3.83	4.50	4.17	4.08
4. Surveyed to assess acceptable tax increase	3.50	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.38
5. Detailed inservice for citizens on bond comm.	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.17	4.13
6. Distributed detailed campaign literature	4.67	4.33	4.17	4.50	4.42
7. Focused communication on establishing need	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.46
8. Demonstrated responsiveness to opposition	3.17	3.67	4.00	3.83	3.67
9. Pointed out negative effects of a failed bond	3.00	2.50	2.83	2.83	2.79
10. Ongoing, positive PR campaign in place	3.83	3.33	3.67	4.17	3.75
11. Used unpaid media to distribute information	4.00	4.00	3.83	3.67	3.88
12. Used paid media to distribute information	3.50	2.67	3.67	3.17	3.25
13. Information on tax increase on average home	4.50	4.50	3.83	4.00	4.21
14. Had long-range plan in place before election	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83
15. Numerous opportunities to receive information	4.67	4.33	4.33	3.83	4.29
16. Gained support of special interest groups	4.33	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00
17. Registered parents of school-aged children	4.50	3.50	3.83	3.67	3.88
18. Identified voter preference by telephone polls	3.50	3.17	2.83	4.00	3.38
19. Conducted a direct mail campaign	3.33	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.46
20. Ran vote by mail campaign to increase turnout	2.17	2.33	2.67	2.67	2.46
21. Personal contact to "undecided" voters	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.50	3.38
22. Conducted Election Day strategies	3.33	3.50	3.17	3.17	3.29
23. Provided early voting opportunities	3.00	2.83	2.33	3.17	2.83
24. Established citizens' committee to support bond	3.83	4.33	4.17	4.17	4.13
25. Secured support from local newspapers	4.00	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.88
26. Recruited and involved the senior citizens	3.83	3.67	3.67	3.50	3.67
27. Conducted community events to publicize bond	4.00	3.33	3.83	3.67	3.71
28. Utilized school organizations to promote bond	4.17	3.83	3.83	4.00	3.96
29. Involved community leaders in campaign	4.33	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.92
30. Included citizens on facility planning committee	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.17	4.21
31. Obtained unanimous support of school board	5.00	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.50
32. Established and trained a speakers' bureau	3.33	4.33	3.50	3.50	3.67
Average Ranking by Position in District	3.84	3.66	3.63	3.78	3.73

Appendix I

Pearson's Chi-Square Values of Utilization and Importance Ratings for Campaign Strategies

Pearson's Chi-Square Values for Campaign Strategies

Strategy Number and Description	*df	**Asympg. Sig. (2-sided)
A1. Conducted community survey to assess voter wishes.	2	.027
B1. Conducted community survey to assess voter wishes.	3	.297
A2. Hired a professional campaign consultant to conduct bond.	2	.865
B2. Hired a professional campaign consultant to conduct bond.	4	.844
A3. Assessed community opinion on controversial issues.	2	.822
B3. Assessed community opinion on controversial issues.	3	.779
A4. Surveyed community to assess acceptable tax increase.	2	.904
B4. Surveyed community to assess acceptable tax increase.	4	.699
A5. Provided detailed information to citizens working on campaign.	2	.879
B5. Provided detailed information to citizens working on campaign.	2	.879
A6. Developed & distributed detailed campaign literature to patrons.	1	.307
B6. Developed & distributed detailed campaign literature to patrons.	2	.167
A7. Focused communication on establishing legitimate need.	2	.592
B7. Focused communication on establishing legitimate need.	2	.341
A8. Demonstrated responsiveness to the opposition.	2	1.000
B8. Demonstrated responsiveness to the opposition.	4	.388
A9. Attempted to neutralize "No" vote by pointing out effect of defeat.	2	1.000
B9. Attempted to neutralize "No" vote by pointing out effect of defeat.	4	.900
A10. Had public relations campaign in place before deciding on bond.	2	.080
B10. Had public relations campaign in place before deciding on bond.	3	.543
A11. Used unpaid media to distribute information about the bond.	2	.336
B11. Used unpaid media to distribute information about the bond.	3	.339
A12. Provided many opportunities to receive & discuss bond inform.	2	.449
B12. Provided many opportunities to receive & discuss bond inform.	4	.282
A13. Provided information on tax increase for average home.	1	1.000
B13. Provided information on tax increase for average home.	2	.904
A14. Had long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.	2	.607
B14. Had long-range plan in place before calling for the bond election.	3	.147
A15. Made personal contact with identified "Undecided" voters.	1	.537
B15. Made personal contact with identified "Undecided" voters.	2	.460
A16. Identified and contacted special interest groups to gather support.	2	.589
B16. Identified and contacted special interest groups to gather support.	3	.347
A17. Registered voters whose children attended district schools.	2	.254
B17. Registered voters whose children attended district schools.	4	.118
A18. Identified "Yes", "No", and "Undecided" voters by telephone poll	2	.208
B18. Identified "Yes", "No", and "Undecided" voters by telephone poll	4	.689
A19. Conducted mail campaign to target "Yes" & "Undecided" voters.	2	.024
B19. Conducted mail campaign to target "Yes" & "Undecided" voters.	4	.242
A20. Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.	2	.107
B20. Ran a "Vote by Mail" campaign to increase voter turnout.	3	.469

Strategy Number and Description	*df	**Asympg. Sig. (2-sided)
A21. Made personal contact & gave information to undecided voters.	2	.890
B21. Made personal contact & gave information to undecided voters.	4	.675
A22. Conducted Election Day activities to encourage the "Yes" vote.	2	.320
B22. Conducted Election Day activities to encourage the "Yes" vote.	4	.431
A23. Provided early voting opportunities.	2	.288
B23. Provided early voting opportunities.	3	.598
A24. Established a citizens' committee to involve the community.	2	.641
B24. Established a citizens' committee to involve the community.	3	.120
A25. Secured support from local newspapers for the bond election.	2	.165
B25. Secured support from local newspapers for the bond election.	4	.070
A26. Recruited senior citizens & involved them in campaign process.	2	.607
B26. Recruited senior citizens & involved them in campaign process.	3	.080
A27. Conducted special community events to call attention to election.	2	.824
B27. Conducted special community events to call attention to election.	3	.398
A28. Utilized existing school organizations to promote bond.	2	.143
B28. Utilized existing school organizations to promote bond.	2	.319
A29. Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.	2	.879
B29. Involved community leaders in key campaign roles.	3	.530
A30. Included citizens on facility planning commission for input.	2	.121
B30. Included citizens on facility planning commission for input.	2	.904
A31. Obtained unanimous support from school board for bond issue.	2	.005
B31. Obtained unanimous support from school board for bond issue.	2	.584
A32. Established speakers' bureau & trained volunteers to do speeches.	2	.349
B32. Established speakers' bureau & trained volunteers to do speeches.	3	.815

*df=Degrees of Freedom
**Asympg. Sig. (2-sided)=Asymptotic Significance

Appendix J

Cross-tabulations Tables

Cross-tabs Values for Item A1

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	11	5	16
	% within A1	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	91.7%	41.7%	66.7%
Unknown	Count	1	3	4
	% within A1	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	25.0%	16.7%
No	Count	0	4	4
	% within A1	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	33.3%	16.7%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A1	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B1

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B1	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	41.7%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	1	4	5
	% within B1	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	33.3%	20.8%
Very Important	Count	8	5	13
	% within B1	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	66.7%	41.7%	54.2%
Critical Importance	Count	3	2	5
	% within B1	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	16.7%	20.8%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B1	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A2

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	5	6	11
	% within A2	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	50.0%	45.8%
Unknown	Count	3	2	5
	% within A2	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	16.7%	20.8%
No	Count	4	4	8
	% within A2	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A2	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B2

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	1	3	4
	% within B2	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	25.0%	16.7%
Somewhat Important	Count	3	2	5
	% within B2	60.6%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	16.7%	20.8%
Average Importance	Count	3	3	6
	% within B2	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Very Important	Count	3	2	5
	% within B2	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	16.7%	20.8%
Critical Importance	Count	2	2	4
	% within B2	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B2	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A3

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	8	17
	% within A3	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	66.7%	70.8%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A3	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	1	2	3
	% within A3	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A3	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B3

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B3	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	2	2	4
	% within B3	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Very Important	Count	6	5	11
	% within B3	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	41.7%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	4	4	8
	% within B3	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B3	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A4

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	6	5	11
	% within A4	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	41.7%	45.8%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A4	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	4	5	9
	% within A4	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	41.7%	37.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A4	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B4

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B4	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	1	2
	% within B4	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Average Importance	Count	5	4	9
	% within B4	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	33.3%	37.5%
Very Important	Count	6	5	11
	% within B4	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	41.7%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	0	1	1
	% within B4	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B4	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A5

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	8	17
	% within A5	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	66.7%	70.8%
Unknown	Count	2	3	5
	% within A5	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	25.0%	20.8%
No	Count	1	1	2
	% within A5	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A5	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B5

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	1	1	2
	% within B5	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Very Important	Count	8	9	17
	% within B5	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	66.7%	75.0%	70.8%
Critical Importance	Count	3	2	5
	% within B5	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	16.7%	20.8%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B5	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A6

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	12	11	23
	% within A6	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	91.7%	95.8%
Unknown	Count	0	1	1
	% within A6	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A6	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B6

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	3	0	3
	% within B6	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Very Important	Count	3	5	8
	% within B6	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	41.7%	33.3%
Critical Importance	Count	6	7	13
	% within B6	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	58.3%	54.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B6	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A7

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	11	10	21
	% within A7	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	91.7%	83.3%	87.5%
Unknown	Count	0	1	1
	% within A7	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%
No	Count	1	1	2
	% within A7	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A7	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B7

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	1	0	1
	% within B7	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	0.0%	4.2%
Very Important	Count	4	7	11
	% within B7	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	58.3%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	7	5	12
	% within B7	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	41.7%	50.0%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B7	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A8

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	4	4	8
	% within A8	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A8	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	6	6	12
	% within A8	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A8	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B8

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	2	1	3
	% within B8	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B8	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	3	3	6
	% within B8	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Very Important	Count	1	4	5
	% within B8	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	33.3%	20.8%
Critical Importance	Count	6	3	9
	% within B8	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	25.0%	37.5%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B8	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A9

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	4	4	8
	% within A9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	6	6	12
	% within A9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B9

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	3	3	6
	% within B9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	1	2
	% within B9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Average Importance	Count	4	6	10
	% within B9	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	50.0%	41.7%
Very Important	Count	2	1	3
	% within B9	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%
Critical Importance	Count	2	1	3
	% within B9	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B9	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A10

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	8	3	11
	% within A10	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	66.7%	25.0%	45.8%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A10	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	2	7	9
	% within A10	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	58.3%	37.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A10	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B10

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B10	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	3	4	7
	% within B10	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	33.3%	29.2%
Very Important	Count	6	6	12
	% within B10	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Critical Importance	Count	3	1	4
	% within B10	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B10	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A11

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	12	10	22
	% within A11	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	83.3%	91.7%
Unknown	Count	0	1	1
	% within A11	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
No	Count	0	1	1
	% within A11	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A11	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B11

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	1	0	1
	% within B11	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	.0%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	2	5	7
	% within B11	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	41.7%	29.2%
Very Important	Count	5	5	10
	% within B11	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	41.7%	41.7%
Critical Importance	Count	4	2	6
	% within B11	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	16.7%	25.0%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B11	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A12

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	6	15
	% within A12	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	50.0%	62.5%
Unknown	Count	1	2	3
	% within A12	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
No	Count	2	4	6
	% within A12	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A12	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B12

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	1	1	2
	% within B12	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	0	1
	% within B12	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	.0%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	4	9	13
	% within B12	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	75.0%	54.2%
Very Important	Count	4	1	5
	% within B12	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	8.3%	20.8%
Critical Importance	Count	2	1	3
	% within B12	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B12	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A13

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	11	11	22
	% within A13	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	91.7%	91.7%	91.7%
Unknown	Count	1	1	2
	% within A13	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A13	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B13

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	2	2	4
	% within B13	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Very Important	Count	5	6	11
	% within B13	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	50.0%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	5	4	9
	% within B13	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	33.3%	37.5%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B13	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A14

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	7	5	12
	% within A14	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	41.7%	50.0%
Unknown	Count	2	4	6
	% within A14	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%
No	Count	3	3	6
	% within A14	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A14	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B14

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B14	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	1	5	6
	% within B14	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	41.7%	25.0%
Very Important	Count	8	5	13
	% within B14	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	66.7%	41.7%	54.2%
Critical Importance	Count	3	1	4
	% within B14	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B14	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A15

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	11	10	21
	% within A15	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	91.7%	83.3%	87.5%
Unknown	Count	1	2	3
	% within A15	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A15	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B15

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	2	1	3
	% within B15	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%
Very Important	Count	4	7	11
	% within B15	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	58.3%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	6	4	10
	% within B15	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	33.3%	41.7%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B15	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A16

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	8	17
	% within A16	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	66.7%	70.8%
Unknown	Count	3	3	6
	% within A16	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
No	Count	0	1	1
	% within A16	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A16	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B16

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	1	0	1
	% within B16	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	.0%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	2	3	5
	% within B16	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	25.0%	20.8%
Very Important	Count	4	7	11
	% within B16	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	58.3%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	5	2	7
	% within B16	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	16.7%	29.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B16	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A17

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	6	15
	% within A17	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	50.0%	62.5%
Unknown	Count	3	4	7
	% within A17	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	33.3%	29.2%
No	Count	0	2	2
	% within A17	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	16.7%	8.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A17	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B17

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B17	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B17	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	1	4	5
	% within B17	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	33.3%	20.8%
Very Important	Count	5	5	10
	% within B17	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	41.7%	41.7%
Critical Importance	Count	6	1	7
	% within B17	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	8.3%	29.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B17	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A18

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	6	3	9
	% within A18	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	25.0%	37.5%
Unknown	Count	4	3	7
	% within A18	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
No	Count	2	6	8
	% within A18	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A18	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B18

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	2	2
	% within B18	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	16.7%	8.3%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	1	2
	% within B18	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Average Importance	Count	5	4	9
	% within B18	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	33.3%	37.5%
Very Important	Count	4	3	7
	% within B18	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
Critical Importance	Count	2	2	4
	% within B18	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B18	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A19

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	3	12
	% within A19	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A19	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	1	7	8
	% within A19	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	58.3%	33.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A19	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B19

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	2	2
	% within B19	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	16.7%	8.3%
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B19	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	3	4	7
	% within B19	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	33.3%	29.2%
Very Important	Count	7	5	12
	% within B19	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	41.7%	50.0%
Critical Importance	Count	2	0	2
	% within B19	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	.0%	8.3%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B19	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A20

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	3	1	4
	% within A20	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%
Unknown	Count	4	1	5
	% within A20	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	8.3%	20.8%
No	Count	5	10	15
	% within A20	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	83.3%	62.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A20	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B20

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	4	1	5
	% within B20	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	8.3%	20.8%
Somewhat Important	Count	3	3	6
	% within B20	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Average Importance	Count	4	6	10
	% within B20	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	50.0%	41.7%
Very Important	Count	1	2	3
	% within B20	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B20	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A21

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	5	6	11
	% within A21	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	50.0%	45.8%
Unknown	Count	4	3	7
	% within A21	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
No	Count	3	3	6
	% within A21	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A21	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B21

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	1	1	2
	% within B21	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B21	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	4	4	8
	% within B21	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Very Important	Count	7	5	12
	% within B21	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	41.7%	50.0%
Critical Importance	Count	0	1	1
	% within B21	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B21	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A22

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	7	5	12
	% within A22	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	41.7%	50.0%
Unknown	Count	4	3	7
	% within A22	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
No	Count	1	4	5
	% within A22	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	33.3%	20.8%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A22	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B22

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	2	2
	% within B22	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	16.7%	8.3%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	1	2
	% within B22	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Average Importance	Count	4	4	8
	% within B22	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Very Important	Count	7	4	11
	% within B22	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	33.3%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	0	1	1
	% within B22	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B22	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A23

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	8	5	13
	% within A23	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	66.7%	41.7%	54.2%
Unknown	Count	3	3	6
	% within A23	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
No	Count	1	4	5
	% within A23	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	33.3%	20.8%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A23	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B23

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	1	3	4
	% within B23	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	25.0%	16.7%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	2	3
	% within B23	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
Average Importance	Count	6	4	10
	% within B23	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	33.3%	41.7%
Very Important	Count	4	3	7
	% within B23	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B23	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A24

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	10	8	18
	% within A24	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	83.3%	66.7%	75.0%
Unknown	Count	1	2	3
	% within A24	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
No	Count	1	2	3
	% within A24	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A24	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B24

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B24	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	3	0	3
	% within B24	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	.0%	12.5%
Very Important	Count	4	8	12
	% within B24	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%
Critical Importance	Count	5	3	8
	% within B24	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	25.0%	33.3 %
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B24	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A25

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	6	15
	% within A25	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	50.0%	62.5%
Unknown	Count	0	3	3
	% within A25	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	25.0%	12.5%
No	Count	3	3	6
	% within A25	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A25	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B25

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	0	1	1
	% within B25	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	8.3%	4.2%
Somewhat Important	Count	1	0	1
	% within B25	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	.0%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	3	1	4
	% within B25	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%
Very Important	Count	3	9	12
	% within B25	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	75.0%	50.0%
Critical Importance	Count	5	1	6
	% within B25	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	8.3%	25.0%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B25	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A26

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	5	7	12
	% within A26	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	58.3%	50.0%
Unknown	Count	4	2	6
	% within A26	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	16.7%	25.0%
No	Count	3	3	6
	% within A26	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A26	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B26

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	3	0	3
	% within B26	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	.0%	12.5%
Average Importance	Count	1	5	6
	% within B26	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	41.7%	25.0%
Very Important	Count	5	6	11
	% within B26	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	50.0%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	3	1	4
	% within B26	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	8.3%	16.7 %
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B26	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A27

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	10	9	19
	% within A27	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	83.3%	75.0%	79.2%
Unknown	Count	1	1	2
	% within A27	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
No	Count	1	2	3
	% within A27	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A27	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B27

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	2	0	2
	% within B27	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	.0%	8.3%
Average Importance	Count	4	3	7
	% within B27	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
Very Important	Count	4	7	11
	% within B27	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	58.3%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	2	2	4
	% within B27	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7 %
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B27	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A28

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	11	7	18
	% within A28	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	91.7%	58.3%	75.0%
Unknown	Count	1	3	4
	% within A28	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	25.0%	16.7%
No	Count	0	2	2
	% within A28	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	16.7%	8.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A28	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B28

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	4	4	8
	% within B28	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Very Important	Count	3	6	9
	% within B28	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	50.0%	37.5%
Critical Importance	Count	5	2	7
	% within B28	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	16.7%	29.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B28	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A29

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	9	8	17
	% within A29	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	75.0%	66.7%	70.8%
Unknown	Count	2	3	5
	% within A29	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	25.0%	20.8%
No	Count	1	1	2
	% within A29	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A29	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B29

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Not Important	Count	1	0	1
	% within B29	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	.0%	4.2%
Average Importance	Count	4	2	6
	% within B29	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	16.7%	25.0%
Very Important	Count	4	6	10
	% within B29	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	50.0%	41.7%
Critical Importance	Count	3	4	7
	% within B29	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	33.3%	29.2 %
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B29	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A30

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	11	7	18
	% within A30	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	91.7%	58.3%	75.0%
Unknown	Count	1	2	3
	% within A30	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%
No	Count	0	3	3
	% within A30	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A30	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B30

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	2	2	4
	% within B30	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Very Important	Count	6	5	11
	% within B30	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	41.7%	45.8%
Critical Importance	Count	4	5	9
	% within B30	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	33.3%	41.7%	37.5%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B30	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A31

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	3	10	13
	% within A31	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	83.3%	54.2%
Unknown	Count	2	2	4
	% within A31	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
No	Count	7	0	7
	% within A31	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	.0%	29.2%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A31	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B31

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Average Importance	Count	1	0	1
	% within B31	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	8.3%	.0%	4.2%
Very Important	Count	5	5	10
	% within B31	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	41.7%	41.7%	41.7%
Critical Importance	Count	6	7	13
	% within B31	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	58.3%	54.2%
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B31	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item A32

Strategy		Successful	Districts	
Practiced		No	Yes	Total
Yes	Count	7	4	11
	% within A32	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	58.3%	33.3%	45.8%
Unknown	Count	3	3	6
	% within A32	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
No	Count	2	5	7
	% within A32	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	41.7%	29.2%
	Total Count	12	12	24
	% within A32	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabs Values for Item B32

Rating		Successful	Districts	
		No	Yes	Total
Somewhat Important	Count	2	1	3
	% within B32	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%
Average Importance	Count	2	3	5
	% within B32	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	25.0%	20.8%
Very Important	Count	6	7	13
	% within B32	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	50.0%	58.3%	54.2%
Critical Importance	Count	2	1	3
	% within B32	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	16.7%	8.3%	12.5 %
Total	Count	12	12	24
	% within B32	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Successful Districts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%