FACTORS INFLUENCING THE SUCCESSFUL PASSAGE OF A SCHOOL BOND REFERENDUM AS IDENTIFIED BY SELECTED VOTERS IN THE NAVASOTA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT IN TEXAS

A Record of Study

by

DAVID JEROME FALTYS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 2006

Major Subject: Educational Administration

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE SUCCESSFUL PASSAGE OF A SCHOOL BOND REFERENDUM AS IDENTIFIED BY SELECTED VOTERS IN THE NAVASOTA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT IN TEXAS

A Record of Study

by

DAVID JEROME FALTYS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Stephen L. Stark
Committee Members,	John R. Hoyle
	Virginia Collier
	Charles E. Lamb
Head of Department,	Jim Scheurich

May 2006

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

Factors Influencing the Successful Passage of a School Bond Referendum
as Identified by Selected Voters in the Navasota Independent
School District in Texas. (May 2006)
David Jerome Faltys, B.S., Texas A&M University, Kingsville;
M.S., Texas A&M University
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Stephen Stark

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors influencing the successful passage of a school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas. The secondary purpose of the study was to examine pre- and post-strategies of the failed September 11, 2004, referendum and identify those factors that influenced the positive referendum on December 11, 2004.

Surveys were sent to 260 registered voters who participated in both the September 11, 2004, and December 11, 2004, school bond referenda in the Navasota Independent School District. Frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and Chi-Square tests were performed on the data to determine if there were any significant findings through the surveys.

The results of the investigation were fairly clear. As stated in the research by Surratt (1987), trust in the administration and follow-through in previous bond referenda played a significant role in determining the negative outcome of the

September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD school bond referendum. In the December 11, 2004, bond referendum, detailed information on bond plans, individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum, opportunity to vote on more than one proposition, and information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in NISD were instrumental in the positive outcome of that referendum. In regards to demographics of the voting population, the factor "currently having children in the district" played a significant role in determining the outcome of the referenda. This agreed with earlier research by Theobold & Meier (2002).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		v
LIST OF TABLES		vii
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Purpose	4
	Research Questions	4
	Operational Definitions	5
	Assumptions	6
	Limitations	7
	Methodology	7
	Significance of the Study	9
	Contents of the Record of Study	10
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
	Introduction	11
	The Need for School Bond Referenda	11
	Influential Factors in School Bond Referenda	16
	Summary	33
III	METHODOLOGY	35
	Population	35
	Instrumentation	36
	Data Collection Procedures	39
	Data Analysis Procedures	41

CHAPTER Page

IV DATA ANALYSIS 44

Demographic Data 45
Measures of Central Tendency 46
Strategic Planning 50
School Bond Referendum Theme 55
Citizen Involvement 57
Single-Issue Election 63
Public Relations Campaign 65
Voters with or without Children 74
Number of Students Affected 78
Population Growth in NISD 79
Endorsements in the Community 81
School Personnel Involvement 83
Individual Campus Activities Promoting the Needs for the Passage of the Bond Referendum 85
Trust 87
The Critical Incidents 99
Demographic Information 101
Summary 106

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 110

Summary 110
Conclusions 111
Recommendations 120

REFERENCES 123

APPENDIX A 128

VITA 133

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Percentage of Voters in the Navasota ISD from Each Polling Precinct Who Voted in Both the September 11 and December 11, 2004, Elections	36
2.	Return Rate of the Questionnaire Sent to Voting Households on Initial Mailing on January 26, 2005	40
3.	Return Rate of the Questionnaires Sent to Voting Households on Initial and Follow-up Mailing	41
4.	Voters' Length of Residency within Navasota ISD	45
5.	Voters Having Children in the Navasota ISD	46
6.	Voters Formerly Having Children in the Navasota ISD	46
7.	Descriptive Statistics for Factors Influencing Voter Opinions in the September 11, 2004, Election in Navasota ISD	47
8.	Descriptive Statistics for Factors Influencing Voter Opinions in the December 11, 2004, Election in Navasota ISD	48
9.	Chi-square analysis of the Influence of the NISD Facility Planning Committee (S4) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum	50
10.	Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the NISD Facility Planning Committee (D4) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum	51
11.	Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the NISD Long-range Plans (S12) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum	52
12.	Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the NISD Long-range Plans (D12) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum	53
13.	Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Detailed Information on Bond Plans (S15) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum	54

TABLE Page

14. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Detailed Information on Bond Plans (D15) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 55

15. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the "Vote for Schools" Committee (S5) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 56

16. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the "Vote for Schools" Committee (D5) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 57

17. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Early Voting Opportunities (S1) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 58

18. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Early Voting Opportunities (D1) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 59

19. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Parental Participation in the Bond Election (S9) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 60

20. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Parental Participation in the Bond Election (D9) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 60

21. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Community Participation in the Bond Election (S14) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 62

22. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Community Participation in the Bond Election (D14) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 63

23. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Single-issue Elections (S27) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 64

TABLE Page

24. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Single-issue Elections (D27) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 64

25. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Surrounding School District's Tax Rates (S17) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 66

26. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Surrounding School District's Tax Rates (D17) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 67

27. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on the Cost of the Tax Increase for the Average Home in the NISD (S20), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 68

28. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on the Cost of the Tax Increase for the Average Home in the NISD (D20), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 68

29. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Consequences of Failed Bond Referendum (S21), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 69

30. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Consequences of Failed Bond Referendum (D21), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 70

31. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Regarding Government Compliance Issues (S23), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 71

32. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Regarding Government Compliance Issues (D23), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 72

33. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Informative Town Hall Meetings (S26) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 73

TABLE Page

34. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Informative Town Hall Meetings (D26) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 74

35. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children in NISD (S2), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 75

36. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children in NISD (D2), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 76

37. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children Formerly in NISD (S3) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 76

38. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children Formerly in NISD (D3) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 77

39. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Number of Students Affected (S16) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 78

40. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Number of Students Affected (D16) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 79

41. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on Population Growth in NISD (S10) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 80

42. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Population Growth in NISD (D10) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 81

43. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Endorsements in the Community (S8) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 82

TABLE Page

44. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on Endorsements in the Community (D8) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 83

45. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of NISD Employee Participation (S6) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 84

46. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of NISD Employee Participation (D6) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 85

47. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Individual Campus Activities Promoting the Needs for the Passage of the Bond Referendum (S22) and Voter Decision in the Navasota ISD September 11, 2004, School Bond Referendum..... 86

48. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Individual Campus Activities Promoting the Needs for the Passage of the Bond Referendum (D22) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 87

49. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Trust in NISD School Board (S7) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 88

50. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Trust in NISD School Board (D7) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 89

51. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Past NISD Tax Cuts (S11) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 89

52. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Past NISD Tax Cuts (D11) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 90

53. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Regarding Trust in NISD Administration (S13) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 91

TABLE Page

54. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD Administration (D13) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 92

55. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD (S18) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 93

56. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD (D18) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 94

57. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning 1994 School Bond Referendum Follow-through (S19) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 94

58. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning 1994 School Bond Referendum Follow-through (D19) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 95

59. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Previous Cost Cutting Measures in NISD (S24)) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 96

60. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Previous Cost Cutting Measures in NISD (D24) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 97

61. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD Teachers (S28) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 98

62. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD Teachers (D28) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 99

63. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Critical Incidents (S25) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 100

TABLE Page

64. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Critical Incidents (D25) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 100

65. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Length of Residency and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 102

66. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Length of Residency and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 102

67. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Currently Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 103

68. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Currently Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 104

69. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Formerly Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 105

70. Chi-square Analysis of Formerly Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum..... 106

71. Chi-square Analysis Summary of Voting Decisions by Influences for the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 107

72. Chi-square Analysis Summary of Voting Decisions by Influences for the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum 108

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

School districts around the nation and in Texas have a need to maintain and/or improve their facilities. The Department of Education estimates that the average age of school facilities in the nation is 42 years (Holmes, 2000). The General Accounting Office reported that one third of all school districts in the nation had one or more buildings that needed to be repaired or replaced (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2000). The U.S. General Accounting Office Report stated that spending on construction for elementary and secondary schools grew 39% from 1990 to 1997 (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2000). From the year 1990 to 1997, Texas has led the nation in school construction, totaling more than $18 billion dollars (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2000). With an influx of approximately 80,000 students per year, with some estimates predicting over 100,000 in the next five years (Neeley, 2004), Texas school districts have found themselves in dire need of new construction and maintaining existing facilities. The costs associated with construction, or major remodeling, is difficult to afford utilizing maintenance and operations funding available to school districts today. Money for building and repairs is tight for many school districts (Spoor, 1998). School districts have been unable to make these needed repairs due to limited state aid and maintenance and operations rates that are

---

The style and format of this record of study follow that of the *Journal of Educational Research*.

at their maximum level allowed by the state. In the case of Dallas ISD, over 100 of their 200 school buildings are more than 40 years old and in need of updates and repairs (Spoor, 1998).

How can schools in Texas pay for such repairs? Approximately 70% of school districts across the state of Texas are within five cents of the state mandated cap of $1.50 for maintenance and operations (Texas Education Code, 2005d). Judge John Dietz ruled in the recent West Orange-Cove CISD lawsuit versus the State of Texas that many schools have lost reasonable discretion over their tax rates thereby constituting a state property tax (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004). Available funds are needed to fund the everyday operations of school districts; including salaries, transportation, child nutrition, utilities, security and maintenance of the physical plant. Districts do not have the funds to perform major repairs and renovations to their campuses.

As a result of legal limits on raising funds for schools in Texas, school districts have found themselves with crowded and deteriorating school facilities. This is not only a Texas concern. According to the 2004 report by Education Vital Signs, 75% of this nation's 86,000 schools need repairs to bring them up to today's educational standards (Joyner, 2004). In an editorial in the Austin American Statesman in September, 2004, Gamkhar and Olson write that discussions of school finance at the state level should take educational facilities into consideration. They contend that having quality teachers is important, but having quality and equitable facilities for all districts is critical to the education of students in Texas (Gamkhar & Olson, 2004). In 1995, the Texas Supreme Court issued an opinion that encouraged the state to look at

school facility funding. The Court stated that "an efficient system of public education requires not only classroom instruction, but also the classrooms where that instruction is to take place. These components of an efficient system—instructions and facilities—are inseparable" (Gamkhar & Olson, 2004). In the recent court ruling by Judge John Dietz, the Texas Legislature was directed to develop a new school funding mechanism which should include a method for financing the construction of new facilities (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004). As the state legislature revisits the issue of school finance, the payment for construction costs should be included in the debate. School districts in the State of Texas must rely on support of taxpayers to approve bond referenda which may be used to pay for these new facilities or remodeling of existing ones. These bonds are repaid by school districts through the levying of a tax which is used to pay the interest and sinking fund note associated with these bonds.

Statement of the Problem

The passage of a school bond can determine the direction for a district for many years to come. Upkeep of older facilities and the building of new facilities can have an impact on student instruction and perceptions toward the district (Gamkhar & Olson, 2004). In a recent ruling by Judge John Dietz versus the state of Texas, the research showed a range in differences in the achievement of students in poor facilities versus students in standard condition facilities of between 5 and 17 percentile points (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004). Another study found that students in excellent facilities scored as many as 11 percentile points

higher than students who attended schools that were considered to be in poor condition (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004). In a brief by John Lyons, the author states that study after study have concluded that there is a definite relationship between educational outcomes and the physical characteristics of school buildings (Lyons, 2001). Thus, careful communication about the existing facilities and program needs are critical in persuading taxpayers to vote in favor of these referenda.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors influencing the successful passage of a school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas. The secondary purpose of the study is to examine pre- and post-strategies of the failed September 11, 2004, referendum and identify those factors that influenced the positive referendum on December 11, 2004.

Research Questions

This study will be guided by the following research questions.

1. What pre-election factors contributed to the failure of the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?
2. What pre-election factors contributed to the successful passage of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?

3. Did selected demographic variables of the selected voters impact the successful passage of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?

Operational Definitions

Early Voting—the voting period prior to the actual day of the School Bond Referendum. Early votes may be cast not more than 17 days prior to or less than 4 days prior to the actual election date.

Temporary Early Voting Sites—those sites designated by the school district where early voting may take place. These sites may be at places other than the school district or at school activities and are regulated by State of Texas Election Law.

Approval Rate—the percentage of voters who voted in favor of the Navasota ISD Bond Referendum.

Navasota Independent School District (NISD)—a public school district in Grimes County in Navasota, Texas. Portions of the 360 square mile district also include Brazos County. The district serves approximately 3,000 students.

Growth—the increase or decline of the student population over time. This may be expressed as positive or negative growth.

Passage—a majority vote on Election Day.

Polling Precinct—the locations in which voters cast their votes according to the geographical location of their home.

Referendum—a vote that enables the public to have direct input into the passage of the proposed matter.

School Bond Referendum—the presentation to the public of a proposed sale of bonds, by a school district, for which the tax payers would be financially responsible.

Pre-election Factors—factors present prior to the bond referenda that had a positive or negative impact on voters' opinions.

Selected Demographic Variables—variables that define the voter; such as voter precinct resided in, students in the district or not, years lived in the district, and how they voted in each of the referenda.

Selected Voters—voters drawn from a pool of all voters who voted in both the September 11th, 2004, and the December 11th, 2004, school bond referenda.

Assumptions

The following assumptions apply to this study.

1. The data collected through surveys will be accurate even though time will pass after the bond referendum.
2. Adequate records will be available to accurately describe what occurred in the bond referendum.
3. The people who are surveyed will display accuracy in their recall of events surrounding the bond referendum.

Limitations

The following limitations apply to this study.

1. The study will analyze the September 11, 2004, and the December 11, 2004, referenda and voting records and opinions of the voters regarding these two referenda.
2. The results of this particular naturalistic study may not be easily generalized to other districts as they proceed with their own bond referenda.

Methodology

The findings of the study are to be ascertained through the following methods of conducting research.

Population

The population for this study consists of a stratified purposeful sample of the registered voters in the Navasota Independent School District. Voters were selected based on whether they voted in both the September 11, 2004, and the December 11, 2004, elections. Voters who participated in both referenda were assigned numbers and placed in a pool. Given there were 822 voters in both elections, the sample size for this study will be 260 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) and these were drawn from the pool.

Instrumentation

The district collected data based on a survey of voters following the successful December 11, 2004, school bond referendum. The survey was conducted utilizing a

modified survey from the Stockton record of study (Stockton, 1996). The instrument was developed by Stockton in 1994 following the guidelines provided in *Handbook in Research and* Evaluation (Isaac & Michael, 1987) and *Educational Research: An Introduction* (Borg & Gall, 1989). The development of the instrument included face-to-face interviews with administrative staff in the Conroe Independent School District as well as a pilot survey of early voters in the Conroe Independent School District. Tests for validity were also performed through field tests and checks by Conroe ISD officials.

The instrument originally contained 26 items for the Conroe Independent School District and two additional items were added to address specific issues related to the Navasota Independent School District. Using this instrument, selected voters were asked to rank the impact of these 28 factors on how they voted in the September 11, 2004, and December 11, 2004, bond referenda.

Procedures

Those who voted in both the September 11, 2004, and the December 11, 2004, elections were assigned numbers. Of the 822 voters, 260 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) of these were randomly selected from the various voting precincts by drawing numbers from the total pool of eligible voters. There was one survey sent to these selected voters. After two weeks, a reminder letter was sent along with another copy of the survey instrument. These surveys are currently being kept on file by the district for use in upcoming bond referendum.

Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed a sample of the total voter population using the accepted quantitative measures that have been identified by Borg, Gall, and Gall, (1993). Analysis will be performed on the collected data by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)—an electronic driven statistical software program.

Descriptive and inferential statistics will be utilized across each item in this study to provide appropriate analysis of the data in an effort to produce a profile of the opinions of the voters. Descriptive and inferential statistics will be displayed in both chart and table format.

The researcher reviewed voter surveys and sorted them by yes-yes, yes-no, and no-yes surveys. The no-yes surveys were analyzed to determine which strategies utilized by the district had a positive impact on voter opinion from the first referendum in September to the second one in December.

Significance of the Study

The passage of a school bond referendum is no longer considered an easy task. The percentage of bond elections that have passed declined from approximately 75% in 1960 to 35% in 1986 (Wirt & Kirst, 1997). School bond referenda are one of the only cases where citizens can directly make decisions in regard to school district policy (as opposed to indirectly via school board elections) (Theobold & Meier, 2002). The public attitude of no new taxes has created doubt about all public school referenda (Senden, 1993).

On September 11, 2004, the district failed to pass a single proposition, $25 million school bond referendum. On December 11, 2004, the Navasota Independent School District was successful in passing a three proposition, $25 million school bond referendum. This research attempted to identify successful and unsuccessful strategies used by the district to persuade voters to pass all three propositions in the December election. The results of this study will by utilized by the Navasota Independent School District in future school bond referenda as well as shared with other similar school districts in Texas.

Contents of the Record of Study

The record of study is divided into five major units or chapters. Chapter I contains an introduction, a statement of the problem, a need for the study, specific objectives, limitations and assumptions, and a definition of terms. Chapter II contains a review of the literature. The methodology and procedures followed are found in Chapter III, and Chapter IV contains the analysis and comparisons of the data collected in the study. Chapter V contains the researcher's conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter II is to review current literature and expert opinion on factors that have been found to be influential to the passage of school bond referenda. The emphasis of this chapter is on specific factors that influence the voting public and consequently determine the success or failure of school bond referenda cam-paigns. The first section consists of an overview of the literature and publications that describe the need for school bond referenda. The second section will look at specific factors that influence the public's support of school bond referenda.

The Need for School Bond Referenda

Schools today are faced with much different issues than were present 20 to 30 years ago. A recent district court decision, *West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley* (2004), outlines several areas where schools are receiving increasing pressure. His decision is based on a compilation of findings of state directed facilities and educational studies, as well as testimony by experts in the field of education.

In *West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley* (2004), Judge Deitz begins his decision by outlining the basic principles behind school finance. These basic princi-ples include a local property tax for maintenance and operations of a district not to exceed $1.50 per $100 of property valuation (Texas Education Code, 2005d). This money is utilized to fund the everyday operations of the school district. What cannot

be financed through this tax is basically subsidized through the Tier I State funding mechanism. In order to bring some equity to the system, the Tier II was developed. When a Texas school district exceeds $305,000 in per pupil valuation (Texas Education Code, 2005c), the excess funds flow back to the state in the form of recapture. These funds are redistributed to districts with per pupil valuations of less than $275,000 in order to attempt to bring them to the same level of funding as some of the richer school districts in the state.

School facility construction in most states is financed through the passing of local general obligation bond referenda. If voters approve the referenda, then the bonds are paid with funds raised on taxes that are above and beyond the general property tax. These overrides remain in effect until the bond moneys are fully repaid (Balsdon, Brunner, & Rueben, 2003). In order to fund construction of new or renovated facilities, the Texas Education Code (2005d) states that a district may only raise funds through interest and sinking (I&S) taxes, which cannot exceed $0.50 per $100 of valuation. In order to levy this I&S tax, the district must seek voter approval (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2000).

In *West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley* (2004) Judge Dietz goes on to outline the increasing academic pressures placed on schools today. He states clearly that the requirements placed on schools by the legislature regarding the "general diffusion" of knowledge imply that all school districts in Texas should be performing above the "Academically Acceptable" mark. He goes on further to show that "Academically Acceptable" does not equal an adequate education as defined by state and federal laws.

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) represent the state outlined curriculum for schools in Texas (Texas Education Code, 2005b). In finding of fact 368, Dietz explains that the equal opportunity for students to meet the state-defined standards and obtain an adequate education is deprived by inadequate school facilities (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004).

The need for school facilities has a decided impact on student achievement. In finding of fact 341, the studies find that there can be as much as a 5 to 17 percentile point difference between achievement levels of students whose school facilities are found to be poor as opposed to those students who are educated in standard condition buildings (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004). This holds true after controlling for socioeconomic status of students as well.

In a study by Taylor et al. (2005) for the Joint Select Committee on Public School Finance, the average age of a school building in Texas exceeds 24 years with the oldest being 113 years old. Not surprisingly, school districts in rural school districts were more than 30 years old. In 29 school districts surveyed, the average age of the school building was more than 60 years, with 22 of these being in rural school districts (Taylor et al., 2005).

Taylor et al. (2005) conclude that there is a direct correlation between student characteristics and the age of buildings. She found that within her sample poor and Hispanic students attend classes in buildings which are significantly older than other students.

Also, Dietz continues that in Edgewood IV the state concluded that property-poor school districts are unable to provide students with a learning environment in which

to obtain this general diffusion of knowledge because they lack all of the facilities necessary to do so (*West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley*, 2004).

As Stockton points out, schools are being asked to provide much more than the basic education for students (Stockton, 1996). Today, students are required to show mastery of skills based on the TEKS, or they risk moving on to the next grade level. The Student Success Initiative (SSI) now requires students in the 3rd and 5th grades to show mastery on the Math and Reading portion of the TAKS in order to be promoted to the next grade level (Texas Education Code, 2005a). An 11th grader must show mastery on the English-Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science TAKS test in order to graduate from high school. With the stakes so high for students in Texas, the need for updated and equitable facilities is great. As the previ-ous research points out clearly, students who attend older and outdated facilities risk being promoted to the next grade and may even be prevented from graduating from high school unless these facilities are brought up to standard.

The *Vital Signs* (1995) declares that Texas is one of the top states annually in terms of the number of bond issues taken before the voters as well as the total dollar amount of bond issues. According to the Texas Bond Review Board (2004), the total amount issued in debt in the state of Texas in fiscal year 2004 increased by 5.46% over the amount issued in fiscal year 2003. Much of this increase had to do with the improved economy and the lowering of interest rates on bond money. Due to these favorable interest rates, more than $919 million in bonds outstanding were refinanced resulting in savings of more than $30 million in cash to the holders of these bonds

(Texas Bond Review Board, 2004). All of the transactions for new money and refunded money required voter approval.

There are many factors that influenced voters in these referenda. In 1992, Cannon and Koetter reported on a study conducted by the Illinois Association of School Boards and the School Management Foundation of Illinois. They conducted a study of districts that had a history of failed bond referenda. A list of factors that contributed to the defeat of these referenda was produced. The top five detrimental factors that were identified were:

1. Voters were opposed to any tax increases.
2. There was influential or organized opposition.
3. Campaign committee was absent or unable to convince voters of the need.
4. Public was simply apathetic towards schools.
5. People did not understand the issue. (page 11)

Also identified were five factors regarding long-term conditions in the community that contributed to the failure of school bond referenda. These were:

1. Public feels taxes are already too high.
2. Community includes large voting blocs that oppose tax increases.
3. Citizens fear the effect of reassessment, multiplier, and other issues related to taxes.
4. The public does not truly understand the school finance situation. (page 11)

Cannon and Koetter (1992) go on to state that schools are no longer a popular cause in many communities. Stockton (1996) concludes that schools must utilize a

comprehensive, year round community relations campaign to gain community support. In an article published by the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (1998), the author states that schools are able to influence the way voters think and vote. School districts are more likely to pass these bond referenda when an organized, step-by-step approach is utilized. The district must also present a united front in order to overcome many of the factors that may be present in a community. When districts put forth a great deal of effort and planning toward the bond referendum, the chances are greater that they will overcome negative factors and pass the referendum (Nehls, 1991).

The purpose of this research and literature review was to identify factors influencing voter opinions in school bond referenda. Specific characteristics of factors that effect voter opinion is reviewed in detail.

Influential Factors in School Bond Referenda

Strategic Planning

In a review of rural schools districts in Kansas, Bohrer (1998) writes that one of the reasons for district success in passing bond referenda is the creation of a long-range strategic plan. He goes on to state that this plan should not only outline the educational need of the referendum, but should outline the financial impact of the measure as well. This planning allows for citizen participation in establishing the needs of the district and for promoting the issue as well.

Nehls (1991) found that no single election campaign strategy or planning efforts explains why some bond elections pass, or why some of them fail. The main point is,

however, that structured planning did take place in some form or another (Brax, 1990). Nehls (1991) goes on to state that each election and its' strategies should be uniquely designed, as each district is uniquely different from the other. Strategic planning must be implemented in formal or informal ways in order to gauge the nature and characteristics of the community (Kelly & Zieper, 2001; Lifto, 1995).

The board and community members should work together to develop a long-range strategic plan and communicate that plan effectively to the public (Lode, 1999). Down-to-earth campaigning techniques that meet the needs of the community work best to communicate the plan to all interested parties (Lode, 1999) A plan that is well-organized and implemented properly can minimize the opposition districts may receive from parties opposed to tax increases meant to pay for the measures (Brax, 1990). Plans should be evaluated along the way to ensure effectiveness and to afford a promotion strategy that best meets the needs of the community (Lode, 1999).

Many districts that have been unsuccessful in passing bond referenda did not put forth the time or effort to create this type of plan. Simpson (1993) concluded that this gives the impression of a knee-jerk reaction to some change in the district as opposed to being part of a well-thought out process of planning.

School Bond Referendum Theme

Much of the research surrounding the school bond referendum theme is out of date with Texas law. Hamel (1984) states a crucial step in a school bond referendum campaign is the selection of a theme early in the process. The theme should be the key message that allows the consumers to associate a single idea with the need for the

referendum (Brax, 1990). This theme must be one that is easily remembered and reminds the voter of what is at stake. Holt (1993) echoes the thought that the theme should be centered on the key message of the referendum. This message should suggest that by supporting the referendum that the voter would be investing in the future with the knowledge that good schools would enhance the perception of the quality of life for the district (Holt, 1993). Stockton (1996) goes on to state that this theme should be based on confidence and optimism and should have an influence on the voter's opinion and their vote.

Today in Texas, school districts must be wary of mixing the campaign slogan with the facts of the measure (Texas PR Express, 2004). Districts must work with their bond counsel to ensure that the slogan does not coerce voters to vote a particular way in the referendum. If a Texas school district is found to have expended public funds for political advertising, the penalty may be as high as a $3,000 fine, one year in jail, or both (Texas PR Express, 2004). The litmus test for a campaign slogan is whether or not a reasonable person could construe the ad to be advocating the passage or defeat of the issue (Texas PR Express, 2004). School districts in Texas should stick to the facts surrounding the referendum, and let the political action committees expend funds to persuade voters to vote for or against the issue.

Citizen Involvement

Barney (1984) states that the input of many different sources is an important component of a school bond referendum. The most significant factor identified for a school bond referendum to be successful is the early development of a citizens'

volunteer group to serve as leadership for support of the issue (Holt, 1993). Weathersby (2002) states that a community-based citizens' committee can have a tremendous impact on the passage of a school bond referendum. School district officials should carefully select community members to serve on the committee (Weathersby, 2002).

One of the six major factors that emerge from the literature as being important to the passage of school bond referendum is an active, supportive citizen volunteer committee (Brax, 1990). This committee has been identified by many authors to be fundamental to the passage of a school bond issue (Bohrer, 1998; Brax, 1990; Holt, 1993; Weathersby, 2002). Beyond the school board and the staff, Lifto (1995) concludes that organizing citizens is a key to the success of the school bond referendum.

Holt (1993) felt that a community task force should be in place to review needs, study alternatives to the issue, make recommendations to the board, and market the school bond proposal once finalized. He states that the committee should be in place in the early stages to assist district officials in assessing needs, therefore increasing the potential for success of the referendum from the outset (Holt, 1993). This committee should be involved in studying pupil growth or decline, site selection and traffic issues, and the needs and value of existing structures. This committee should explore all aspects of the school bond referendum (Barney, 1984). This committee should be in place to ask, and be able to answer to the community, all of the questions surrounding the referendum. Questions such as: What is needed? What will these

needs cost? How long with the project take to complete? Are there any alternatives to these projects? And, what, if any funding alternatives do we have?

The involvement of this committee offers the district a tremendous advantage in that the needs of the district are developed by the community; not by the district administration whom the community may not trust completely based on past experiences (Holt, 1993).

Lipinski (1992) reported on Ohio school districts that approved income tax increases to raise revenue for school districts. Lipinski states that schools appeared to have greater success when a committee made up of both community and school representatives worked for the passage of the issues in a supportive way (Lipinski, 1992). After studying 133 school districts in Ohio, Mancini (1987) identified seven strategies that were statistically predictive of successful elections. The use of a citizen advisory committee was first on the list of factors that had a strong positive influence on the issue (Mancini, 1987). These committees seemed to provide informal channels of communication and feedback that proved to be invaluable for convincing influential citizens in school election campaigns (Lifto, 1995).

Lode (1999) goes on to state that these citizen committees provide a mechanism for getting a clear explanation of the issue out to the voters. The citizens on the committee were able to more clearly describe the issues to their neighbors and friends and influence the positive vote (Lode, 1999).

Holt (1993) concludes that local citizens must be included in all phases of the school bond program, and that every effort must be made to utilize these citizens to inform the general public.

Single-Issue Election

School boards are able to act strategically at the policy level in that they have the authority to set the date for a school bond referendum (Lifto, 1995). In Texas, there are four uniform election dates; however, schools may opt to hold their bond referenda on a non-uniform election date once per biennium (Texas Education Code, 2005d). In a study by Piele and Hall (1973), the research gives recognition to the relationship between the selection of a date, the probable voter turnout, and the likelihood of success of the referendum. Election turnout is found to be greater if the election is held on the same date with other major elections (Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). Piele and Hall (1973) found, however, that elections held at the same time as other elections that result in large voter turnouts are less likely to win.

In research by Stanley (1986), the recommendation is that school bond referendum elections be held as single issue special ballots. Holt (1993) also concludes that school bond referenda should be presented to the voter on a special election date. Utilizing this special ballot date signifies that the issue is important and necessary. By doing so also reduces the possibility that a block of negative votes that politically controversial issues can generate will arrive at the polls (Stanley, 1986). Weathersby (2002) also concludes that considerable numbers of voters who may be neutral or negative towards school bond elections have a tendency to come out on general election dates. The researcher also found that voters who are neither interested in or knowledgeable about school concerns tend to come out on major election dates.

When the school bond issue is the single item on the ballot, the chances of passage are increased (Thompson & Hartley, 1991).

Holt (1993) recommends that the school bond referendum should be set at a special election date during the school year, and that schools should utilize non-uniform dates when available. School bond issues should be placed on the ballot by itself, not with other local, general, or primary elections according to overwhelm research (Piele & Hall, 1973; Weathersby, 2002). This way the voters are able to decide only on the school bond issue.

Public Relations Campaign

Much research points to ongoing public relations campaigns as being a critical factor in the passage of school bond referenda (Brax, 1990; Kelly & Zieper, 2001; Lifto, 1995; Lode, 1999; Stanley, 1986; Weathersby, 2002). School districts that have ongoing public relations efforts are usually the most successful when it comes to passing school bond referenda (Mancini, 1987; Weathersby, 2002). These efforts have also been considered to be successful in both past and more recent research according to Lifto (1995). Theobold and Meier (2002) also show that the information that is presented during the publicity campaign plays a critical role in the success of the school district's bond election.

In a survey detailed by Holt (1993), a review was completed of the campaign activities and the techniques to determine which were the most important to the success of the referendum. Of school districts who were successful, 84% of them focused their campaigns on the voters who were identified as "yes" voters (Holt,

1993). Neiman (1990) also found that districts used a formal publicity campaign 77.6% of the time. These efforts were found to have a significant positive impact when districts were attempting a school bond referendum (Neiman, 1990). These campaigns were typically organized to promote the "get-out-to-vote" theme to those who were know to be supportive of the school districts' efforts.

Public relations campaigns have been found to have two critical components. First of all, the campaign is typically considered the role of management (Lode, 1999). Angelo (2002) also states that the superintendent should make great efforts to reach out to the community in the pre-bond campaign in order to inform citizens of the issue. It was found that if two-way communication internally and externally were not in place, these bond issues were more likely not to pass (Lode, 1999). The most successful public relations campaigns instill trust, confidence, and faith in the local school district (Stanley, 1986). Holt (1993) points out that the most effective means of informing the community is through person-to-person contacts.

The second critical component is that districts should learn from other winners (Lode, 1999). Most successful bond campaigns have several common traits, and many of these can be duplicated by other districts to achieve success.

Lode (1999) goes on to offer four suggestions regarding school districts' public relations campaigns. The first suggestion is that districts have well-managed public relations programs that maintains a steady stream of information to the local media. These campaigns should keep good news about the district in front of patrons at all times. The second is districts communicate with their staff members through written form and open forums. Newsletters and district-wide e-mails are ways to

communicate to all staff members easily. Third, weekly updates should be written for the local media regarding board and facility committee action to keep everyone abreast of activities. And finally, put together a forum where citizens can ask questions and received answers in a timely fashion. These should be face-to-face events where citizens can ask questions of the administration personally and get an immediate response.

Holt (1993) also points out that a poorly organized or managed publicity campaign is a critical factor in many failed school bond issues. Lode (1999) suggests that if districts are not able to complete these items on their own, they should consider a public relations firm to assist them in their efforts.

Voters with Children in the School District

Piele and Hall (1973) found that parents of school-age children have a high interest level when it relates to school bond issues. Parents of children in the school district are more likely to support bonds because their children will see a direct benefit from the new and improved facilities (Theobold & Meier, 2002). Theobold and Meier (2002) go on to state that data on the number of parents in the district should be studied before the referendum is attempted. These parents should be targeted and asked to promote the bond issue to relatives and friends, particularly of other children (Weathersby, 2002).

Brax (1990) showed that parents held the key to success or failure in school bond referenda. He felt that if the parents were unhappy, they would seek political solutions. These solutions could include voting “no” en masse in a school bond

referenda. School should be responsive to the needs and wants of parents in order to keep relationships from deteriorating (Brax, 1990). Fickes (1998) goes on to suggest that schools should form partnerships with the community by allowing use of facilities by certain groups, particularly those with children.

Of particular interest in this discussion is the issue of senior citizens, or other members of the community who do not have children in the school district. At times, groups of senior citizens have been shown to vote against school bond referenda (Holt, 1993). These groups often complain of poor use of funds, increased taxes, and over-expenditures for education and use these reasons in order to not support the issues. Brax (1990) also found communities where blocks of senior citizens were able to hinder school bond campaign efforts.

Holt (1993) found that the most critical issue in the successful passage of school bond referenda was the establishment of a senior citizen volunteer group who would be in support of the issue. Several researches give suggestions to use when dealing with these senior citizens groups. McManus (2001) discovered that while senior citizens were against raising taxes, they typically supported the idea of raising revenue for school. Bohrer (1998) suggests that setting up public forums held specifically for senior citizen groups has proven to be of limited success in rural school districts in Kansas.

While Holt (1993) found that by relating the ages of buildings to the senior citizens generation and showing that the facilities are actually quite old has met some success in areas of South Dakota. Crader, Holloway, and Stauffacher (2002) suggest allowing senior citizens free admission to all school events helps keep them involved

in school activities. These events could include all sporting events, plays and any other school activity where school-age children are involved. This serves two purposes. First, the senior citizens become active participants in the lives of school children. Second, this allows them a first-hand view of facility conditions.

All of these researchers felt that these groups of senior citizens could be persuaded to support school bond referenda under the correct conditions. In Texas, for example, senior citizens groups should be reminded that their taxes are frozen at the age of 65 (Texas Tax Code, 2004). This freeze stops their taxes from ever increasing on their current property.

Number of the School District's Students Affected

Typically, school districts have many areas that are in critical need at the time a bond referendum is attempted (Stockton, 1996). In most cases, the more issues that are addressed in a referendum, the greater number of students whose needs are addressed.

Theobold and Meier (2002) point out that voters are more likely to vote for a referendum if their children are directly impacted by the issue. Pullium (1993) found that the number of schools which benefited from a school bond referendum had a direct influence on the success of the referendum. Parents find it easier to support a referendum when their children will receive the direct benefit from the improved facilities or programs.

Districts should always point out the needs of all children. They should also advertise how this particular referendum is directed at and will meet the needs of all

the children (Lode, 1999). Holt (1993) also shows that districts should point out the percentage of campuses and students involved in the campaign literature given to the voters. Theobold and Meier (2002) strongly urge districts to focus on the total number of students who would be directly impacted by the passage, or failure, of the school bond referendum. The more children that will be positively affected by the bond referendum, the more positive the voting public will be regarding the issue (Stockton, 1996).

Student Population Growth in the School District

Stockton (1996) states that increases in student population have predicated the need for many more school bond referenda, particularly in Texas. With an influx of approximately 80,000 students per year in the state of Texas, with some estimates predicting over 100,000 per year in the next five years (Neeley, 2004), Texas school districts have found themselves in dire need of constructing new facilities. There appears to be a positive relationship between student population growth and the successful passage of a school bond referendum in the research (Stockton, 1996).

The need for newer or larger school facilities should be shown to the voters (Theobold & Meier, 2002). This is considered a critical issue when attempting to pass a referendum. The researchers go on to state that there will be a positive relationship between class size and the likelihood of a successful school bond referendum. Lifto (1995) also shows that the greater the increase in student enrollment in a district over the last five years before the election, the more the likelihood that the issue will pass.

This population growth should be shown in detail to the voter (Gallagher, Bagin & Kindred, 1997). Voters are not always aware of population growth in the school district unless through a public relations campaign. Stockton (1996) states that most taxpayers view schools from the outside of the building, where it is impossible to view the overcrowded setting inside. School should provide accurate statistics to give the taxpayer a picture of the conditions inside the buildings.

Endorsements (Signs in the Yard)

In some school bond referenda, the difference between the success or failure of the issue may be due to the support and endorsement of influential community members. Eighty-five percent of those polled in a survey by Crader, Holloway, and Stauffacher (2002) stated that the use of influential community members was selected either as a good or very good technique to use in winning a referendum. Lifto (1995) showed that endorsements within the political framework have been studied and have been proven to be an important component regarding the outcome of a bond election.

School districts should be diligent in garnering support from city councils, chambers of commerce, commissioner's courts, and other groups in the community. In Bohrer's (1998) research of rural communities in Kansas, a Christian elder's endorsement was a strong statement to the community to support the issue. This gentleman appeared to be a community member to whom many citizens relied on and trusted for direction. When he spoke in favor of the bond referendum, it was felt that he influenced many others in the community to support the issue as well.

Gallagher et al. (1997) believe the use of endorsements is an important part of the campaign. They provide a list of three ways that these endorsements can be helpful to a school bond campaign. First, these endorsements are a way to communicate to others members of an organization, e.g., Kiwanis Club, that the group as a whole is supportive. If members of the group have missed meetings or announcements, this will signal them that they should support the issue. Second, a bandwagon effect can be fostered by advertising the groups who have come out in support of the issue. Everyone wants to be on the winning team, and school bond referenda are no different. Third, the community can be shown a broad spectrum of support by publishing the list of supportive organizations near the end of the campaign. This can help build strong momentum in the days leading up to the election.

Holt (1993) showed that successful districts often sought out influential people and asked them to serve in positions of leadership for the campaign. The endorsements of the city council, or other governing bodies in the community, have been shown to have a positive effect on the success of a school bond referendum (Mancini, 1987). In a story for News 8 Austin, Bordelon (2005) reported that placing signs of support in the yards of influential people in the community seemed to have a positive effect on the outcome of the referendum in the small Texas town of Thrall.

The Texas Association of School Boards state in their publication, Texas PR Express (2004), that the endorsements of influential business or community leader can be an effective tool. Schools should be very careful, however, in selecting these endorsements. Many times, leaders who have a great positive following may still produce a negative effect on some voters.

School Personnel Involvement

When the average citizen thinks of the school system, they think of the employees who work for the district, specifically the teachers (Weathersby, 2002). According to officials at the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (1998), the voters will look to the opinions of teachers and principals if they are undecided about which way to vote on a particular referendum. These employees are typically well-respected and trusted in the community and considered knowledgeable in regards to school affairs.

One of the most valuable resources in the planning stages and for providing testimonials during the campaign stage are the employees of the school district (Lode, 1999). Lifto (1995) finds that those who get their information regarding the school bond issues from school personnel are more likely to vote for the referendum than those whose information was received from other sources. Teachers can have an impact on the issue that goes far beyond their individual vote (Theobold & Meier, 2002). The researchers find that teachers have a stronger influence on voters than do administrators. Whereas trust may be lacking for administration, teachers are generally held in high regard by the community. In his review of the literature, Holt (1993) found that when ranking factors that effect voter opinions in school bond elections, school personnel participation ranked first in its positive contribution to voter approval.

One of the most overlooked and underutilized segment of school personnel are the non-certified employees: Bus drivers, cafeteria workers, clerical staff, assistant

teachers, and custodians (Weathersby, 2002). In many districts, these employees make up more of the total staff than do the certified personnel. Often these employees have day-to-day contact with more friends and neighbors than certified staff and must be utilized in getting the word out to their neighbors and friends.

School district employees should be enlisted to contact as many friends and neighbors they can and explain the issue in full (Brax, 1997). This demands that school administration should dedicate time educating the entire staff on all aspects of the issue. School personnel should then go out and talk about the benefits of the bond issue to everyone with whom they have contact (Weathersby, 2002). This has been proven to be an effective strategy in getting issues passed.

One area of caution for school employees is that they should never use school time to campaign for the issue (Lode, 1999). They should also not use their position of influence over the voting-age students in the district.

If all school district employees take ownership in the bond referendum, then the likelihood of it passing is much greater (Weathersby, 2002). These employees can have a tremendous positive, or negative, influence on the success of the school bond referendum.

Trust in Administration

School bond referenda are won or lost based on the amount of trust the community has in the superintendent and the board of trustees (Nunnery & Kimbrough, 1971). The credibility of the superintendent can be a side issue that will kill a referendum if the voters do not trust him or her, according to the North Carolina State Department

of Public Instruction (1998). In 70% of losing school bond elec-tions in South Carolina, the credibility of school administration and the board of education were listed as contributing factors to the failure of the issues (Holt, 1993).

In rural school districts in Kansas, Bohrer (1998) discussed 10 problems that were common to failed school bond elections. The only problem that could not be changed but had to be dealt with was trust in the prior administration. Piele and Hall (1973) go on to state that in their analysis of school bond referenda, the only significant difference between one district's failed campaign and another district's successful one is the salesperson. Although in a study by Boyle (1984), the research showed that this link proved to be insignificant.

An area that can cause issues with trust is the financial management of the district. Taxpayers want to know that the superintendent and board of trustees can be trusted to do the right thing with taxpayers' dollars (Surratt, 1987). Zakariya (1988) states that school construction is one of the most politically charged challenges the superintendent and board will ever face. Unity among board members and the administration is necessary for the successful passage of the referendum (Holt, 1993). The personal qualities and characteristics of school officials can be one of a district's most valuable resources if that trust and unity is there (Lifto, 1995).

Critical Incidents

The final factor discussed here which has been shown to have an effect on the outcome of school bond issues are critical incidents that can occur within a relatively short time before the vote. There is scant little discussion of critical incidents in the

literature. Lifto (1995) mentions that critical incidents can have a negative effect on school bond referenda if they occur. These incidents are much different than general community conflict and how that conflict impacts elections results. These incidents seem to develop out of nowhere.

Critical incidents can be major events such as crashes in the stock market or terrorist attacks on our country (Lifto, 1995). They can also be minor events such as a highly politically charged hospital district election called on the same day as the school bond referendum.

In a study of 18 bond elections held between 1987 and 1989 in California, Wood (1990) identified 12 findings. The critical incidents in the failing elections were significant to the outcome. All nine districts with losing elections detailed how unplanned, critical incidents affected the voting. These incidents were all unexpected, occurred very late in the campaign, and were perceived to have had a significant impact on the outcome of the election (Wood, 1990).

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to outline the need for school bond referenda in districts today as well as review current literature on influential factors which contribute to the success or failure of the referenda. The influential factors reviewed here included: utilizing a strategic plan, bond theme or slogan, citizen involvement, single issue campaigns public relations campaigns, voters with or without children in school, number of students affected, student population growth, endorsements by influential citizens or groups, involvement of school personnel, trust in the district

administration, and critical incidents that can develop prior to the election. Chapter III will explain the design of the study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In 1994, the Conroe Independent School District held an $85.8 million bond referendum. Stockton (1996) surveyed voters of the 28,000 student school district to determine which pre-election factors influenced voters and their votes.

The Navasota Independent School District has an enrollment of approximately 3000 students. Navasota ISD held a bond referendum totaling $25 million on September 11, 2004. With over 1,300 voters participating, the referendum failed by 30 votes. In December, 2004, the district put forth the same $25 million bond referendum. This issue was broken into three propositions, each of which passed by several hundred votes.

This study will build upon the Stockton study, using current literature, to determine if similar results are found to be evident in a much different school district.

Population

The population of this survey consists of the 822 registered voters who voted in both the September 11, 2004, and the December 11, 2004, school bond referenda in the Navasota Independent School District. The purposeful sample represents voters from the 9 different polling precincts within the Navasota ISD attendance boundaries. Table 1 shows the percentages of voters from each polling precinct.

TABLE 1. **Percentage of Voters in the Navasota ISD from Each Polling Precinct Who Voted in Both the September 11 and December 11, 2004, Elections**

Precinct	Frequency	Percent
1	19	2.4%
3	127	15.4%
4	122	14.8%
5	68	8.3%
6	291	35.5%
9	10	1.2%
12	107	13.0%
14	68	8.3%
15	10	1.2%
Total	**822**	**100.0%**

To ensure for richness of data, a random sample size of 260 voters was used, which equals the n=260 suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), to collect data (Borg & Gall, 1989). The purpose of this sample was to collect data from across all voting precincts that accurately reflected the perception's of the voter on influential factors present before the September 11, 2004, and the December 11, 2004, NISD school bond referenda.

Instrumentation

The design of this study was descriptive or *ex post facto*. The *ex post facto* research design was utilized because the event that was studied had already taken place in the fall and early winter of 2004. The board of trustees of the Navasota ISD had directed a survey be performed following the successful referendum in

December, 2004, to determine if any of the strategies utilized between the two referenda had a significant input on voter's opinions. A survey was modified to collect data on the events being studied. The modified survey was developed by Don Stockton (1996) of the Conroe Independent School District.

The survey was developed by Stockton in 1994 following the guidelines provided in the *Handbook in Research and Evaluation* (Isaac & Michael, 1987) and *Educational Research: An Introduction* (Borg & Gall, 1989). The instrument was developed, initially, by conducting a face-to-face interview with the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, the Public Relations Director and other key personnel within Conroe Independent School District, and 10 selected absentee voters from the October 1, 1994, Conroe ISD school bond referendum.

Based on the information gathered through those interviews, and an extensive review of the literature, the questionnaire was formulated. The questionnaire reflected factors that previous literature had already identified and factors that were present during the October 1, 1994, Conroe ISD school bond referendum. The questionnaire consisted of specific factors that were present in the October 1, 1994, Conroe ISD school bond referendum.

The survey was then sent out to 40 individuals who voted by absentee ballot in the October 1, 1994, Conroe ISD school bond referendum. These 40 individuals were selected by identifying every one hundredth person on the voter sign-in sheet. The pilot sample of 40 individuals represented ten percent of the sample to be used in the actual study.

Feedback garnered from returned pilot survey instrument was taken into account in the finalized survey instrument. Based on the feedback, no changes were necessary on the initial instrument developed by Stockton. The survey instrument featured a series of 26 Likert-type scaled items and one open-ended question. The instrument was submitted to selected Conroe Independent School District officials and voters to provide specific feedback regarding: (1) the clarity of the instructions; (2) the completeness of the factors listed on the items; (3) the legal accuracy of each item; and (4) to the clarity of each item/question.

Five follow-up interviews were conducted with randomly selected voters who voted in the October 1, 1994, Conroe ISD school bond referendum to provide for further understanding of influential factors present during that time. Stockton continued to ask one basic question, "What influenced your vote in the October 1, 1994, Conroe ISD school bond referendum?" These data were used to help explain the reasons for voters' responses.

As the survey instrument was developed by Stockton, appropriate checks on validity of the data were performed. Contend validity was assessed by Conroe ISD officials, and a field test was conducted with a representative sample of voters. Reliability estimates of the data were not necessary since items are independent of one another. Follow-up interviews reinforce the reliability and validity of the survey instrument.

The 1994 Conroe ISD survey was modified less than 25% to include specific factors present in the September 11 and December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD school bond referenda.

The voting precinct of each participant was stated on the questionnaire (Appendix A). Demographic information was collected from the first three questions on the questionnaire: Length of residency in Navasota ISD of less than five years or five or more years, children attending school in Navasota ISD, and children formerly attending school in Navasota ISD. Question four asked the participant whether he/she voted YES or NO in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD school bond referendum. Question five asked the participant whether he/she voted YES or NO on any of the three propositions in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD school bond referendum. A Likert-type scale with five choices was used with the 28 questions that dealt with the influence of specific factors. An open-ended question, asking for additional influencing issues, completed the questionnaire.

Data Collection Procedures

The study was conducted by the Navasota ISD Board of Trustees during the winter of 2004 and early spring of 2005. A cover letter accompanied the survey in order to explain the importance of the study as well as assuring the respondent that all information gathered would be anonymous in nature. The cover letter was on Navasota ISD letterhead. This stationary was used as the survey was being conducted by the Board of Trustees to be viewed by the board in a public meeting to determine strategies to be used in potential future school bond referenda. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included in the mailing. A 60% return was targeted, and an actual return rate of 65% was reached after a second mailing.

For the survey, questionnaires were mailed out to 260 randomly selected voters from the September 11 and December 11, 2004, Navasota Independent School District school bond referenda. The researcher assigned numbers to the 822 voters who voted in both referenda. Percentages were assigned to each precinct based on the numbers of voters in each precinct versus the total number of voters who participated in both elections. 260 numbers were randomly drawn from the total pool. These were the voters who received the surveys. The initial mailing took place on January 26, 2005. Table 2 shows the response rate generated by the initial mailing. The initial mail out resulted in a return of 99 surveys, or 38.1%.

TABLE 2. Return Rate of the Questionnaire Sent to Voting Households on Initial Mailing on January 26, 2005

	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Voters	260	99	38.1%

A follow-up mailing was conducted on February 24, 2005. Questionnaires and a reminder letter were sent out. Table 3 shows the final response rate to the questionnaires after the initial and follow-up mailings. This mailing resulted in 70 additional surveys being returned. Responses received from the combination of the initial and follow-up mailings were 169. This represents a total return rate of 65%. A total of five surveys were not used based on them not being filled out completely.

TABLE 3. Return Rate of the Questionnaires Sent to Voting Households on Initial and Follow-up Mailing

	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Voters	260	169	65%

Data Analysis Procedures

Statistical methods used included measures of central tendencies, percentages, and frequency distributions. Descriptive and analytical statistics were utilized across each item in this study to provide appropriate analysis of the data in an effort to produce a profile of the opinions of the voters.

Data from the survey instrument were coded by the researcher and entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The statistical program, SPSS 11.5 for Windows, was used for all statistical calculations. The following statistical procedures were performed on the data set.

In order to look at voter patterns in the 2004 NISD school bond referenda, frequency distributions were calculate on each of the first three demographic questions.

Cross-tabulations were calculated on the vote cast (either YES or NO) and the perception of the influence of each item as listed by the voter in the September and December, 2004 school bond referenda. A Chi-Square test was performed to see if these cross-tabulations were significantly different from expected. A .05 significance level was used to control for making a Type I or Type II error. Analysis of phi was conducted to determine the strength of significance for these factors.

In order to look at item power, means, standard deviation, minimum values observed, and maximum values observed were calculated on the following variables in the data set:

1. Early voting opportunities
2. Children in NISD
3. Children formerly in NISD
4. NISD Facility Planning Committee
5. "Vote for Schools Committee"
6. NISD employee participation in bond campaign
7. Trust in NISD school board
8. Signs of support in yards
9. Parental participation in bond election
10. Population growth in NISD
11. Past NISD tax cuts
12. NISD long range plans
13. Trust in NISD Administration
14. Community participation in bond election
15. Detailed information on bond plans
16. Focus on the needs of all of the NISD students

17. Information comparing surrounding school districts' tax rates
18. Trust in NISD
19. 1994 School Bond Referendum follow-through
20. Information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD
21. Consequences of failed bond referendum
22. Individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum
23. Government compliance issues (i.e. ADA requirements, etc)
24. Previous cost cutting measures in NISD
25. Other issues on same voting day (e.g., Hospital district)
26. Informative Town Hall meetings
27. Opportunity to vote on more than one proposition
28. Trust in NISD teacher

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The student population in Texas continues to increase by nearly 80,000 students per year (Neely, 2004). The average age of school facilities, according to the Department of Education is approximately 42 years nationwide (Holmes, 2000). In Dallas ISD alone, over 100 of their 200 school district buildings are more than 40 years and are in dire need of repairs and updates needed to bring them up to date with today's educational facility standards (Spoor, 1998). These statements indicate the need for school districts to continue to attempt to pass school bond referenda.

Facing problems similar to the ones addressed above, the Navasota ISD found itself in need of attempting a school bond referendum in the fall of 2004. While the district's enrollment has been falling overall, increased enrollment numbers at the lower levels and a shift of population out of the city boundaries forced the district to move forward with a single proposition, $25 million issue on September 11, 2004. With over 1300 votes cast in this election, the proposition failed by 30 votes. The district then put forth a three proposition, $25 million issue on December 11, 2004. In this election over 1400 votes were cast and all three propositions passed by several hundred votes.

This study investigated the factors that influenced the public to support the bond referendum in December while attempting to explain which factors had a direct influence on voter opinions in both elections. Specifically, the following questions were explored:

4. What pre-election factors contributed to the failure of the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?
5. What pre-election factors contributed to the failure of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?
6. Did selected demographic variables of the selected voters impact the successful passage of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?

Demographic Data

Using the first three questions from the survey, the researcher gathered demographic data from those citizens who voted in the September 11, 2004, NISD school bond referendum. Table 4 is a summary the data on the length of residency within the NISD attendance zone. This information is divided into less than five years of residency within NISD and five or more years of residency within NISD.

TABLE 4. Voters' Length of Residency within Navasota ISD

Length of Residency	Frequency	Percent
Less than 5 years	12	7.1
More than 5 years	157	92.9
Total	**169**	**100.0**

Table 5 is a summary of the data from those voters having children in the NISD. These data are categorized as either "yes," for those having children in NISD, or "no," for those not having children in NISD.

TABLE 5. Voters Having Children in the Navasota ISD

Children in Navasota ISD	Frequency	Percent
Yes	56	33.1
No	113	66.9
Total	**169**	**100.0**

Table 6 is a summary the data from those voters formerly having children in the NISD. This data are categorized as either "yes," for those formerly having children in NISD, or "no," for those not formerly having children in NISD.

TABLE 6. Voters Formerly Having Children in the Navasota ISD

Children Formerly in Navasota ISD	Frequency	Percent
Yes	107	63.3
No	62	36.7
Total	**169**	**100.0**

Measures of Central Tendency

The researcher used a Likert-type scale to gather data across 28 different possible factors influencing voter opinions. These influences were present in NISD during the preparation and campaign of the September 11 and December 11, 2004, NISD school

bond referenda. Table 7 is a representation of the voter's perceptions of the influence of each of the 28 factors present on the September 11, 2004, election.

TABLE 7. Descriptive Statistics for Factors Influencing Voter Opinions in the September 11, 2004, Election in Navasota ISD

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
S1	1	5	3.53	1.215
S2	1	5	3.69	1.000
S3	1	5	3.29	1.060
S4	1	5	3.19	1.091
S5	1	5	3.20	1.083
S6	1	5	3.13	1.055
S7	1	5	3.14	1.255
S8	1	5	3.02	1.003
S9	1	5	3.18	.909
S10	1	5	3.60	1.025
S11	1	5	2.98	.848
S12	1	5	3.38	1.205
S13	1	5	3.21	1.240
S14	1	5	3.31	.988
S15	1	5	3.30	1.178
S16	1	5	3.62	1.144
S17	1	5	3.26	1.037
S18	1	5	3.18	1.202
S19	1	5	2.72	.881
S20	1	5	3.22	1.233
S21	1	5	3.16	1.115
S22	1	5	3.04	1.091
S23	1	5	3.13	.897
S24	1	5	2.88	1.062
S25	1	5	2.72	1.191
S26	1	5	3.27	.979
S27	1	5	3.29	1.152
S28	1	5	3.59	1.002

Early voting opportunities (S1), children in NISD (S2), population growth in NISD (S10), focus on the needs of all of the NISD students (S16), and trust in NISD

teachers (S28) all have the largest mean values of the items on the September 11 portion of the survey. Past NISD tax cuts (S11), 1994 School Bond Referendum follow-through (S19), previous cost-cutting measures in NISD (S24), and other issues on same voting day (i.e., hospital district) (S25) all had the lowest mean values on the items on the September 11 portion of the survey.

Table 8 is a representation of the voter's perceptions of the influence of each of the 28 factors present in the December 11, 2004, election. Early voting opportunities (D1), children in NISD (D2), population growth in NISD (D10), NISD long-range plans (D12), community participation in bond election (D14), detailed information on bond plans (D15), focus on the needs of all of the NISD students (D16), opportunity to vote on more than one proposition (D27) and trust in NISD teacher (D28) all have the largest mean values of the items on the December 11 portion of the survey. Past NISD tax cuts (D11), 1994 School Bond Referendum follow-through (D19), previous cost cutting measures in NISD (D24) all had the lowest mean values on the items on the December 11 portion of the survey.

TABLE 8. Descriptive Statistics for Factors Influencing Voter Opinions in the December 11, 2004, Election in Navasota ISD

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
D1	1	5	3.60	1.231
D2	1	5	3.70	.980
D3	1	5	3.30	1.067
D4	1	5	3.22	1.143
D5	1	5	3.40	1.151
D6	1	5	3.28	1.175
D7	1	5	3.22	1.252
D8	1	5	3.27	1.199

TABLE 8. Continued

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
D9	1	5	3.18	.949
D10	1	5	3.65	1.092
D11	1	5	2.97	.841
D12	1	5	3.53	1.196
D13	1	5	3.31	1.220
D14	1	5	3.50	1.024
D15	1	5	3.75	1.189
D16	1	5	3.77	1.086
D17	1	5	3.33	1.044
D18	1	5	3.22	1.162
D19	1	5	2.79	.872
D20	1	5	3.36	1.227
D21	1	5	3.37	1.132
D22	1	5	3.14	1.125
D23	1	5	3.20	.890
D24	1	5	2.87	1.067
D25	1	5	3.31	1.107
D26	1	5	3.25	1.057
D27	1	5	3.91	1.219
D28	1	5	3.63	1.044

The remainder of this chapter is organized around the 12 broad areas of bond referenda influences identified in the review of the literature in Chapter II. Those areas include: Strategic planning, school bond referendum theme, citizen involvement, single issue elections, the public relations campaign, voters having children in the school district, number of the school district's students affected, student population growth in the school district, endorsements in the community, school personnel involvement, trust in the administration, and critical incidents. The 28 items of possible influence that were present in the September 11 and December 11, 2004, NISD school bond referenda are analyzed through each broad area identified by the research.

Strategic Planning

The first area of influence examined was the amount of strategic planning utilized by the district. The area of strategic planning included: NISD facility planning committee (Question 4, Q4), NISD long range plans (Q12), and detailed information on bond plans (Q15). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q4, Q12, and Q15) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of the NISD facility planning committee and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9. Chi-square analysis of the Influence of the NISD Facility Planning Committee (S4) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	2	42	18	21	85
	2.4%	2.4%	49.4%	21.2%	24.7%	100.0%
No	15	7	53	3	6	84
	17.9%	8.3%	63.1%	3.6%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	**17**	**9**	**95**	**21**	**27**	**169**
	10.1%	**5.3%**	**56.2%**	**12.4%**	**16.0%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 33.035 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .442

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderate strength

of relationship between the two. Clearly, 45.9% of the voters who voted YES and 10.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, NISD facility planning committee, was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the NISD facility planning committee and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the NISD Facility Planning Committee (D4) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	6	8	70	25	30	139
	4.3%	5.8%	50.4%	18.0%	21.6%	100.0%
No	12	3	15	0	0	30
	40.0%	10.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**18**	**11**	**85**	**25**	**30**	**169**
	10.7%	**6.5%**	**50.3%**	**14.8%**	**17.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 42.052 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .499

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderate strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 37.6% of the voters who voted YES and 0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, NISD facility planning committee, was influential to their voting decision.

The next item with the strategic planning area to be examined was the NISD long range plans. A Chi-square Test was used to analyze the assumption of the

independence of the variables NISD long-range plans and voting decision. The results of the analysis of the NISD long-range plans and voting decision in the September 11, 2004, are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the NISD Long-range Plans (S12) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	1	17	31	34	85
	2.4%	1.2%	20.0%	36.5%	40.0%	100.0%
No	13	18	43	6	4	84
	15.5%	21.4%	51.2%	7.1%	4.8%	100.0%
Total	**15**	**19**	**60**	**37**	**38**	**169**
	8.9%	**11.2%**	**35.5%**	**21.9%**	**22.5%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 75.117 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .667

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 76.5% of the voters who voted YES and 11.9% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, NISD long-range plans, was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the NISD long-range plans and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the NISD Long-range Plans (D12) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	9	4	36	50	40	139
	6.5%	2.9%	25.9%	36.0%	28.8%	100.0%
No	6	9	14	0	1	30
	20.0%	30.0%	46.7%	.0%	3.3%	100.0%
Total	**15**	**13**	**50**	**50**	**41**	**169**
	8.9%	**7.7%**	**29.6%**	**29.6%**	**24.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 49.654 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .542

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 64.8% of the voters who voted YES and 3.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, NISD long-range plans, was influential to their voting decision.

The next item with the strategic planning area to be examined was detailed information on bond plans. A Chi-square test was used to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables information on bond plans and voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the information on bond plans and voting decision in the September 11, 2004, are presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Detailed Information on Bond Plans (S15) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	4	29	26	24	85
	2.4%	4.7%	34.1%	30.6%	28.2%	100.0%
No	16	9	42	9	8	84
	19.0%	10.7%	50.0%	10.7%	9.5%	100.0%
Total	**18**	**13**	**71**	**35**	**32**	**169**
	10.7%	**7.7%**	**42.0%**	**20.7%**	**18.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 31.445 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .431

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderate strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 58.8% of the voters who voted YES and 20.2% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, detailed information on bond plans, was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the detailed information on bond plans and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 14.

TABLE 14. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Detailed Information on Bond Plans (D15) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	6	4	24	52	53	139
	4.3%	2.9%	17.3%	37.4%	38.1%	100.0%
No	7	5	16	0	2	30
	23.3%	16.7%	53.3%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**13**	**9**	**40**	**52**	**55**	**169**
	7.7%	**5.3%**	**23.7%**	**30.8%**	**32.5%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 52.699 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .558

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 75.5% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, detailed information on bond plans, was influential to their voting decision.

School Bond Referendum Theme

The next broad area of influence examined was school bond referendum theme. A Chi-square test was used to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variable school bond referendum theme (Q5) and voting decision. The results are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the "Vote for Schools" Committee (S5) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	4	41	12	25	85
	3.5%	4.7%	48.2%	14.1%	29.4%	100.0%
No	11	12	47	12	2	84
	13.1%	14.3%	56.0%	14.3%	2.4%	100.0%
Total	**14**	**16**	**88**	**24**	**27**	**169**
	8.3%	**9.5%**	**52.1%**	**14.2%**	**16.0%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 28.568 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .411

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 43.5% of the voters who voted YES and 16.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, "vote for schools" committee, was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the "vote for schools" committee and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 16.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 48.2% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, "vote for schools" committee, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 16. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the "Vote for Schools" Committee (D5) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	6	7	59	32	35	139
	4.3%	5.0%	42.4%	23.0%	25.2%	100.0%
No	9	2	17	0	2	30
	30.0%	6.7%	56.7%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**15**	**9**	**76**	**32**	**37**	**169**
	8.9%	**5.3%**	**45.0%**	**18.9%**	**21.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 30.340 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .424

Citizen Involvement

The next broad area of influence examined was citizen involvement. Citizen involvement included: Early voting opportunities (Q1), parental participation in bond election (Q9), and community participation in bond plans (Q14). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q1, Q9, and Q14) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of early voting opportunities (S1) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 17.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 54.1% of the voters who voted YES and 38.1% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, early voting opportunities, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 17. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Early Voting Opportunities (S1) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	1	1	37	15	31	85
	1.2%	1.2%	43.5%	17.6%	36.5%	100.0%
No	17	0	35	15	17	84
	20.2%	.0%	41.7%	17.9%	20.2%	100.0%
Total	**18**	**1**	**72**	**30**	**48**	**169**
	10.7%	**.6%**	**42.6%**	**17.8%**	**28.4%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 19.356 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .001
Phi = .338

The results of the analysis of the early voting opportunities (D1) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 18.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 57.5% of the voters who voted YES and 16.6% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, early voting opportunities, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 18. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Early Voting Opportunities (D1) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Total n
Yes	9	50	28	52	139
	6.5%	36.0%	20.1%	37.4%	100.0%
No	9	16	4	1	30
	30.0%	53.3%	13.3%	3.3%	100.0%
Total	**18**	**66**	**32**	**53**	**169**
	10.7%	**39.1%**	**18.9%**	**31.4%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 24.467 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .380

The next item in the citizen involvement area to be examined was parental participation in the bond election (Q9). A Chi-square test was used to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables information on parental participation and voting decision. The results of the analysis of the information on parental participation and voting decision in the September 11, 2004, are presented in Table 19.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 41.2% of the voters who voted YES and 11.9% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, parental participation, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 19. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Parental Participation in the Bond Election (S9) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	1	3	46	19	16	85
	1.2%	3.5%	54.1%	22.4%	18.8%	100.0%
No	9	8	57	10	0	84
	10.7%	9.5%	67.9%	11.9%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**10**	**11**	**103**	**29**	**16**	**169**
	5.9%	**6.5%**	**60.9%**	**17.2%**	**9.5%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 28.636 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .412

The results of the analysis of the parental participation in the bond election (D9) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Parental Participation in the Bond Election (D9) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	5	86	27	18	139
	2.2%	3.6%	61.9%	19.4%	12.9%	100.0%
No	9	4	16	1	0	30
	30.0%	13.3%	53.3%	3.3%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**12**	**9**	**102**	**28**	**18**	**169**
	7.1%	**5.3%**	**60.4%**	**16.6%**	**10.7%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 39.368 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .483

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 32.3% of the voters who voted YES and 3.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, parental participation, was influential to their voting decision.

The next item in the citizen involvement area to be examined was community participation in the bond election (Q14). A Chi-square test was used to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables community participation in the bond election and voting decision. The results of the analysis of community participation in the bond election (S14) and voting decision in the September 11, 2004, are shown in Table 21.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 62.3% of the voters who voted YES and 16.6% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, community participation, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 21. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Community Participation in the Bond Election (S14) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	0	1	31	41	12	85
	.0%	1.2%	36.5%	48.2%	14.1%	100.0%
No	9	16	45	6	8	84
	10.7%	19.0%	53.6%	7.1%	9.5%	100.0%
Total	**9**	**17**	**76**	**47**	**20**	**169**
	5.3%	**10.1%**	**45.0%**	**27.8%**	**11.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 51.674 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .553

The results of the analysis of the community participation in the bond election (D14) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are shown in Table 22.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 61.1% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, community participation, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 22. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Community Participation in the Bond Election (D14) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	7	45	59	26	139
	1.4%	5.0%	32.4%	42.4%	18.7%	100.0%
No	7	5	16	0	2	30
	23.3%	16.7%	53.3%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**9**	**12**	**61**	**59**	**28**	**169**
	5.3%	**7.1%**	**36.1%**	**34.9%**	**16.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 44.807 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .515

Single-Issue Election

The next broad area of influence examined was single-issue elections. A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q27) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of single-issue elections (S27) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 23.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 38.9% of the voters who voted YES and 33.33% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, single-issue elections, was not influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 23. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Single-issue Elections (S27) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	7	5	40	10	23	85
	8.2%	5.9%	47.1%	11.8%	27.1%	100.0%
No	11	3	42	19	9	84
	13.1%	3.6%	50.0%	22.6%	10.7%	100.0%
Total	**18**	**8**	**82**	**29**	**32**	**169**
	10.7%	**4.7%**	**48.5%**	**17.2%**	**18.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 10.350 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .035
Phi = .247

The results of the analysis of the single issue elections (D27) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 24.

TABLE 24. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Single-issue Elections (D27) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	5	2	26	32	74	139
	3.6%	1.4%	18.7%	23.0%	53.2%	100.0%
No	8	3	14	5	0	30
	26.7%	10.0%	46.7%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**13**	**5**	**40**	**37**	**74**	**169**
	7.7%	**3.0%**	**23.7%**	**21.9%**	**43.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 47.761 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .532

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 76.2% of the voters who voted YES and 16.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, single issue elections, was influential to their voting decision.

Public Relations Campaign

The next broad area of influence examined was the public relations campaign. Public relations campaign included: Information concerning surrounding school district's tax rates (Q17), information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD (Q20), consequences of failed bond referendum (Q21), information regarding government compliance issues (Q23), and informative Town Hall meetings (Q26). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q17, Q20, Q21, Q23, and Q26) and voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information concerning surrounding school district's tax rates (S17) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are shown in Table 25.

The high probability indicates that it is very likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 37.6% of the voters who voted YES and 33.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, information

concerning surrounding school district's tax rates, was not influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 25. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Surrounding School District's Tax Rates (S17) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	6	44	20	12	85
	3.5%	7.1%	51.8%	23.5%	14.1%	100.0%
No	11	4	41	18	10	84
	13.1%	4.8%	48.8%	21.4%	11.9%	100.0%
Total	**14**	**10**	**85**	**38**	**22**	**169**
	8.3%	**5.9%**	**50.3%**	**22.5%**	**13.0%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 5.359 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .252
Phi = .178

The results of the analysis of information concerning surrounding school district's tax rates in the bond election (D17) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 26.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 51.1% of the voters who voted YES and 3.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, information concerning surrounding school district's tax rates, was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 26. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Surrounding School District's Tax Rates (D17) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	4	6	58	51	20	139
	2.9%	4.3%	41.7%	36.7%	14.4%	100.0%
No	10	4	15	0	1	30
	33.3%	13.3%	50.0%	.0%	3.3%	100.0%
Total	**14**	**10**	**73**	**51**	**21**	**169**
	8.3%	**5.9%**	**43.2%**	**30.2%**	**12.4%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 44.843
p = .000
Phi = .515

The results of the analysis of information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD (S20), and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 27.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 49.4% of the voters who voted YES and 42.9% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD (S20), was not influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 27. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on the Cost of the Tax Increase for the Average Home in the NISD (S20), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	4	6	33	31	11	85
	4.7%	7.1%	38.8%	36.5%	12.9%	100.0%
No	21	8	19	23	13	84
	25.0%	9.5%	22.6%	27.4%	15.5%	100.0%
Total	**25**	**14**	**52**	**54**	**24**	**169**
	14.8%	**8.3%**	**30.8%**	**32.0%**	**14.2%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 16.961 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .002
Phi = .317

The results of the analysis of information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD (D20), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 28.

TABLE 28. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on the Cost of the Tax Increase for the Average Home in the NISD (D20), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	8	8	39	59	25	139
	5.8%	5.8%	28.1%	42.4%	18.0%	100.0%
No	14	4	8	0	4	30
	46.7%	13.3%	26.7%	.0%	13.3%	100.0%
Total	**22**	**12**	**47**	**59**	**29**	**169**
	13.0%	**7.1%**	**27.8%**	**34.9%**	**17.2%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 46.783 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .526

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 60.4% of the voters who voted YES and 13.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD (D20), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the consequences of failed bond referendum (S21), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 29.

TABLE 29. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Consequences of Failed Bond Referendum (S21), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	7	42	15	18	85
	3.5%	8.2%	49.4%	17.6%	21.2%	100.0%
No	13	13	37	14	7	84
	15.5%	15.5%	44.0%	16.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total	**16**	**20**	**79**	**29**	**25**	**169**
	9.5%	**11.8%**	**46.7%**	**17.2%**	**14.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 13.235 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .001
Phi = .280

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 38.8% of the voters who voted YES and 25.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, consequences of failed bond referendum (Q21), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the consequences of failed bond referendum (D21), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 30.

TABLE 30. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of the Consequences of Failed Bond Referendum (D21), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	6	6	61	35	31	139
	4.3%	4.3%	43.9%	25.2%	22.3%	100.0%
No	9	4	14	1	2	30
	30.0%	13.3%	46.7%	3.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**15**	**10**	**75**	**36**	**33**	**169**
	8.9%	**5.9%**	**44.4%**	**21.3%**	**19.5%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 30.389 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .424

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 47.5% of the voters who voted

YES and 10.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, consequences of failed bond referendum (D21), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding government compliance issues (S23), and voting decision for the September11, 2004, referendum are shown in Table 31.

TABLE 31. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Regarding Government Compliance Issues (S23), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	3	47	20	12	85
	3.5%	3.5%	55.3%	23.5%	14.1%	100.0%
No	9	5	62	6	2	84
	10.7%	6.0%	73.8%	7.1%	2.4%	100.0%
Total	**12**	**8**	**109**	**26**	**14**	**169**
	7.1%	**4.7%**	**64.5%**	**15.4%**	**8.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 20.240 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .346

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 37.6% of the voters who voted YES and 9.5% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, early voting opportunities, was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding government compliance issues (D23), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are shown in Table 32.

TABLE 32. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Regarding Government Compliance Issues (D23), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	4	5	87	29	14	139
	2.9%	3.6%	62.6%	20.9%	10.1%	100.0%
No	6	2	20	0	2	30
	20.0%	6.7%	66.7%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**10**	**7**	**107**	**29**	**16**	**169**
	5.9%	**4.1%**	**63.3%**	**17.2%**	**9.5%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 19.413 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .001
Phi = .339

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 31.0% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, information regarding government compliance issues (D23), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of informative Town Hall meetings (S26) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 33.

TABLE 33. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Informative Town Hall Meetings (S26) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	1	45	22	14	85
	3.5%	1.2%	52.9%	25.9%	16.5%	100.0%
No	10	8	38	26	2	84
	11.9%	9.5%	45.2%	31.0%	2.4%	100.0%
Total	**13**	**9**	**83**	**48**	**16**	**169**
	7.7%	**5.3%**	**49.1%**	**28.4%**	**9.5%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 19.132 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .001
Phi = .336

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 42.4% of the voters who voted YES and 33.4% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, informative Town Hall meetings (S26), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of informative Town Hall meetings (D26) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 34.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 46.8% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, informative Town Hall meetings (D26), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 34. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Informative Town Hall Meetings (D26) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	8	3	63	49	16	139
	5.8%	2.2%	45.3%	35.3%	11.5%	100.0%
No	9	6	13	0	2	30
	30.0%	20.0%	43.3%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**17**	**9**	**76**	**49**	**18**	**169**
	10.1%	**5.3%**	**45.0%**	**29.0%**	**10.7%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 40.308 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .488

Voters with or without Children

The next broad area of influence examined was voters with or without children. Voters with or without children included: children in NISD (Q2), and children formerly in NISD (Q3). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q2 and Q3) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of voters with children in NISD (S2) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 35.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 49.4% of the voters who voted YES and 41.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, voters with children in NISD (S2), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 35. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children in NISD (S2), and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	1	1	41	5	37	85
	1.2%	1.2%	48.2%	5.9%	43.5%	100.0%
No	3	2	44	21	14	84
	3.6%	2.4%	52.4%	25.0%	16.7%	100.0%
Total	**4**	**3**	**85**	**26**	**51**	**169**
	2.4%	**1.8%**	**50.3%**	**15.4%**	**30.2%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 21.653 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .358

The results of the analysis of voters with children in NISD (D2), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 36.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 50.3% of the voters who voted YES and 26.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, children in NISD (D2), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 36. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children in NISD (D2), and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	0	0	69	22	48	139
	.0%	.0%	49.6%	15.8%	34.5%	100.0%
No	4	1	17	6	2	30
	13.3%	3.3%	56.7%	20.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**4**	**1**	**86**	**28**	**50**	**169**
	2.4%	**.6%**	**50.9%**	**16.6%**	**29.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 30.141 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .422

The results of the analysis of children formerly in NISD (S3) and voting decision for the September11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 37.

TABLE 37. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children Formerly in NISD (S3) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	5	3	43	13	21	85
	5.9%	3.5%	50.6%	15.3%	24.7%	100.0%
No	6	9	52	6	11	84
	7.1%	10.7%	61.9%	7.1%	13.1%	100.0%
Total	**11**	**12**	**95**	**19**	**32**	**169**
	6.5%	**7.1%**	**56.2%**	**11.2%**	**18.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 9.642 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .047
Phi = .239

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 30.0% of the voters who voted YES and 20.2% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, children formerly in NISD (S3), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of children formerly in NISD (D3) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 38.

TABLE 38. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Children Formerly in NISD (D3) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	5	10	74	21	29	139
	3.6%	7.2%	53.2%	15.1%	20.9%	100.0%
No	6	3	18	0	3	30
	20.0%	10.0%	60.0%	.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	**11**	**13**	**92**	**21**	**32**	**169**
	6.5%	**7.7%**	**54.4%**	**12.4%**	**18.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 16.730 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .002
Phi = .315

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 36.0% of the voters who voted YES and 10.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, children formerly in NISD (D3), was influential to their voting decision.

Number of Students Affected

The next broad area of influence examined was number of students affected. A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q16) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of number of student's affected (S16) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 39.

TABLE 39. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Number of Students Affected (S16) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	2	14	28	39	85
	2.4%	2.4%	16.5%	32.9%	45.9%	100.0%
No	7	11	47	8	11	84
	8.3%	13.1%	56.0%	9.5%	13.1%	100.0%
Total	**9**	**13**	**61**	**36**	**50**	**169**
	5.3%	**7.7%**	**36.1%**	**21.3%**	**29.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 53.648 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .563

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 78.8% of the voters who voted YES and 22.6% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, number of students affected (S16), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of number of student's affected (D16) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 40.

TABLE 40. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Number of Students Affected (D16) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	1	39	45	51	139
	2.2%	.7%	28.1%	32.4%	36.7%	100.0%
No	5	6	15	2	2	30
	16.7%	20.0%	50.0%	6.7%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**8**	**7**	**54**	**47**	**53**	**169**
	4.7%	**4.1%**	**32.0%**	**27.8%**	**31.4%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 49.791 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .543

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 69.1% of the voters who voted YES and 13.4% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, number of students affected (D16), was influential to their voting decision.

Population Growth in NISD

The next broad area of influence examined was population growth in NISD (Q10). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variable (Q10) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of

population growth in NISD (S10) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 41.

TABLE 41. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on Population Growth in NISD (S10) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	0	1	16	33	35	85
	.0%	1.2%	18.8%	38.8%	41.2%	100.0%
No	3	23	30	28	0	84
	3.6%	27.4%	35.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**3**	**24**	**46**	**61**	**35**	**169**
	1.8%	**14.2%**	**27.2%**	**36.1%**	**20.7%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 62.834 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .610

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 80.0% of the voters who voted YES and 33.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, population growth in NISD (S10), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of the population growth in NISD (D10) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 42.

TABLE 42. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on Population Growth in NISD (D10) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	16	23	55	43	139
	1.4%	11.5%	16.5%	39.6%	30.9%	100.0%
No	3	7	18	2	0	30
	10.0%	23.3%	60.0%	6.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**5**	**23**	**41**	**57**	**43**	**169**
	3.0%	**13.6%**	**24.3%**	**33.7%**	**25.4%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 45.051 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .516

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 70.5% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, population growth in NISD (D10), was influential to their voting decision.

Endorsements in the Community

The next broad area of influence examined was endorsements in the community (Q8). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variable (Q8) and voting decision. The results of endorsements in the community (S8) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 43.

TABLE 43. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Endorsements in the Community (S8) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	3	47	18	14	85
	3.5%	3.5%	55.3%	21.2%	16.5%	100.0%
No	17	6	55	6	0	84
	20.2%	7.1%	65.5%	7.1%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**20**	**9**	**102**	**24**	**14**	**169**
	11.8%	**5.3%**	**60.4%**	**14.2%**	**8.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 31.423 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .431

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 37.7% of the voters who voted YES and 7.1% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, endorsements in the community (S8), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of endorsements in the community (D8) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 44.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 46.0% of the voters who voted YES and 0.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, endorsements in the community (D8), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 44. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information on Endorsements in the Community (D8) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	10	4	61	32	32	139
	7.2%	2.9%	43.9%	23.0%	23.0%	100.0%
No	12	2	16	0	0	30
	40.0%	6.7%	53.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**22**	**6**	**77**	**32**	**32**	**169**
	13.0%	**3.6%**	**45.6%**	**18.9%**	**18.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 35.693 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .460

School Personnel Involvement

The next broad area of influence examined was school personnel involvement in the school bond referendum. School personnel involvement included: NISD employee participation in the bond campaign (Q6), and individual campus activities promoting the needs for the passage of the bond referendum (Q22). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q6 and Q22) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of school personnel involvement (S6) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 45.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 31.7% of the voters who voted

YES and 26.2% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, NISD employee participation (S6), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 45. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of NISD Employee Participation (S6) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	4	4	50	11	16	85
	4.7%	4.7%	58.8%	12.9%	18.8%	100.0%
No	13	9	40	18	4	84
	15.5%	10.7%	47.6%	21.4%	4.8%	100.0%
Total	**17**	**13**	**90**	**29**	**20**	**169**
	10.1%	**7.7%**	**53.3%**	**17.2%**	**11.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 16.683 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .002
Phi = .314

The results of the analysis of NISD employee participation (D6) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 46.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 43.9% of the voters who voted YES and 13.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, NISD employee participation (D6), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 46. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of NISD Employee Participation (D6) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	8	9	61	34	27	139
	5.8%	6.5%	43.9%	24.5%	19.4%	100.0%
No	11	2	13	0	4	30
	36.7%	6.7%	43.3%	.0%	13.3%	100.0%
Total	**19**	**11**	**74**	**34**	**31**	**169**
	11.2%	**6.5%**	**43.8%**	**20.1%**	**18.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 28.811 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .413

Individual Campus Activities Promoting the Needs for the Passage of the Bond Referendum

The next broad area of influence examined was individual campus activities promoting the needs for the passage of the bond referendum (Q22). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (S22) and voting decision. The results of the analysis of individual campus activities promoting the needs for the passage of the bond referendum (S22) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 47.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 40.0% of the voters who voted YES and 9.5% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, individual campus

activities promoting the needs for the passage of the bond referendum (S22), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 47. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Individual Campus Activities Promoting the Needs for the Passage of the Bond Referendum (S22) and Voter Decision in the Navasota ISD September 11, 2004, School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	4	45	16	18	85
	2.4%	4.7%	52.9%	18.8%	21.2%	100.0%
No	19	10	47	6	2	84
	22.6%	11.9%	56.0%	7.1%	2.4%	100.0%
Total	**21**	**14**	**92**	**22**	**20**	**169**
	12.4%	**8.3%**	**54.4%**	**13.0%**	**11.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 33.718 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .447

The results of the analysis of individual campus activities promoting the needs for the passage of the bond referendum (D22), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 48.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 38.1% of the voters who voted YES and 6.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, individual campus activities promoting the needs for the passage of the bond referendum (D22), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 48. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Individual Campus Activities Promoting the Needs for the Passage of the Bond Referendum (D22) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	6	8	72	33	20	139
	4.3%	5.8%	51.8%	23.7%	14.4%	100.0%
No	15	3	10	0	2	30
	50.0%	10.0%	33.3%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**21**	**11**	**82**	**33**	**22**	**169**
	12.4%	**6.5%**	**48.5%**	**19.5%**	**13.0%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 52.111 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .555

Trust

The next broad area of influence examined was trust. Trust included: Trust in NISD school board (Q7), past NISD tax cuts (Q11), trust in NISD administration (Q13), trust in NISD (Q18), 1994 school bond referendum follow-through (Q19), previous cost cutting measures in NISD (Q24), and trust in NISD teacher (Q28). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q7, Q11, Q13, Q18, Q19, Q24, and Q28) and voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding trust in NISD school board (S7), and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 49.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of

relationship between the two. Clearly, 63.5% of the voters who voted YES and 10.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD school board (S7), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 49. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Trust in NISD School Board (S7) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	3	25	32	22	85
	3.5%	3.5%	29.4%	37.6%	25.9%	100.0%
No	24	10	41	3	6	84
	28.6%	11.9%	48.8%	3.6%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	**27**	**13**	**66**	**35**	**28**	**169**
	16.0%	**7.7%**	**39.1%**	**20.7%**	**16.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 57.149 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .582

The results of the analysis of trust in NISD school board (D7) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 50.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 48.2% of the voters who voted YES and 10.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD school board (D7), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 50. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Trust in NISD School Board (D7) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	11	10	51	40	27	139
	7.9%	7.2%	36.7%	28.8%	19.4%	100.0%
No	14	2	11	0	3	30
	46.7%	6.7%	36.7%	.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	**25**	**12**	**62**	**40**	**30**	**169**
	14.8%	**7.1%**	**36.7%**	**23.7%**	**17.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 34.927 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .455

The results of the analysis of information past NISD tax cuts (S11) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 51.

TABLE 51. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Past NISD Tax Cuts (S11) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	5	2	62	11	5	85
	5.9%	2.4%	72.9%	12.9%	5.9%	100.0%
No	10	6	58	6	4	84
	11.9%	7.1%	69.0%	7.1%	4.8%	100.0%
Total	**15**	**8**	**120**	**17**	**9**	**169**
	8.9%	**4.7%**	**71.0%**	**10.1%**	**5.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 5.376 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .251
Phi = .178

The high probability indicates that it is very likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 18.8% of the voters who voted YES and 11.9% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, past NISD tax cuts (S11), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information past NISD tax cuts (D11), and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 52.

TABLE 52. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Past NISD Tax Cuts (D11) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	7	2	105	18	7	139
	5.0%	1.4%	75.5%	12.9%	5.0%	100.0%
No	8	7	14	0	1	30
	26.7%	23.3%	46.7%	.0%	3.3%	100.0%
Total	**15**	**9**	**119**	**18**	**8**	**169**
	8.9%	**5.3%**	**70.4%**	**10.7%**	**4.7%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 42.175 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .500

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 17.9% of the voters who voted YES and 3.3%

of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item past NISD tax cuts (D11), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding trust in NISD administration (S13) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are shown in Table 53.

TABLE 53. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Regarding Trust in NISD Administration (S13) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	1	7	21	34	22	85
	1.2%	8.2%	24.7%	40.0%	25.9%	100.0%
No	23	8	38	9	6	84
	27.4%	9.5%	45.2%	10.7%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	**24**	**15**	**59**	**43**	**28**	**169**
	14.2%	**8.9%**	**34.9%**	**25.4%**	**16.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 48.805
p = .000
Phi = .537

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 65.9% of the voters who voted YES and 17.8% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD administration (S13), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information trust in NISD administration (D13) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 54.

TABLE 54. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD Administration (D13) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	8	10	44	51	26	139
	5.8%	7.2%	31.7%	36.7%	18.7%	100.0%
No	13	5	9	0	3	30
	43.3%	16.7%	30.0%	.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	**21**	**15**	**53**	**51**	**29**	**169**
	12.4%	**8.9%**	**31.4%**	**30.2%**	**17.2%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 42.653 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .502

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 55.4% of the voters who voted YES and 10.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD administration (D13), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding trust in NISD (S18) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 55.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of

relationship between the two. Clearly, 65.9% of the voters who voted YES and 17.9% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD (S18), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 55. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD (S18) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	2	5	22	37	19	85
	2.4%	5.9%	25.9%	43.5%	22.4%	100.0%
No	22	10	37	12	3	84
	26.2%	11.9%	44.0%	14.3%	3.6%	100.0%
Total	**24**	**15**	**59**	**49**	**22**	**169**
	14.2%	**8.9%**	**34.9%**	**29.0%**	**13.0%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 46.534 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .525

The results of the analysis of information regarding trust in NISD (D18) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 56.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 53.2% of the voters who voted YES and 0.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD (D18) was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 56. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD (D18) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	9	7	49	54	20	139
	6.5%	5.0%	35.3%	38.8%	14.4%	100.0%
No	13	6	11	0	0	30
	43.3%	20.0%	36.7%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**22**	**13**	**60**	**54**	**20**	**169**
	13.0%	**7.7%**	**35.5%**	**32.0%**	**11.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 48.919 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .538

The results of the analysis of information regarding 1994 school bond referendum follow-through (S19) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 57.

TABLE 57. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning 1994 School Bond Referendum Follow-through (S19) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	4	4	55	21	1	85
	4.7%	4.7%	64.7%	24.7%	1.2%	100.0%
No	17	28	36	3	0	84
	20.2%	33.3%	42.9%	3.6%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**21**	**32**	**91**	**24**	**1**	**169**
	12.4%	**18.9%**	**53.8%**	**14.2%**	**.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 44.510 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .513

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 64.7% of the voters who voted YES and 3.6% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, 1994 school bond referendum follow-through (S19), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding 1994 school bond referendum follow-through (D19) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 58.

TABLE 58. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning 1994 School Bond Referendum Follow-through (D19) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	11	18	81	28	1	139
	7.9%	12.9%	58.3%	20.1%	.7%	100.0%
No	8	9	13	0	0	30
	26.7%	30.0%	43.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	**19**	**27**	**94**	**28**	**1**	**169**
	11.2%	**16.0%**	**55.6%**	**16.6%**	**.6%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 19.457 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .001
Phi = .339

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 20.8% of the voters who voted

YES and 0.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, 1994 school bond referendum follow-through (D19), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding previous cost cutting measures in NISD (S24) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 59.

TABLE 59. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Previous Cost Cutting Measures in NISD (S24)) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	3	6	53	16	7	85
	3.5%	7.1%	62.4%	18.8%	8.2%	100.0%
No	19	20	32	6	7	84
	22.6%	23.8%	38.1%	7.1%	8.3%	100.0%
Total	**22**	**26**	**85**	**22**	**14**	**169**
	13.0%	**15.4%**	**50.3%**	**13.0%**	**8.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 28.904 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .414

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is moderately strong strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 27.0% of the voters who voted YES and 15.4% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, previous cost cutting measures in NISD (S24), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding previous cost cutting measures in NISD (D24) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 60.

TABLE 60. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Previous Cost Cutting Measures in NISD (D24) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	11	25	71	22	10	139
	7.9%	18.0%	51.1%	15.8%	7.2%	100.0%
No	11	3	12	0	4	30
	36.7%	10.0%	40.0%	.0%	13.3%	100.0%
Total	**22**	**28**	**83**	**22**	**14**	**169**
	13.0%	**16.6%**	**49.1%**	**13.0%**	**8.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 23.108 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .370

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 23.0% of the voters who voted YES and 13.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, previous cost cutting measures in NISD (D24), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding trust in NISD teachers (S28) and voting decision for the September11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 61.

TABLE 61. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD Teachers (S28) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	1	5	31	23	25	85
	1.2%	5.9%	36.5%	27.1%	29.4%	100.0%
No	5	6	33	30	10	84
	6.0%	7.1%	39.3%	35.7%	11.9%	100.0%
Total	**6**	**11**	**64**	**53**	**35**	**169**
	3.6%	**6.5%**	**37.9%**	**31.4%**	**20.7%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 10.168 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .038
Phi = .245

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 56.5% of the voters who voted YES and 47.6% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD teachers (S28), was influential to their voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information trust in NISD teachers (D28) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 62.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 52.6% of the voters who voted YES and 20.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, trust in NISD teachers (D28), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 62. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Trust in NISD Teachers (D28) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	4	8	40	53	34	139
	2.9%	5.8%	28.8%	38.1%	24.5%	100.0%
No	4	1	19	1	5	30
	13.3%	3.3%	63.3%	3.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Total	**8**	**9**	**59**	**54**	**39**	**169**
	4.7%	**5.3%**	**34.9%**	**32.0%**	**23.1%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 24.409 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .000
Phi = .380

The Critical Incidents

The next broad area of influence examined was the critical incidents (Q25). A Chi-square test was performed to analyze the assumption of the independence of the variables (Q25) and voting decision.

The results of the analysis of information regarding critical incidents (S25) and voting decision for the September 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 63.

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 15.3% of the voters who voted YES and 16.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, critical incidents (S25), was influential to their voting decision.

TABLE 63. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Critical Incidents (S25) and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	10	17	45	6	7	85
	11.8%	20.0%	52.9%	7.1%	8.2%	100.0%
No	25	8	37	1	13	84
	29.8%	9.5%	44.0%	1.2%	15.5%	100.0%
Total	**35**	**25**	**82**	**7**	**20**	**169**
	20.7%	**14.8%**	**48.5%**	**4.1%**	**11.8%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 15.815 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .001
Phi = .306

The results of the analysis of information regarding critical incidents (D25) and voting decision for the December 11, 2004, referendum are presented in Table 64.

TABLE 64. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Information Concerning Critical Incidents (D25) and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Strong Negative	Moderate Negative	Neutral	Moderate Positive	Strong Positive	Total n
Yes	11	4	68	27	29	139
	7.9%	2.9%	48.9%	19.4%	20.9%	100.0%
No	5	2	20	1	2	30
	16.7%	6.7%	66.7%	3.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Total	**16**	**6**	**88**	**28**	**31**	**169**
	9.5%	**3.6%**	**52.1%**	**16.6%**	**18.3%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 11.054 with 4 degrees of freedom
p = .026
Phi = .256

The low probability indicates that it is very unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is fairly weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 40.3% of the voters who voted YES and 10.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the item, critical incidents (D25), was influential to their voting decision.

Demographic Information

In considering demographic information as it relates to voting decision in the September 11 and December 11, 2004, school bond referenda, these three variables were considered: Length of residency in the district, currently having children in the district, and formerly having children in the district.

The Chi-square analysis of the variable length of residency in the district for the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 65.

The probability indicates that it is likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 91.8% of the voters who voted YES and 94.0% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the length of residency in the district was influential to their voting decision in the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

TABLE 65. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Length of Residency and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Less than 5 years	Greater than 5 years	Total
Yes	7	78	85
	8.2%	91.8%	100.0%
No	5	79	84
	6.0%	94.0%	100.0%
Total	**12**	**157**	**169**
	7.1%	**92.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = .334 with 1 degree of freedom
p = .563
Phi = .044

The Chi-square analysis of the variable length of residency in the district for the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 66.

TABLE 66. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Length of Residency and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Less than 5 years	Greater than 5 years	Total
Yes	10	129	139
	7.2%	92.8%	100.0%
No	2	28	30
	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
Total	**12**	**157**	**169**
	7.1%	**92.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = .010 with 1 degree of freedom
p = .919
Phi = .008

The probability indicates that it is likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 92.8% of the voters who voted YES and 93.3% of the voters who voted NO indicate that the length of residency in the district was influential to their voting decision in the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

The Chi-square analysis of the variable currently having children in the district for the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 67.

TABLE 67. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Currently Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Children currently in the district	Not having children in the district	Total
Yes	28	57	85
	32.9%	67.1%	100.0%
No	28	56	84
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Total	**56**	**113**	**169**
	33.1%	**66.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = .003 with 1 degree of freedom
p = .957
Phi = -.004

The probability indicates that it is likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 67.1% of the voters who voted YES and 66.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that currently having children in the district was

influential to their voting decision in the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

The Chi-square analysis of the variable currently having children in the district for the December11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 68.

TABLE 68. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Currently Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Children currently in the district	Not having children in the district	Total
Yes	52	87	139
	37.4%	62.6%	100.0%
No	4	26	30
	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
Total	**56**	**113**	**169**
	33.1%	**66.9%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = 6.456 with 1 degree of freedom
p = .011
Phi = .195

The low probability indicates that it is unlikely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 62.6% of the voters who voted YES and 86.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that not having children in the district was influential to their voting decision in the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

The Chi-square analysis of the variable formerly having children in the district for the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 69.

TABLE 69. Chi-square Analysis of the Influence of Formerly Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Children formerly in the district	No children formerly in the district	Total
Yes	51	34	85
	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
No	56	28	84
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total	**107**	**62**	**169**
	63.3%	**36.7%**	**100.0%**

Chi-square = .808 with 1 degree of freedom
p = .369
Phi = -.069

The probability indicates that it is likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 60.0% of the voters who voted YES and 66.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that formerly having children in the district was influential to their voting decision in the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

The Chi-square analysis of the variable formerly having children in the district for the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 70.

TABLE 70. Chi-square Analysis of Formerly Having Children in the District and Voter Decision in the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Decision	Children formerly in the district	No children formerly in the district	Total
Yes	90	49	139
	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
No	17	13	30
	56.7%	43.3%	100.0%
Total	107	62	169
	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%

Chi-square = .694 with 1 degree of freedom
p = .405
Phi = .064

The probability indicates that it is likely that the two variables are independent of each other. The value of Phi indicates that there is a weak strength of relationship between the two. Clearly, 64.7% of the voters who voted YES and 56.7% of the voters who voted NO indicate that formerly having children in the district was influential to their voting decision in the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

Summary

Chapter IV presented a quantitative analysis of the relationship between identified pre-existing voting influences present in the September 11 and December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD school bond referenda and voting decision. In the September 11, 2004, referendum, of the 169 voters surveyed, 85 supported the bond referendum and 84 did not support the bond referendum. In the December 11, 2004, school bond

referendum, of the same 169 voters surveyed, 139 supported the bond referendum and 30 voters did not support the bond referendum.

Chi-square analysis was used for the dichotomous independent variables. Phi values were also analyzed to determine the strength of relationship between the variables. The findings clearly answered the three research questions, with 26 of the 28 influences in the September 11, 2004, election having probabilities of less than $p < 0.05$. All of the 28 influences analyzed in the December 11, 2004, election had probabilities of less than $p < 0.05$. This indicates that it is very unlikely that these items and the variable voting decision are independent of each other. The Phi value is utilized to analyze the strength of the relationship between the two. A summary of the values of the Chi-square analysis for the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 71.

TABLE 71. Chi-square Analysis Summary of Voting Decisions by Influences for the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Influences	Value	Probability	Phi	YES Vote Influenced by Item	NO Vote Influenced by Item
Item 12	75.117	0.000	0.667	75.6%	11.9%
Item 10	62.834	0.000	0.610	80.0%	33.3%
Item 7	57.149	0.000	0.582	63.5%	10.7%
Item 16	53.648	0.000	0.563	78.8%	22.6%
Item 14	51.674	0.000	0.553	62.3%	16.6%
Item 13	48.805	0.000	0.537	65.9%	17.8%
Item 18	46.534	0.000	0.525	65.9%	17.9%
Item 19	44.510	0.000	0.513	64.7%	3.6%
Item 22	33.718	0.000	0.447	40.0%	9.5%
Item 4	33.035	0.000	0.442	45.9%	10.7%
Item 15	31.445	0.000	0.431	58.8%	20.2%

TABLE 71. Continued

Influences	Value	Probability	Phi	YES Vote Influenced by Item	NO Vote Influenced by Item
Item 8	31.423	0.000	0.431	37.7%	7.2%
Item 24	28.904	0.000	0.414	27.0%	15.4%
Item 9	28.636	0.000	0.412	41.2%	11.9%
Item 5	28.568	0.000	0.411	43.5%	16.7%
Item 2	21.653	0.000	0.358	49.4%	41.7%
Item 23	20.240	0.000	0.346	37.6%	9.5%
Item 1	19.356	0.001	0.338	54.1%	38.1%
Item 26	19.132	0.001	0.336	42.4%	33.4%
Item 20	16.961	0.002	0.317	49.4%	42.9%
Item 6	16.683	0.002	0.314	31.7%	26.2%
Item 25	15.815	0.001	0.306	15.3%	16.7%
Item 21	13.235	0.001	0.280	38.8%	25.0%
Item 27	10.350	0.035	0.247	38.9%	33.3%
Item 28	10.168	0.038	0.245	56.5%	47.6%
Item 3	9.642	0.047	0.239	30.0%	20.2%
Item 11	5.376	0.251	0.178	18.8%	11.9%
Item 17	5.359	0.252	0.178	37.6%	33.3%

A summary of the values of the Chi-square analysis for the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum is presented in Table 72.

TABLE 72. Chi-square Analysis Summary of Voting Decisions by Influences for the December 11, 2004, Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum

Influences	Value	Probability	Phi	YES Vote Influenced by Item	NO Vote Influenced by Item
Item 15	52.699	0.000	0.558	75.5%	6.7%
Item 22	52.111	0.000	0.555	38.1%	6.7%
Item 16	49.791	0.000	0.543	69.1%	13.4%
Item 12	49.654	0.000	0.542	64.8%	3.3%

TABLE 72. Continued

Influences	Value	Probability	Phi	YES Vote Influenced by Item	NO Vote Influenced by Item
Item 18	48.919	0.000	0.538	53.2%	0.0%
Item 27	47.761	0.000	0.532	76.2%	16.7%
Item 20	46.783	0.000	0.526	60.4%	13.3%
Item 10	45.051	0.000	0.516	70.5%	6.7%
Item 17	44.843	0.000	0.515	51.1%	3.3%
Item 14	44.807	0.000	0.515	61.1%	6.7%
Item 13	42.653	0.000	0.502	55.4%	10.0%
Item 11	42.175	0.000	0.500	17.9%	3.3%
Item 4	42.052	0.000	0.499	37.6%	0.0%
Item 26	40.308	0.000	0.488	46.8%	6.7%
Item 9	39.368	0.000	0.483	32.3%	3.3%
Item 8	35.693	0.000	0.460	46.0%	0.0%
Item 7	34.927	0.000	0.455	48.2%	10.0%
Item 21	30.389	0.000	0.424	47.5%	10.0%
Item 5	30.340	0.000	0.424	48.2%	6.7%
Item 2	30.141	0.000	0.422	50.3%	26.7%
Item 6	28.811	0.000	0.413	43.9%	13.3%
Item 1	24.467	0.000	0.380	57.5%	16.6%
Item 28	24.409	0.000	0.380	52.6%	20.0%
Item 24	23.108	0.000	0.370	23.0%	13.3%
Item 19	19.457	0.001	0.339	20.8%	0.0%
Item 23	19.413	0.001	0.339	31.0%	6.7%
Item 3	16.730	0.002	0.315	36.0%	10.0%
Item 25	11.054	0.026	0.256	40.3%	10.0%

Chapter V will provide a summary of the study. Conclusions will be presented regarding the findings of the study, implications, and recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors influencing the successful passage of a school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas. The secondary purpose of the study was to examine pre- and post-strategies of the failed September 11, 2004, referendum and identify those factors that influenced the positive referendum on December 11, 2004.

The population for this study consisted of a stratified purposeful sample of the registered voters in the Navasota Independent School District. Voters were selected based on whether they voted in both the September 11, 2004, and the December 11, 2004, elections. Voters who participated in both referenda were assigned numbers and placed in a pool. Given there were 822 voters in both elections, the sample size for this study will be 260 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970), and these were drawn from the pool.

For the survey, questionnaires were mailed out to 260 randomly selected voters from the September 11 and December 11, 2004, Navasota Independent School District school bond referenda. The initial mailout resulted in a return of 99 surveys, or 38.1%. A follow-up mailing was conducted on February 24, 2005. Questionnaires and a reminder letter were sent out. This mailing resulted in 70 additional surveys being returned. Responses received from the combination of the initial and follow-up mailings were 169. This represents a total return rate of 65%.

The passage of a school bond referendum is no longer considered an easy task. The percentage of bond elections that have passed declined from approximately 75% in 1960 to 35% in 1986 (Wirt & Kirst 1997). School bond referenda are one of the only cases whereby citizens can directly make decisions in regard to school district policy (as opposed to indirectly via school board elections) (Theobold & Meier, 2002). The public attitude of no new taxes has created doubt about all public school referenda (Senden, 1993).

On September 11, 2004, the Navasota ISD failed to pass a single-proposition, $25 million school bond referendum. On December 11, 2004, the Navasota ISD was successful in passing a three-proposition, $25 million school bond referendum. This research attempted to identify successful and unsuccessful strategies used by the district to persuade voters to pass all three propositions in the December election. The results of this study will by utilized by the Navasota Independent School District in future school bond referenda as well as be shared with other similar school districts in Texas.

Conclusions

A number of conclusions regarding factors which were influential to voting decisions in the September 11 and December 11, 2004, school bond referenda can be drawn based on the analysis of the study data as presented in Chapter IV. These conclusions are reached by studying the findings that are statistically significant and have a strong Phi value indicating a strong strength of relationship. The conclusions are presented in reference to the three original research questions that guided this study.

Research Question #1

Research Question One asked, What pre-election factors contributed to the failure of the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?

Findings. After a thorough review of the quantitative data collected through surveys of selected voters in the Navasota ISD, there were a few significant findings which became apparent. Several factors had a significant influence on voter opinion in the September 11, 2004, school bond referendum. Of those factors, there were two that appeared to have significantly influenced the unsuccessful passage of the school bond referendum. These factors were trust in the NISD school board and 1994 school bond referendum follow-through.

School bond referenda are won or lost based on the amount of trust the community has in the superintendent and the board of trustees (Nunnery & Kimbrough, 1971). The factor trust in the NISD school board showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors. The Chi-square value was 57.149 with a p value equal to .000 which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.582, which is a value indicating a strong strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. The mean value for this particular factor was also 3.14, which is just above a neutral rating on the five point scale. This conclusion is supported by the fact that of those who voted YES in the September 11,

2004, referendum, 63.5% were positively influenced by this factor. Of those voters who voted NO, 40.5% said they were negatively influenced by this factor. This seems to support the research that states that the personal qualities and characteristics of school officials can be one of a district's most valuable resources if that trust and unity is there (Lifto, 1995).

The factor 1994 school bond referendum follow-through showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors as well. Zakariya (1988) states that school construction is one of the most politically charged challenges the superintendent and board will ever face. The Chi-square value was 44.510 with a p value equal to .001, which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.513, which is a value indicating a strong strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. The mean value for this particular factor was also 2.72, which is below a neutral rating on the five-point scale. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that of those who voted YES in the September 11, 2004, referendum, 25.9% were strong to moderate positively influenced by this factor. Of those voters who voted NO, 53.5% said they were strong to moderate negatively influenced by this factor. Taxpayers want to know that the superintendent and board of trustees can be trusted to do the right thing with taxpayers' dollars (Surratt, 1987), and the perception of a lack of follow-through on a prior bond referendum can be difficult to overcome in future bond referenda.

Implications for practice. The issues of trust in the school board and school bond referendum follow-through are ones that can take years to correct and change. The research is clear in this record of study that steps must be made to ensure that the school board acts in very open and honest ways towards their constituents. Actions must be straightforward and out in front of the public in all areas in order to gain the trust of those in the community. In some ways, only time can heal the wounds of the past.

The same may be said for school bond referendum follow-through. Issues that occurred in the past can take time and subsequent bond referendum follow-through to correct. School officials in districts where this is an issue, must take steps to ensure a fit between what is perceived by the public and what is constructed by the district are the same. Much of this is monitored by the Justice Department and laws governing bond expenditures, but perception can become reality if a district is not careful.

Research Question #2

Research Question Two asked, "What pre-election factors contributed to the successful passage of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum as identified by selected voters in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?"

Findings. After a thorough review of the quantitative data collected through surveys of selected voters in the Navasota ISD, there were a few significant findings which became apparent for this question as well. Several factors had a significant influence on voter opinion in the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum. Of

those factors, there were five that appeared to have a significant impact to the successful passage of the school bond referendum. These factors include detailed information on bond plans, individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum, opportunity to vote on more than one proposition, and information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in NISD.

The factor detailed information on bond plans showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors. Theobold and Meier (2002) show that information that is presented during the publicity campaign plays a critical role in the success of the school district's bond election. The Chi-square value was 52.699 with a p value equal to .001 which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.558, which is a value indicating a strong strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. The mean value for this particular factor was also 3.75, which is .45 greater than in the September 11, 2004, election. This conclusion is supported by the fact that of those who voted YES in the December 11, 2004, referendum, 75.5% were positively influenced by this factor. Of those voters who voted NO, 6.7% said they were positively influenced by this factor as well. Public information efforts were found to have a significant positive impact when districts were attempting a school bond referendum (Neiman, 1990).

The factor individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors. If all school district employees take ownership in the bond referendum, then the likelihood of it passing is much greater (Weathersby, 2002). These

employees can have a tremendous positive, or negative, influence on the success of the school bond referendum and should be included in varied ways. The Chi-square value was 52.111 with a p value equal to .001 which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.555, which is a value indicating a strong strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. The mean value for this particular factor was also 3.14, which is above the neutral rating on the five point scale. This conclusion is supported by the fact that of those who voted YES in the December 11, 2004, referendum, 38.1% were positively influenced by this factor. Of those voters who voted NO, 6.7% said they were positively influenced by this factor as well.

The factor opportunity to vote on more than one proposition showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors. In research by Stanley (1986), the recommendation is that school bond referendum elections be held as single issue special ballots. The data for the September 11, 2004, Navasota ISD school bond referendum did not agree with this research. The Chi-square value was 47.761 with a p value equal to .001 which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.532, which is a value indicating a strong strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. The mean value for this particular factor was also 3.91, which is .62 greater than in the September 11, 2004, election. This conclusion is supported by the fact that of those who voted YES in the December 11, 2004, referendum, 76.2% were positively influenced by this factor. Of

those voters who voted NO, 16.7% said they were positively influenced by this factor as well.

The factor information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in NISD showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors. Theobold and Meier (2002) also show that the information that is presented during the publicity campaign plays a critical role in the success of the school district's bond election. The Chi-square value was 46.783 with a p value equal to .000 which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.526, which is a value indicating a strong strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. The mean value for this particular factor was also 3.36, which is above the neutral rating on the five point scale. This conclusion is supported by the fact that of those who voted YES in the December 11, 2004, referendum, 60.4% were positively influenced by this factor. Of those voters who voted NO, 13.3% said they were positively influenced by this factor as well.

Implications for practice. Four of the five statistically significant factors affecting the passage of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum in the Navasota ISD can be dealt with through the utilization of a thorough public relations campaign. Detailed information on bond plans, individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum, and information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in NISD should all be spelled out well in advance through an active information campaign with the public. This campaign should be well

presented to as many community groups as possible. A speaker's bureau could be utilized to get the message out to as many groups as often as possible.

The opportunity to vote on more than one proposition is typically handled through the call for the school bond referendum. Community surveys or opinion polls should be conducted with an appropriate number of voters in order to determine the course of action in this area. Bond counsel can be of great assistance in deciding not only this decision, but whether or not to vote on a uniform or non-uniform election date.

Research Question #3

Research Question Three asked, Did selected demographic variables of the selected voters impact the successful passage of the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum in the Navasota Independent School District in Texas?

Findings. After a thorough review of the quantitative data collected through surveys of selected voters in the Navasota ISD, there was one finding which became apparent for research question #3. The factor currently having children in the district had a significant influence on voter opinion in the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum.

The factor currently having children in the district showed to be statistically significant through a Chi-square analysis of the factors. Piele and Hall (1973) found that parents of school age children have a high interest level when it relates to school bond issues. Parents of children in the school district are more likely to support bonds because their children will see a direct benefit from the new and improved

facilities (Theobold & Meier, 2002). The Chi-square value was 6.456 with a p value equal to .011 which showed to be significant. This did not show the strength of the significance which was found through a Phi analysis of the factor. The Phi value of this factor was 0.195, which is a value indicating a fairly weak strength of relationship between the factor and voter opinion. 62.6% of the voters who voted YES and 86.7% of the voters who voted NO did not have children in the December 11, 2004, school bond referendum. In the September 11, 2004, election, 33.3% of those who voted NO had students currently enrolled in the district. In the December 11, 2004, election, only 13.3% of those who voted NO had students currently enrolled in the district. There was a positive swing in the NO vote from parents of students currently enrolled in the district.

Implications for practice. Schools should be responsive to the needs and wants of parents in order to keep relationships from deteriorating (Brax, 1990) and to encourage their support in future school bond referenda. It appears in this referendum, that parents of school-age children held a significant key to the referendum's success. There was a difference in the NO vote of parents of currently enrolled school children of 20%. School administrators should give every effort to inform parents of school age children of the needs for new facilities. They should also be informed as to what will be done with bond proceeds should the referendum succeed. By inference, parents should be strongly encouraged to get out to vote in future referenda.

Recommendations

Data collection, analysis, and examination led the researcher to a series of conclusions. The following recommendations are based on those research results and they are presented with the hope that additional data will be gathered by others to test the validity of each suggestion.

Based on the Study

1. As the item analysis demonstrated a relationship between trust in the NISD school board and the success of the school bond referendum, districts should focus efforts on building trust between the board of trustees and the community.
2. As a relationship exists between the 1994 school bond referendum follow-through and the success of the school bond referendum, the district should strive to complete all projects as written—on time and on budget. This may act to ease the efforts required to pass future bond referenda.
3. The demonstrated relationship between detailed information on bond plans and the success of the school bond referendum should encourage district officials to make every effort in the future to get as much detailed information regarding bond plans to the public early and often in future bond referenda.
4. The relationship between individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum and the success of the school bond referendum shows that administrators should plan bond referenda around times of the year when many varied activities are occurring on campuses. These activities

provide opportunities for district officials to get factual information regarding bond plans into the hands of parents and others who may attend.

5. As a relationship exists between the opportunity to vote on more than one proposition and the success of the school bond referendum, district officials should work closely with bond counsel and the community planning groups to determine how the election should be formatted and presented.
6. The relationship between information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in NISD and the success of the school bond referendum should encourage administrators to work closely with the district's financial advisor and the campaign committee to disseminate accurate information to the voting public.
7. The demonstrated relationship between currently having children in the district and the success of the school bond referendum should cause district officials to focus efforts on getting information regarding bond plans to parents of school children. Officials should also make themselves available at school functions to answer factual questions regarding bond plans.

For Further Study

1. Survey instruments would be mailed to the random samples of voters within two weeks following the second bond election. It would be best to send the surveys between elections, but it would be difficult to ensure that surveys were sent to voters who participated in both elections. This would enrich the

data with information that is fresh in the minds of the voter as opposed to possible duplication of responses.

2. Data disaggregated by precinct could be reviewed thoroughly to determine whether or not there were differences in influential factors according to where a voter lived.
3. A mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods could be utilized. Interviews of selected voters could be conducted to add to the data collected through surveys. This would give voters an opportunity to respond to a question-and-answer segment that may reveal more than the simple survey instrument. This information could be used to guide a school district in future bond referenda planning.
4. A more extensive study of the NO vote for each election could be conducted. This would require an expanded sample size and an instrument specific to the NO vote. This type of survey could reveal information useful in swaying the NO vote to become a YES in future school bond referenda. Personal interviews would also prove to be productive in this type of study as well.
5. It would be useful to utilize a more simple survey instrument. The survey instrument was confusing to some voters when using a five-category Likert-type scale on both elections on the same page. The five-category Likert-type scale could be changed to two categories, influential and not influential. This may help to provide more accurate information in future surveys.

REFERENCES

Angelo, J. M. (2002). District politics. *District Administration.* Retrieved September 24, 2002, from http://www.districtadministration.com

Balsdon, E., Brunner, E., 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.

Bohrer, S. (1998, May). *Politics of building or renovating rural school facilities*. Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on Rural School Facilities, Kansas City, Mo.

Bordelon, J. (2005, May 25). School bond failures. *News 8 Austin*. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from http://www.news8austin.com/content/top_stories/default.asp?arID=138063

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction (*5th ed.*).* New York, NY: Longman.

Borg, W. R., Gall, P. J., & Gall, M. D. (1993). *Applying educational research: A practical guide.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Boyle, L. (1984). *A study of variables related to successful and unsuccessful Minnesota Public School referenda elections in 1981 and 1982.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Brax, D. (1990). *Factors associated with passage or failure of local option budgets in Kansas school districts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS.

Cannon , T., & Koetter, B. (1992). *Going to the polls: A guide to successful school bond elections.* Austin, TX: Texas Association of School Boards.

Crader, A., Holloway, K., & Stauffacher, A. (2002, March). *Perceptions of successful strategies and passage of school bond issues.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Finance Association, Albuquerque, NM.

Fickes, M. (1998). The community use trend. *School Planning and Management*, *37*(1), 62-66.

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

Gamkhar, S., & Olson, J. (2004, Sept. 24). Gamkhar and Olson: Money for school facilities needs to be part of equation. *Austin American-Statesman*.

Hamel, G. (1984). Fairfax County loves its schools. *School Business Affairs*, *50*(2), 32, 50.

Holmes, N. (March, 2000). New GAO report finds construction expenditures grew 39 percent between 1990-1997. *AASA Leadership News*. Retrieved October 2, 2004, from http://www.aasa.org/leadershipnews.htm

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

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1987). *Handbook in research and evaluation (2nd ed.).* San Diego, CA: EdITS Publishers.

Joyner, A. (2004). *A billion-dollar building boom*. Education Vital Signs 2004, special report of the American School Board Journal, Alexandria, Va.

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

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational Research and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 55-57.

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

Lipinski, S. J. (1992). *A comparative study of voter approval/disapproval of the school income tax in four Ohio school districts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, Akron, OH.

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

Lyons, J. (2001, November). *Do school facilities really impact a child's education*? A CEFPI Brief on Educational Facility Issues. Scottsdale, AZ: Council of Educational Facility Planners International.

MacManus, S. (2001). *On equal terms: The constitutional politics of educational opportunity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mancini, D. (1987). *A study of variables related to successful and unsuccessful school tax referenda in Ohio*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, Akron, OH.

Neeley, S. (2004, November). *The state of education in Texas.* Speech presented at the Commissioner's Cabinet of Superintendents, Austin, TX.

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

Neiman, B. (1990). *Building an optimum marketing and public relations model for school tax referenda campaigns.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO.

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. (1998). *Planning successful bond campaigns.* Raleigh, NC: Author, Division of School Support.

Nunnery, M., & Kimbrough, R. (1971). *Politics, power, and school elections.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Piele, T. N., & Hall, J. (1973). *Budgets, bonds, and ballots: Voting behaviors in school financial elections.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Press.

Pulliam, T. N. (1983). *A study of selected factors associated with the success or failure of school bond issues in the state of Georgia during the decade of the 1970s.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Atlanta.

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

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

Spoor, D. (1998, December). Facing challenges. *American School and University*. Retrieved January 27, 2005, from http://asumag.com/mag/university_facing_challenges

Stanley, C. (1986). How to win next time: Public relations and school bond issue elections. In J. J. Lane (Ed.), *Marketing techniques for school districts*. Reston, VA: Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada.

Stockton, D. (1996). *Influences contributing to the successful passage of a school bond referendum in the Conroe Independent School District*. Unpublished record of study, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.

Surratt, J. E. (1987, February). *Passing a bond issue*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA.

Taylor, L., Barrineau, S., Barron, L., Fiebig, M., Forbey, S., Gray, J., et al. (2005). *Meeting needs? A survey of school facilities in the State of Texas.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M University, Bush School of Government and Public Service.

Texas Bond Review Board. (2004). *Texas bond review annual report.* Retrieved on July 12, 2005, from http://www.brb.state.tx.us/agency/publications.html

Texas Education Agency. (2005). Final DPV03. Retrieved on November 21, 2005, from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/school.finance/funding/dpv03_final.xls

Texas Education Code. (2005a). Chapter 28 § 28.0211. Retrieved on July 12, 2005, from http://capitol.state.tx.us./statutes/ed.toc.htm

Texas Education Code. (2005b). Chapter 39 § 39.021. Retrieved on July 12, 2005, from http://capitol.state.tx.us./statutes/ed.toc.htm

Texas Education Code. (2005c). Chapter 41 § 41.002. Retrieved on July 12, 2005, from http://capitol.state.tx.us./statutes/ed.toc.htm

Texas Education Code (2005d). Chapter 45 § 45.0031. Retrieved on July 12, 2005, from http://capitol.state.tx.us./statutes/ed.toc.htm

Texas PR Express. (2004, February). *Texas Association of School Boards*, 1-3.

Texas Tax Code, (2004). Chapter 11 § 11.26. Retrieved on July 12, 2005, from http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statues/tx.toc.htm

Theobold, N., & Meier, K. (2002, April). *The politics of school finance: Passing school bonds*. Paper presented at the annual National Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, IL.

Thompson, R., & Hartley, C. (1991, June). Winning taxpayers' support. *Building Education,* A5-A7.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (2000, March). *School facilities: Construction Expenditures have grown significantly in recent years* (Publication No. GAO/HEHS-00-41). Retrieved January 29, 2005, from http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO/HEHS-00-41

Vital signs: Buildings and bonds. (1995). *American School Board Journal, 182*, A10-A29.

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

West Orange-Cove Consolidated ISD v. Neeley, No. GV-100528 (Tex. 250th Judicial Court, November 30, 2004).

Wolfinger, R., & Rosenstone, S. (1980). *Who votes?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (1997). *The political dynamics of American education.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Wood, W. (1990). *A comparison of selected variables in successful and unsuccessful general obligation bond elections campaigns in selected Unified School Districts in the State of California.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

Zakariya, S. B. (1988). Construction is a hot, new board game with complex rules and gigantic stakes. *American School Board Journal*, *175*(4), 27-30.

APPENDIX A

NAVASOTA ISD SCHOOL BOND REFERENDUM SURVEY

Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum Survey

The Navasota Independent School District (NISD) is interested in receiving feedback concerning the September 11th and December 11th, 2004 School Bond Referendum.

Your response will assist the NISD in planning for future construction, additions, and improvements. All responses will be kept confidential.

Voting Precinct_____

Please circle the appropriate statement.

1. I have resided within the NISD for:
   a. less than five (5) years b. five (5) or more years

2. I have children in NISD
   a. YES b. NO

3. I have children who formerly attended NISD:
   a. YES b. NO

4. In the September 11, 2004, NISD School Bond Referendum, I voted:
   a. YES b. NO

5. In the December 11, 2004, NISD School Bond Referendum,

   On Proposition 1 (elementary schools), I voted:
   a. YES b. NO

   On Proposition 2 (high school gym & cafeteria), I voted:
   a. YES b. NO

   On Proposition 3 (stadium relocation), I voted:
   a. YES b. NO

Navasota ISD School Bond Referendum Survey

Please rate the influence of each of the twenty-eight items below based on your perceptions in the September 11 and December 11, 2004 election. Please circle the number which reflects the amount of influence of each item.		September 11, 2004 (1 Proposal ($25 million))					December 11, 2004 (3 Proposals ($18, $5, & $2 million))				
		Strong Positive Influence	Moderate Positive Influence	Neutral	Moderate Negative Influence	Strong Negative Influence	Strong Positive Influence	Moderate Positive Influence	Neutral	Moderate Negative Influence	Strong Negative Influence
1.	Early voting opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Children in NISD	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Children formerly in NISD	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4.	NISD Facility Planning Committee	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
5.	"Vote for Schools Committee"	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
6.	NISD employee participation in bond campaign	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Trust in NISD school board	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Signs of support in yards	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Parental participation in bond election	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Population growth in NISD	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
11.	Past NISD tax cuts	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
12.	NISD long range plans	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Trust in NISD Admini-	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

	stration										
14.	Community participation in bond election	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Detailed information on bond plans	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Focus on the needs of all of the NISD students	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Information comparing surrounding school districts' tax rates	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Trust in NISD	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
19.	1994 School Bond Referendum follow-through	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Information on the cost of the tax increase for the average home in the NISD	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
21.	Conse-quences of failed bond referendum	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
22.	Individual campus activities promoting needs for the passage of the bond referendum	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
23.	Government compliance issues (i.e. ADA requirements, etc)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
24.	Previous cost cutting measures in NISD	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
25.	Other issues on same voting day (ie. Hospital district)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
26.	Informative	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

	Town Hall meetings										
27.	Opportunity to vote on more than one proposition	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
28.	Trust in NISD teacher	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any additional issue(s) and/or item(s) that influenced your vote in the September 11 and the December 11, 2004, NISD School Bond Referendum on the back on this survey.

VITA

David Jerome Faltys
711 Aberdeen Way
Southlake, TX 76052

Education

2006 Doctor of Education, Educational Administration, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

1999 Master of Science, Educational Administration, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

1987 Bachelor of Science, Physical Education, Texas A&M University, Kingsville, TX

Certifications (State of Texas)

Standard Superintendent
Professional Mid-Management (Life)
Professional Secondary Life-Earth Science (Life)
Professional Secondary Science Composite (Life)
Professional Secondary Physical Education (Life)

Experience

2006-Present Superintendent, Carroll ISD, Southlake, TX

2003-2006 Superintendent, Navasota ISD, Navasota, TX

2001-2003 Principal, Navasota HS, Navasota ISD, Navasota, TX

1999-2001 Principal, Carver Learning Center, Navasota ISD, Navasota, TX

This record of study was typed by Bill A. Ashworth, Jr.