DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 834 RC 016 648

AUTHOR Meehan, Merrill L.; DeYoung, Alan
TITLE A Demographic Study of Rural, Small School Districts in Four Appalachian States. Occasional Paper 025.
INSTITUTION Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 87
CONTRACT 400-86-0001
NOTE 130p.
AVAILABLE FROM Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc., P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325 ($11.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Consolidated Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure per Student; Literature Reviews; Rural Population; *Rural Schools; Rural to Urban Migration; *School Demography; School District Size; *Small Schools; Statistical Surveys; Student Transportation
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachia; Conant (James Bryant); Rural Education Association; *Small School Districts

ABSTRACT

Data gathered from a review of the literature, state department of education personnel, and directories of school districts are used to report on small school districts in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia. Enrollment size of school districts, expenditures per pupil, transportation costs per pupil, and student density were computed for the study area. Only student density proved a useful index to rurality. The review of the literature notes that educational research has shown an urban bias and that problems and strengths of rural schools has been researched outside of the educational research community. Other discussion notes that further research should seek to develop data on family income and building-level enrollment. Statistical information is presented in 47 tables and 93 references are appended to the review of the literature. (SKW)

Occasional Paper 025:

A Demographic Study of Rural, Small School Districts in Four Appalachian States

by Merrill L. Meehan and Alan DeYoung

November 1987

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) is located in Charleston, West Virginia. Its mission is to work with the Region's educators in an ongoing R & D-based effort to improve education and educational opportunity. To accomplish this mission AEL will work toward:

- the improvement of professional quality,
- the improvement of curriculum and instruction,
- the improvement of community support, and
- the improvement of opportunity for access to quality education by all children.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by contacting the Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Post Office Box 1348, Charleston, West Virginia 25325.

This publication is issued in draft form for developmental purposes.

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number 400-86-0001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to create a status report on the rural, small school districts in the four Appalachian Region states of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. Data were gathered from an extensive review of the literature, state department of education personnel, and state-prepared directories of school districts.

The review of the literature reported that, nationally, almost two-thirds of all school districts, half of all public schools, and one-third of all classroom teachers exist in rural areas of the United States. However, research on the particular problems, issues, and trends in rural and small schools of the United States is relatively scarce and lacking sophistication.

State directories listed 123 school districts in the four Appalachian states with total school enrollments of less than 2,000 students. However, it is not easy to determine which school districts are both rural and small when total school district enrollment figures are used. Many of the small district enrollments are independent school districts in large townships, towns, or cities in the AEL Region. Expenditures per pupil also were computed for all the school districts in the Appalachian states. However, this proved unreliable as an index of ruralness. Another possible index of rurality was then examined—transportation costs per pupil. This factor proved misleading as a simple-to-use predictor of ruralness, because the independent school districts often had high transportation costs even though they were located in more urban settings.

Finally, a students-per-square-mile figure was computed for the school districts in the AEL Region. This proved to be a useful index of rurality. This new index of ruralness is seen as the major contribution of this study.

Recommendations for further research were for the collection, display, and analysis of building-level enrollment data for the schools in the four Appalachian states.

INTRODUCTION

The status of schooling in rural America, and more particularly in the AEL Region of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, is the subject of this study. It seems that for decades most people, especially urban people, thought it unnecessary to investigate rural schooling because the rural way of life was viewed as becoming increasingly obsolete and therefore unimportant. Consequently, scholarship on rural education fell behind that of other educational fields.

To remedy this problem, one essential first step is to build better empirical databases to help researchers and policymakers get some working notions of the nature of rural education. That is what we have commenced to do with this study of rural, small school districts in our Region. How many such districts are there? Where are they? What is their condition? How do you identify them and what definitions of ruralness and smallness do you use?

To answer these questions, a set of four general objectives guided the work of the AEL multistate study on rural, small school districts. The first objective was to collect, review, analyze, and synthesize contemporary literature on rural and small school districts. For example, much is said about small schools and their students, but what, exactly, is a small school? Is there an accepted definition of a small school? Ditto rural schools. What do authorities say and write on these topics? Can we synthesize their work?

The second objective of this study was to explore several indices of rural, small school districts; collect data on these indices from the four AEL state departments of education; and experiment with their utility in describing rural, small school districts in the AEL states. Examples of such indicators include enrollment, expenditures, students transported, transportation costs, and district size in square miles. After predicting what indicators might be useful, AEL staff collected such data with the help of key contacts in the states' departments of education. Staff then manipulated the data in order to see what it revealed about rural, small school districts. Based on these data manipulations, then, staff decided which indicators in which forms would be used to present the demographic data.

The third objective of the AEL study on rural, small school districts was to present this basic descriptive data on rural, small school districts in the AEL states. This was accomplished via a comprehensive set of tables which are included in the appendix to this report.

The fourth objective of the rural, small school districts study was to develop recommendations for future research or next steps to take. These recommendations are included at the end of this report.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

by Alan DeYoung
University of Kentucky

Almost two-thirds of all school districts, half of all public schools, and one-third of all classroom teachers exist in rural areas of the United States (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1980). At the same time, available literature on the status of rural and small schools suggests that they face numerous staffing, expenditure, and instructional problems frequently dissimilar to those in metropolitan America (Dunne and Carlson, 1981). This same literature, however, also clearly indicates that research on the particular problems, issues, and trends in rural and small schools of the United States is relatively scarce and lacking sophistication. The purposes of the following review are: to suggest why the current status of rural education studies is so underdeveloped compared to scholarship in other educational fields; to overview the several types of research on rural education previously undertaken; and to suggest the directions such work seems to be following at the current time.

The Urban Focus of 19th Century American Findings

During the past decade a number of historians have become interested in the lack of earlier scholarship on American rural education. The consensus from these quarters has been that rural education and research on issues and problems in rural schooling have been minimal because of an overemphasis on urban education. The focus of early school reform in the United States was, in essence, based on a notion that rural ways of life were and would become increasingly outmoded in an emerging fast-paced urban and cosmopolitan America (Sher, 1977; Tyack, 1974; Cubberley, 1914). In virtually every professional account of school reform in the early days of compulsory public education, rural methods of teaching, organizing instruction, and making decisions about school policy were characterized as without utility for the future.

Much of the mid-19th century school reform literature focused upon ways of coordinating and administering education in urban environments. Leaders of school improvement during this period were urban school superintendents whose careers essentially depended upon the bureaucratization and professionalization of education in the cities like Philadelphia, Boston, Louisville, and New York (Tyack and Hansot, 1982; Perkinson, 1968). Models of rural education in fact became the primary enemy of many 19th century school reformers, who argued that the politics, inefficiency, and uncoordinated curricular characteristics of rural schools could never serve as a model for the institutionalization of public education in the United States. Because America's cities were quickly becoming inundated with throngs of new immigrants, because new technologies were emerging in the workplace that demanded different types of vocational skill teaching, and because advances in the "science" of administration clearly showed the inefficiency of parent control of educational policy, proponents of schooling structures and procedures that had worked earlier in rural settings were quickly outflanked by city school superintendents who argued that they had a better way.

Supporters of autonomous rural schools outside of America's urban areas also suffered defeat once urban reformers began to organize and/or infiltrate state departments of public education. Proponents of educational means and ends associated with rural education, termed "democratic localists" by Katz (1977), were virtually overwhelmed by the "founding fathers" of public education in the late 19th century. As he argues:

> The conflicts between the democratic localists and the bureaucrats often assumed the atmosphere of an undeclared guerilla war of sabotage and resistance, as local school districts refused to comply with state regulations and parents refused to cooperate with the state's representative, the teacher. Insofar as most of the resistance came from inarticulate people, it is the hardest and most maddening aspect of 19th century educational history to document. That it existed is, however, beyond doubt, as the frustrated testimony of local and state reformers testifies in almost every document they wrote (p. 394).

The Re-creation of Community in 20th Century Urban Settings

By the beginning of the 20th century, many Americans had become convinced not only that the future of the country depended upon its movement towards an urban setting, but also that the leaders of most of its public institutions (including the school) were solving the problem of how to organize and administer their operations. For many American educators, the educational problem of the 20th century was the urban problem. As educational reformers like John Dewey and I. W. Howerth argued, progress in education depended upon the re-creation of community in America's urban areas for the multitude of children who had never experienced its many benefits (Perkinson, 1968). While the old rural villages in America would continue to decline in the face of the advances in science and industrialization, the practical, moral, and applied experiences of community vocational and moral life, which rural living earlier provided children, needed to be incorporated and, in fact, made central in the mission of 20th century schools. As Dewey phrased it in 1899:

> At present, concentration of industry and division of labor have practically eliminated household and neighborhood occupations—at least for educational purposes. But it is useless to bemoan the departure of the good old days of children's modesty, reverence, and implicit obedience, if we expect by exhortation to bring them back. It is radical conditions which have changed, and only an equally radical change in education suffices... To do this means to make each one of our schools an embryonic community life, active with types of occupations that reflect the life of the larger society and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history, and science (Archambault, 1964, pp. 229, 310).

Rural schooling then was found inadequate by various spokespersons favoring the "new" education by the turn of the century. The "administrative progressives" found rural schools poorly organized and inefficiently administered, and curricular progressives found the haphazard focus on works of Western civilization not vocationally or scientifically sound enough for the future roles rural students would later play in whatever community and national contexts they might end up in.

Educational Research and Educational Policy in the Early 20th Century

By current standards, most of the policy discussions and decisions regarding rural and small schools in much of the 20th century were not guided by empirical research, but came as the result of convictions held by state departments of education about making rural districts more professional, efficient, and, in many cases, vocationally relevant (Rosenfeld and Sher, 1977). Perhaps the earliest forms of what scholars would not recognize as educational research on specific rural schooling problems were the "school surveys" of the early 20th century. These statistical profiles were typically used by educational reformers not to improve directly rural and small schools, but rather to document their comparatively inferior status and to help bring them under the control of state superintendents of education (e.g., Ayres, 1912; Judd, 1911). Many professional educators during this period called for and achieved reform in the professional training of teachers and school consolidation, the latter of which would ostensibly allow for more efficient use of financial resources and the age grading of students (DeYoung and Boyd, 1987; Tyack and Hansot, 1982).

Small schools in particular were often targeted for reform during this and subsequent periods, not necessarily because they were shown deficient pedagogically, but because they were assumed to be less intellectually stimulating environments and certainly were less desirable administratively and financially.

> [The] movement to take control of the rural common school away from the local community and to turn it over to the professionals was part of a more general organizational revolution in American education in which laymen lost much of their direct control over the schools. In the cities schoolmen pioneered new bureaucratic patterns of educational organization. They [also] sought to "free education from politics" by coercing rural communities to consolidate schools. From 1910 to 1960 the number of one-room schools declined from approximately 200,000 to 20,000 (Tyack, 1974, p. 25).

In addition to school surveys, which typically were coordinated by state and/or district superin-

tendents and used to centralize and expand bureaucratic operations, three other types of educational research were prominent during the first 50 years of the 20th century. The first type focused upon ways of actually making schools more administratively efficient and bureaucratic as desired by state and district superintendents. Such research was basically comprised of estimates for needed facilities coupled with projections of necessary staff increases to keep up with growing enrollments (Tyack and Hansot, 1982). Relatedly, the second type was quasi-empirical accounts of innovative techniques in cost-effective materials and supervision practices, sponsored by educational professionals convinced that the future of school improvement lay in improved management techniques (Callahan, 1962). And finally, the field of eugenics had an interest in the rural school populations of several small isolated regions of the United States. The majority of scholars writing in this field were convinced that many rural schools (particularly southern ones) were heavily populated by cognitively deficient children whose parents had not been smart enough or fortunate enough to leave the decaying countryside for the more lucrative and stimulating environments of America's cities. Because many rural children scored poorly on early standardized tests of ability, such data were typically cited as further evidence that not only were many of America's rural residents lacking in intelligence, but that rural life patterns that were not "upgraded" by the intervention of outside influences would continue to erode in the future (e.g., Hirsch, 1942; Key, 1932; Silver and DeYoung, 1985).

School and Community Studies in the "Nonprofessional" Literature

As this review so far indicates, educational research into the particular problems and needs of America's rural and small schools was almost nonexistent well into the 20th century, because the development of American education as a whole was built upon the assumption that schools of the future would continue to become larger and more metropolitan. To be sure, some educators had called for new ways of researching and improving rural education earlier in the century, but typically found their efforts frustrated at the national level by politicians unwilling to interfere with state's rights in this area (Ravitch, 1983).

On the other hand, there have been several types of important research on issues, problems, and strengths of rural schools which originated outside of the educational research community but which anticipated some of the current wave of interest in rural education. In particular, the field of community studies became prominent in the 20s and 30s, and more academic interpretations of the centrality of the public school in the lives of continuing rural communities have been made by numerous social historians and community sociologists. The integrity of local communities and the importance of the local school as a key institution in its identity, for example, became a theme in several classic sociological investigations of the 30s and 40s in the United States (Lynd and Lynd, 1937; Warner and Lunt, 1941). Several more recent works focusing upon the importance of the local school as a community resource have enhanced the social scientific interest in this perspective (e.g., Peshkin, 1978; Wigginton, 1985).

In addition, a number of historians have retold the story of the battle over school consolidation as seen from the perspective of local populations. Wayne Fuller (1982), for example, has shed much light on how rural midwestern schools earlier in this century attempted to adapt and accommodate urban reform models without completely giving up local autonomy. Importantly, the strengths, weaknesses, and problems encountered along with the solutions attempted by the protagonists in Fuller's book (and others) are frequently the same ones talked about in current descriptions and proposals for rural school enhancement and research. In a sense, then, the significance and importance of the rural school in American history seems to have been first rediscovered academically by scholars *outside* of the educational R & D tradition. This interest continues today.

The Current Status of Rural Education Research

As suggested to this point, there currently exists an urban bias to most available education research in the United States, and for that matter, around the world (Darnell and Simpson, 1981; Sher, 1981; Nash, 1980). Another continuing problem with much of the domestic scholarship on rural and small schooling stems from the relative newness of educational research itself related to

policy interests. In essence, the R & D focus of most current educational scholarship has only emerged during the past 30 years. It was first concerned with national security interests, followed by equality of educational opportunity issues most apparent in America's metropolitan areas (Karabel and Halsey, 1977; Perkinson, 1968; Ravitch, 1983). Thus, even when statistical data on American schools became more readily available to educational researchers, and state and federal monies became more available for studies of schools' functioning, national and metropolitan research questions dominated most educational agendas at least in the 1970s.

Current interest in the particular problems and possibilities of rural education seems to have come about for at least four reasons. Initially, it has become apparent to educational policymakers that even though significant out-migration from farms and small towns has occurred during the past century, such trends have slowed greatly during the past two decades, and, in some cases, been reversed (Beale, 1975; Sher, 1981). Thus, all rural schools and their particular problems will not completely disappear in the foreseeable future. In addition, concern over equality of educational opportunity in rural areas became an important issue in the 1970s. A growing body of literature suggests that problems of minority and special-needs rural students have not been adequately addressed by urban-based models of service delivery (Fratoe, 1980; Helge, 1981; Massey and Crosby, 1983). Also, much of the current "effective schooling" research suggests that the conventional wisdom about bigger schools being better schools and centralized staffing patterns working best may be spurious (Goodlad, 1984; Sher, 1986). And finally, the current interest in improving rural education as an aid to stimulating statewide economic development seems related to more concerted efforts among many states to upgrade rural schools (Rosenfeld, 1983; DeYoung and Boyd, 1987).

The current era of scholarship on rural education issues was ushered in by the work of Jonathan Sher and several of his colleagues in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Sher, 1977, 1978, 1981). Perhaps the landmark book on the overlooked importance of rural education and the lack of relevant scholarship in this area was Sher's edited collection of 1977, provocatively titled *Education in Rural America: A Reassessment of Conventional Wisdom*. The book's major accomplishment was not to document all that is known about the strengths and weaknesses of rural schools, but instead to show that policymakers and researchers actually knew very little about rural education in the United States due to what at least one article called the "urbanization of rural schools" (Rosenfeld and Sher, 1977). Other chapters of the Sher book explored several fallacies of the conventional wisdom about rural schools by: documenting the myth of economy, efficiency, and equality supposedly brought to rural regions of the country by school consolidation and centralization efforts (Sher and Tompkins, 1977); examining both the conceptual weaknesses and benefits associated with rural and small schools (Dunne, 1977); and questioning the belief that increased financial support of rural schools leads to the erosion of local autonomy in school decisionmaking (Tompkins, 1977). Also included were several case studies illustrating the politics of school reform and the importance of understanding class conflict in rural educational issues (Weaver, 1977; Rosenfeld, 1977). The final two chapters in the Sher volume argued for new research and action agendas that would go "beyond the conventional wisdom" and included his proposals for both types of endeavors.

The scholarship that has emerged on rural education during the past few years can be put into three interrelated categories. These include: attempts to conceptually and/or empirically define or construct general research agendas for rural and small school education based on literature reviews and/or surveys of rural educators; research and commentary about the ongoing financial, curricular, and staffing problems many small schools are facing today in an educational environment driven by the needs of metropolitan school districts; and several attempts to discuss educational reform in the context of community economic development.

Efforts to Construct a Comprehensive Educational Research Agenda

Given that educational research and scholarship on rural education is in essence less than a decade old, it should be no surprise that extant works in this area are somewhat obscure, lacking in focus, and relatively unsophisticated by contemporary standards. And this phenomenon has led to several interesting discussions of what we do and

don't know about rural schools. Each discussion also typically contains proposals for remedying the situation. Stephens (1985), for example, made this assessment:

> ...When viewed as a whole, [this] literature is meager and much of it lacks sophistication. Moreover, there is not at present a body of research providing a comprehensive and inclusive view of rural education that even begins to approach that on education in an urban setting (p. 167).

To remedy the lack of quality research in this area, the same author suggests a number of strategies for its enhancement:

> Four initiatives are especially critical and are introduced here: development of a meaningful taxonomy of rural schools, support for university research centers, support for journals that specialize in reporting research and developments in rural education, and the establishment of a process for promoting initiatives judged by the profession to be vital (p. 170).

Most rural education researchers surveyed seem in agreement with Stephens that we don't know a whole lot about what works in rural education. To remedy this situation, many have argued that an essential first step in understanding the status of rural schooling lies in better empirical databases to help researchers and policymakers get some working notions of the nature of rural education. Another major stumbling block to understanding rural schools' operations seems to be their great diversity. According to Helge (1985):

> The diversity of rural school subcultures is significant. For example, the geographic range includes remote islands and deserts as well as small clustered communities; an economic range from stable classic farm communities to depressed lower socioeconomic settings and high growth "boom or bust" communities; and a range of population sparcity from one-room school districts to schools located in small clustered towns or surrounded by other small districts (p. 1-2).

One of the main problems in discussions of rural school research and policy involves a lack of consensus about appropriate definitions of rural education. For example, the National School Boards Association defines a district as rural if:

> It is located in a rural setting, or the student enrollment is 2,500 or less, or it's an intermediate or county unit that serves primarily rural units, or it encounters problems related to areas with population density of fewer than 1,000 (residents) per square mile.

On the other hand, the National Rural Development Institute defines a rural district as one where:

> ...The number of inhabitants is less than 150 per square mile or when located in counties with 60 percent of the population living in communities no larger than 5,000 inhabitants. Districts with more than 10,000 students and/or in (SMSA's) as defined by the Census are not considered rural.

Several ambitious studies have been mounted during the past five years in an effort to establish some baseline data on the form and functioning of rural and small schools (Dunne and Carlson, 1981; Helge, 1985; Hubel and Barker, 1986; Rosenfeld, 1981). The shared purpose of these comprehensive surveys was to look for common themes (as articulated by various school personnel) which might be used to construct rural education research and policy agendas, given earlier oversight and the geographical and financial differences between many rural school districts. Importantly, there seemed some consensus about these themes across the studies.

In 1983, Barker and Muse polled the research committee and executive board members of the Rural Education Association for their views on rural education research priorities. In order of ascending importance, responses to the nine most pressing types of questions as drawn from the literature were:

- the role of the school in rural development;
- assessment of rural school assumptions;
- school district governance and organization;
- rural school finance;
- federal, state, and local policies impacting rural schools and communities;
- taxonomy of rural education;
- curriculum and instruction;

- staff development and professional support; and
- rural school effectiveness.

Helge (1985) performed cluster analysis on questionnaires returned from 461 rural educators who had been asked to rate the importance of 46 types of rural research questions. The top eight clusters that emerged in her study, also presented here in ascending order, included:

- school-community interaction;
- personnel recruitment and retention;
- preservice preparation;
- field-based personnel preparation;
- teaching styles and initiatives;
- staff training and technology as a resource;
- governance and finance; and
- rural school effectiveness.

Hubel and Barker (1986) polled 752 superintendents from K-12 institutions containing fewer than 1,000 students. Although their return rate was rather low, several themes emerged from completed questionnaires. For example, the five top items suggested by respondents regarding what would constitute useful research included:

- studies which would focus on the strengths of small schools and how they seek to correct deficiencies;
- effective strategies rural schools use to stabilize revenue while operating on a small tax base;
- successful practices and programs in rural schools at both the elementary and secondary level that can be replicated;
- creation of new revenue sources and alternative funding formulas for rural schools; and
- characteristics of effective rural schools.

The Dunne and Carlson (1981) research was more extensive than either of the other efforts. It's focus was not on determining a research agenda for rural education, but rather upon the strengths and weaknesses of rural education around the country as perceived by over 1,000 teachers, administrators, and school board members. Their final report also included eight case studies of rural and small schools located in various parts of the country. In general, this study *did find* that many small and rural schools were strongly supported by their local communities, even more so than the national average. Also, three of the four greatest problems identified with public education around the nation were viewed as nonproblematic by respondents in the Dunne and Carlson study, emphasizing once again the distinctiveness of the rural and small school experience in the United States. On the other hand, their research did suggest that many small schools continuously wrestle with some of the staffing and financing themes expressed in each of the other studies.

The Problems and Opportunities of Rural Schools in the United States

Nationally published accounts on the strengths and weaknesses of rural school performance in the United States are virtually nonexistent. There seems to be a growing body of literature on rural and small school needs published in-house by research groups in several rural states, but most of the nationally available scholarship calls for more and better data-based studies on rural schooling dynamics. There is also a great deal of literature on administrative issues and problems in the operation of these institutions. Most of the themes seen in this literature are suggested in the surveys just discussed.

Some of the local calls for further study of rural and small schools echo the national interest in educational research. For example, effective schooling seems to rate high on the list of priorities of just about every rural education researcher and school professional. However, the Dunne and Carlson survey suggests that defining and improving school effectiveness may be even more difficult conceptually in rural and small schools than nationally because of the diversity of expectations rural residents seem to have for their schools, and because in many cases small schools were seen in their study to be performing well at a time when the general perception around the country was that small schools were not.

A number of researchers have also discussed the politics of education and school reform in its rural context. These researchers typically argue that the political factor needs much more attention in discussions of rural school reform than it does in

national school reform (Sher, 1983; Page and Clelland, 1978; Rosenfeld, 1977). Relatedly, the relationship between social class, economic development, and educational performance in rural schools has been highlighted as crucial to understanding the important variables related to rural school achievement by several authors (Weaver, 1977; DeYoung, 1985a).

By and large, specific research and policy questions that have been addressed in the rural education literature have focused on staffing, administrative, and financing problems. For example, a number of authors have discussed the difficulty of attracting, training, and rewarding rural school teachers. In general, these studies suggest that teachers choosing to teach in rural areas have somewhat different occupational interests, perceive characteristics of their teaching situations somewhat differently, and may need different types of occupational incentives to keep them on the job than do teachers in other types of districts (Massey and Crosby, 1983: Mathes and Carlson, 1986; Rottier, Kelley, and Tomhave, 1983; Reed and Busby, 1985). Part of the overall interest in the status of rural school teaching lies in several interesting discussions of teacher organizational and curricular competence. Some studies suggest that the rural school teacher may need much more awareness of school/community relationships and either more general curricular preparation and/or a second specialization in districts lacking enough separate curriculum specialists (Horn, Davis, and Hilt, 1985; Nachtigal, 1980).

Equality of educational opportunity is one very important theme throughout much of the literature on rural schooling. Part of this literature focuses on particular problems of educating various Black, migrant, Hispanic, and/or Indian populations primarily in the South, Southwest, or in Alaska (e.g., Chavis, 1979; De La Garza, 1979; Mack, 1979). Typically, work in this area focuses on discussions of cultural differences and their implications for alternative educational strategies, rather than upon conditions of ruralness per se. On the other hand, there is an argument in much of this literature that being a cultural minority in rural America may be more of a handicap than being a minority in urban America, in terms of special program availability (Fratoe, 1978; Hecht, 1981).

Several important educational "activists" in rural education seem to have been attracted to this area by what they perceive to be the inequality of educational opportunity afforded handicapped populations in rural schools (Helge, 1981; Huebner, Cummings, and McLeskey, 1985). Central to most of their discussions is the purported inability of some rural schools to deliver special services for the handicapped and/or other special-need student populations due to state and federal funding formulas which make diagnosis and intervention strategies difficult. That is, while mandated state and federal programs for special-needs children in metropolitan districts at least can be moderately successful when schools share or rotate specialists, isolated rural districts frequently cannot share resources nearly as effectively. Typically, scholarship on this theme then takes one of two forms, either discussions of staffing needs and problems or calls for creative funding to better facilitate the needs of rural special populations. For example, there are a number of studies that describe and discuss the "burnout" problems of specialists who attempt to do too much with inadequate resources in various types of rural school districts (Helge, 1981; Huebner and Huberty, 1984; McLeskey, Cummings, Huebner, and Waldron, 1983).

When special-needs students as a category encompass concerns over providing equality of educational opportunity to economically disadvantaged populations, even more rural educators seem to turn to discussions of difficulties of educational finance in their districts. As a number of researchers have pointed out, school expenditures and resources in many rural school districts have different patterns than in metropolitan districts. For example, because many rural districts contain disproportionate numbers of economically disadvantaged students and have fewer local resources for education, funding formulas for rural school districts frequently are complicated and the subject of continuing state department of education debate (Sher, 1986). As well, in some states actual expenditures for instruction in rural districts have been shown to be lower than expenditures in metropolitan districts (DeYoung, 1985b; Rosenfeld, 1981), while costs for transportation and capital outlay have been much higher (Tompkins, 1977). Still other research suggests that while rural schools in some states are disadvantaged by federal funding formulas for special projects, in other states rural schools seem at an advantage (Bass and Berman, 1979).

Attempting to provide equality of educational opportunity to comparatively disadvantaged rural schools then presents both practical and conceptual difficulty. Studies attempting to document statistically the best ways to finance economically disadvantaged rural schools have proven inconclusive due to the diversity of school funding patterns (Butler and Monk, 1985; Guthrie, 1979). For example, Rosenfeld (1981) argues that in most research on rural schools, patterns of rural student achievement and educational opportunity have been examined at the school district level. However, while districts in some primarily rural states follow county boundaries, in other states school districts are based on townships, and in others both types of districts exist. Noting that comprehensive educational research at the school building level has yet to be performed, he argues that at best we need to know much more about school building dynamics before sound rural school policies can be implemented. In the meantime, he finds ironic the fact that because some rural school districts cannot meet state and federal guidelines in some programmatic areas, they typically find consolidation into bigger units a necessary fact of life even though the surrounding community may feel that the existing school arrangement promotes their particular view of educational excellence.

The Continuing Debate Over Appropriate School Size

As indicated previously, the "bigger is better" theme in much of the earlier educational literature seems under attack at this time. Practically speaking, a number of studies have suggested that transportation and administration costs in many rural regions of the country tend to mitigate against school consolidation beyond a certain point. Webb (1979), for example, argues that:

> Studies relating to effective and desirable sizes of school districts indicate that school district size is not an absolute, that the "optimum" size will vary from state to state, and that size is but one of many factors related to educational quality and operational efficiency (p. 357).

Similarly, just as some states have begun to accept the limitations of school consolidation in terms of cost effectiveness, several important studies have suggested the pedagogical limitations of large schools. Perhaps the last important effort to prove that larger (secondary) schools were better schools was accomplished by James Conant in 1959. According to that work, more educative high schools were those whose graduating class had at least 100 students. As several authors have argued, however, the data Conant used to support this argument were suspect (Sher and Tompkins, 1977). Even were Conant correct about the minimum number of students and teachers necessary for a successful educational program, some have argued that his data could never be interpreted as evidence to support the establishment of schools with enrollments in the thousands, which school administrators frequently sought during the 1960s and 1970s (Goodlad, 1984).

At the same time, a number of educational psychologists have found smaller schools to be more satisfying and participatory institutions on some dimensions than large schools. Barker and Gump (1964), for example, demonstrated that smaller schools have students who engage more frequently as actors in the life of the school. In a more recent study, Lindsay (1982) found that students in smaller high schools were more satisfied with their schools and attended class more regularly than did their counterparts in larger institutions. In *A Place Called School*, John Goodlad included some discussion about size among the successful institutions he investigated. According to him:

> Most of the schools clustering in the top of our sample on major characteristics [of effective schools] were small, compared with schools clustered near the bottom. It is not impossible to have a good large school; it simply is more difficult... Surely any arguments for larger size based on administrative considerations are far outweighed by educational ones against large schools (pp. 309-310).

At least two of the most eminent scholars in rural education have defended the importance of small schools in rural America. Faith Dunne (1977), for example, points out that small classrooms with extensive community support and high teacher expectations and rapport have always been called in for the national literature on school reform. However, while her studies have found such attributes to be typical in rural schools, school administrators bent on consolidation during the past several decades conveniently have over-

looked these "pluses" in their efforts to centralize school curricula and staffing patterns. Bruce Barker (1986) has gone further than Dunne in arguing that many, if not most, of the new wave of proposed school reforms have been pioneered and proven in many rural schools in the United States, despite the efforts of mainstream educational theory throughout the years to abandon them. In his overview of small schools literature, he argues that such institutions are being rediscovered as models for effective schools, in terms of more individualized instruction, cross-age groupings, more supportive home-school relationships, and peer tutoring.

Currently, then, discussions of school size take on at least a three-dimensional flavor in the literature. There are some who suggest further study is necessary to disentangle the effects of size. Others argue that the politics of local vs. state control should be more central in professional discussions of school reform in a supposedly democratic society (Dunne, 1983). Yet, the majority of rural school educators seem more interested in overcoming administrative liabilities, which they see impeding their real and ongoing efforts to deliver educational services to rural children. The battle over funding formulas and local vs. state control of school policy has led to repeated calls among rural school administrators to discover creative ways to operate their schools in the face of federal and state mandates to guarantee equal educational opportunities in rural regions. Relatedly, the ability of rural and small schools to participate in special programs funded by the federal government also seems diminished primarily due to their size.

Thus, discussions of school size and the problems it engenders in the administration of rural public education seems a major political, as well as pedagogical, concern. We have reviewed the particular problems associated with educational staffing earlier and noted how prominent this concern has been in several comprehensive surveys. Just how significantly the issue of ruralness seems to be entwined with "problems" of smallness in American education is suggested by Rosenfeld in the following quote:

> Size, of course, has implications for the number of programs and courses that can be supported in an area. It is also a major determinant of qualification for federal programs and inclusion in federal data-gathering efforts. Many federal programs are targeted at population centers so that they may reach the maximum number of recipients. Consequently, many rural schools, districts, and counties are too small to be funded.

Education and Rural Development

A final and increasingly important area of interest in domestic and international scholarship on rural education is the role of the school in (1) vocational training and (2) local economic development. The first topic has been examined for several decades, while the second topic has been keen during the past few years. One reason for this interest seems to reside in the post high school opportunities of rural youth. Many of these youth apparently do not go on to college and instead seek vocational programs either in their high schools or in regional vocational education centers. Interestingly, many of the most widely recognized names in the scholarship on rural education have been interested in this particular area. Hobbs (1979), for example, described the success of rural schools in exporting skilled labor to urban areas early in the 20th century. At the same time, he argues, educational programs useful to America's farmers helped them usher in the age of mechanized farming upon which modernization has depended. As Fratoe (1979) points out, state and federal governments have been particularly active agents in rural education during the 20th century by sponsoring three types of training programs relevant to rural development. These have included: career and vocational programs sponsored by the Office of Eduation, several types of CETA programs targeted for various unemployed minority populations in rural areas, and various school extension programs (like 4-H) designed to focus on topics such as agriculture and home economics which frequently have not been part of the public school curriculum.

Rosenfeld (1983) and Sher (1977), on the other hand, have studied the decline of rural economies during the past decade and have proposed new ways to link public education to economic development. Rosenfeld, for example, argues that the two primary thrusts of occupational training during the past three decades currently have little utility in rural America. No longer, he suggests, can either vocational agriculture programs or indus-

trial education efforts be productive in the countryside, because mechanization has replaced most agricultural opportunities in rural America, and the textile, apparel, and metal fabrication industries are steadily leaving this country for overseas locations. Both Rosenfeld and Sher argue that the public school needs to become a site with specific economic development interests, in that the public school curriculum and/or its extracurricular focus should be on fostering local small business development projects in partnerships with local businesses or independently. While noting the possible political difficulties of achieving such programs in some rural communities, they also point out successful examples, such as Wiggenton's Foxfire Foundation, a student-run organization in northern Georgia with financial resources in the millions of dollars.

What We Don't Know and Would Like to Know About Rural Education

Most, if not all, of the scholars who work in the area of rural and small schools tend to agree on several issues. They all tend to agree, for example, that rural education in America has been a stepchild to other aims and interests of professional educators and researchers alike. Importantly, they also typically claim that administrative, curricular, and staffing solutions to educational problems in metropolitan America do not necessarily have utility for rural education. The variations in demographic, economic, administrative, vocational, and community needs existing in rural regions of the country demand more attention by educational researchers and policymakers if rural schools are ever to achieve their full potential.

Educational research on rural and small schools has been minimal and marginal, it has been argued, for several reasons. Historically, the expectation among educational professionals was that the demise of rural America and its schools was inevitable for a modern America. Subsequently, it was assumed that advances in curriculum and instruction based on social and administrative science would lead to one best system for all American schools. And when "full-blown" educational research and development efforts became important during the past 30 years in the United States, funded research focused primarily on problems of urban school districts.

Currently, the consensus among growing numbers of educational researchers and policymakers is that rural education deserves more attention than it has received historically. This is necessary, they claim, because we now know that rural areas of the country have different divergent needs and that past state and federal mandates have hindered as well as helped improvement of rural schools. Further, it is necessary because increasingly local, state, and federal governments are seeking to upgrade rural schools in efforts to attract and promote economic development.

For their part, educational researchers have begun to call for more and more sophisticated research on the particular issues and needs of rural schools. Noting that rural communities frequently find their schools more satisfactory than do metropolitan communities, and observing that smallness may facilitate rather than inhibit educational excellence, there seems renewed interest in the possibilities of rural and small schools as educational models. This renewed interest is clearly evident in the increasing number of published articles on rural education in mainstream educational journals and in the emergence of at least three new journals specifically related to rural education, including *Research in Rural Education*, *The Journal of Small and Rural Schools*, and *The Rural Educator*. As well, many states now have their own clearinghouses on rural education and research together with the federally-funded ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

As has been noted in this review, a research agenda is needed in the area of rural and small schools. In addition, increased state and federal funding for rural education research is of tantamount importance in attracting the kind of scholarly interest necessary to address adequately questions discussed in this review. There seems to be some agreement among scholars in this field that rural classrooms, schools, and school-community settings may be the most important units of analysis for study. As many of the educational excellence studies document, the diversity of classrooms within a school and of schools within a district suggests that smaller units of analysis may be more fruitful for social scientific inquiry. With a growing number of researchers interested in topics like those presented here, and an emergent interest in understanding educational dynamics at the classroom and building level, rural education researchers seem poised to answer a number of important educational questions that for too long have been of little interest to policymakers.

DEMOGRAPHIC INDICES: Method of Collection and Some Findings

Using insights gained from the literature review, advice from experts on rural, small schools, and suggestions elicited from the AEL Board of Directors, staff settled on four general areas for initial data collection: (1) simple school district name and location facts; (2) school district enrollment data including net enrollment, average daily attendance (ADA), and average daily membership (ADM); (3) student transportation figures including number of students transported and total transportation costs; and (4) expenditure data including total school budget. These items were selected as the first round indicators of how to describe rural, small school districts in a meaningful way for the AEL Region of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia .

Data Collection

Next, AEL staff developed a telephone protocol to aid AEL Board members in requesting all the desired data sets from contact persons suggested by the chief state school officers. The state-level contact persons were cooperative; staff received all the data in due time. The publications and documents containing the requested data are listed in the reference section. All four states sent a minimum of two formal, state-level statistically-oriented publications. In a few cases, especially related to ADM, the state personnel had to hand-calculate these data, and they were sent in the form of custom designed data displays and/or data tables. These, too, are listed in the reference section.

Stage three was data manipulation. Staff received school district net enrollment figures from all four states: three states sent figures for the 1984-85 school year and one was for the 1985-86 school year. Staff also received school district ADA data from all four states and ADM figures from three of the four states. A table of districts ranked by enrollment from lowest to highest was developed for each state individually. Then, the upper quartile of each state's list was drawn and reassembled into a separate data table.

Inspection of these student enrollment tables revealed that it was not easy to determine which districts were both rural and small when all the districts from a state are arrayed together. This is because many of the small district enrollments are independent school districts in towns, townships, and cities. Many of these are not rural at all. Thus, the decision was made to break each state's lists of districts into two lists--the "regular" county districts and the "independent" towns, townships, and city school districts. This was not done for West Virginia, where the county *is* the school district and, thus, there are no independent districts. Then, upper quartile lists of both the regular school districts and the independent school districts were drawn and displayed. All other tables were designed to utilize this "regular" and "independent" classification scheme and no other combined lists were designed.

In order to explore and compare the usability of other enrollment indicators, small samples of ADA data were drawn from each state's list and displayed. Visual comparison with the previously-developed net enrollment charts yielded no important differences. A similar process was completed for ADM data. Again, visual inspection yielded no important differences between the ADM and the net enrollment charts. Thus, based on the fact that the net enrollment data were easy to acquire and required no hand-calculations, it was decided to use it in data displays of rural, small school districts.

Similar manipulations were performed on the transportation data. Tables of total transportation costs and number of students transported were constructed for each state, ranking the regular and independent school districts from highest to lowest cost. The upper quartiles of all four states were aggregated and new tables were constructed to display the four-state data. The first two transportation data displays looked different enough to warrant further consideration. As a result, a new index of total transportation costs divided by total number of students transported was devised. This proved useful. State-specific data displays were constructed ranking the regular and independent school district transportation costs per pupil from highest to lowest. Then the upper quartiles of each state were drawn and a table of aggregated quartiles was constructed.

Expenditures-per-pupil tables were con-

structed next. Here, the total school district budget was divided by the net student enrollment number to obtain the figure. The tables were constructed by listing from the lowest to the highest. There were no further manipulations of this index available and the tables seemed useful, so they were retained.

The first round of indicators for describing the school districts of the four Appalachian states ended with the expenditures-per-pupil index. Upon inspection and reflection, this was not an ideal index to describe the rural, small school districts in the AEL Region. What was missing from the data displays was a sense of ruralness, or a feel for the density of the population in rural school districts of Appalachia. To obtain this density factor, the total square miles per each regular and independent school district was obtained. The number of students enrolled in the school district was divided by the number of square miles per district. This yielded a "students per square mile" index. This index was useful for describing the very rural school districts from the more urban school districts. Tables of students per square mile were constructed for the regular and the independent school districts in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia. Then, the upper quartiles for each list were computed and displayed.

Finally, some feel for summarizing all the individual indices was needed--a concluding set of tables. Consultation with others, including the staff of the Rural, Small Schools (RSS) program at AEL, concurred that the student enrollment data should be the first and organizing index on the summary tables and that all the other data should be arrayed against that first index. Also, RSS staff suggested that the upper quartiles only of enrollment be displayed in this fashion. Consequently, the upper quartile of the regular school districts in each state on enrollment data was constructed with the other three indices also listed (i.e., expenditures per pupil, transportation costs per pupil, and students per square mile). Next, the upper quartile of independent school districts in each state (except West Virginia) was constructed in a similar fashion.

Findings

Tables 1 through 10 present the data on public schools' net enrollment in the four AEL states. Each state, except West Virginia (in which the county unit *is* the school district unit), is presented in the order of: (1) all school districts together, (2) the regular school districts only, and (3) the independent school districts only. Tables 11 through 13 present upper quartile lists of student enrollment data in the order of all school districts combined, the regular school districts, and the independent school districts (the last minus West Virginia for the reason stated above).

Tables 14 through 20 present information on expenditures per pupil for each state by regular school districts first, followed by independent school districts (except West Virginia). Next, Tables 21 and 22 present upper quartile lists of school districts expenditures per pupil.

Tables 23 through 29 present information on transportation costs per pupil for each state by regular school districts first, followed by independent school districts. Table 30 displays upper quartile lists of regular school districts' transportation costs per pupil. Table 31 displays upper quartile lists of independent school districts' transportation costs per pupil for districts in the states of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Tables 32 through 38 present data on students per square mile for each state in the AEL Region by regular school districts first, then followed by independent school districts. Tables 39 and 40 display upper quartile lists of school districts' students per square mile for regular and independent school districts. This is the most useful index for displaying the ruralness of Appalachian school districts. Therefore, this is the chief contribution of this study.

Finally, Tables 41 through 47 display upper quartile lists of school districts by enrollment data first, and then by the other indices listed and displayed in all of the previous tables. For Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, the lists are for the regular school districts first, followed by the independent school districts. Of course, West Virginia lists only regular school districts, as in the above tables.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on an extensive review of the literature, and on an analysis of school district enrollment figures, transportation costs per pupil, expenditures per pupil, and students per square mile, certain conclusions can be drawn.

First, neither legislated mergers, consolidations, nor migration to the larger cities has caused the demise of the small school districts in these four Appalachian states. In fact, there are 123 school districts in AEL's four states with total school enrollments of less than 2,000 students each.

Second, not all school districts with small enrollments are rural. Many are independent school districts in large townships, towns, or cities. Only West Virginia is organized by county school districts. The three other states have school districts located within larger county districts. The result of this is that many nonrural, but small, school districts appear in the top quartile when all the districts in a state are ranked by student enrollment from lowest to highest. Kentucky is a good illustration of this. Nine of the first ten school districts are independent districts within counties.

Third, school district transportation costs per pupil are an imperfect index of "rurality." Again, the data are skewed by the independent school districts. Costly pupil transportation programs in independent districts head the lists in several states. The use of public conveyance (taxi cabs) for transporting a few special education students to special schools may be what inflates the costs in these districts. A check of the other relevant transportation data (buses owned by school districts, for example) confirms this.

Fourth, expenditures per pupil was another index of rural, small schools in Appalachia that was computed and displayed in appropriate tables. This index did prove useful in that it did show which districts spent more per pupil than other districts. However, this index was best viewed along with other tables because the costs may be inflated by high transportation costs. This becomes more evident when the two tables are inspected together for any one state or district.

Fifth, this AEL multistate study did not uncover any easy-to-find, easy-to-use index of rurality for school districts when using data conveniently available from the state departments of education. However, this multistate study did develop a useful index of rurality in the "students per square mile" index. This index did yield a sense of rurality in the school districts and this was confirmed when crossed with the enrollment data. Thus, this "students per square mile" index for each school district is seen as the major contribution of this study. This index should be used when describing rural, small school districts.

Sixth, this study used school *district* data. However, a richer, more useful picture of rural, small schools in the Appalachian states might be made from *building-level* data. Future steps should include obtaining these building-level data and mixing them into the group of measures of rurality.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on results of this multistate study, several recommendations for next steps can be made.

First, the school district names from this study should be compared to and checked against the 1980 Census list of school district names to discover all the changed district names. Calls to state department of education officers should be made to determine exactly what happened to districts on the 1980 Census list but not on the 1984-85 updated list of school district names. A record of these findings should be made for history's sake.

Second, another check for veracity of information could be made with other sources such as commercial marketing lists of school district names.

Third, some measure of family income should be incorporated into any final index of rurality.

Fourth, the identification and description of rural, small schools in Appalachia would be improved by including building-level enrollment data.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Archambault, R. (1964). John Dewey on education: Selected writings. New York: The Modern Library.

Ayres, L. (1912). A comparative study of the public school systems in the forty eight states. New York: Russell Sage.

Barker, B. (1986). The advantages of small schools. Las Cruces, New Mexico: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. ERIC Document ED 265 988.

Barker, B., & Muse, I. (1983, October). Research findings on K-12 and 1-12 rural school districts in the United States. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Education Association. Manhattan, Kansas. ERIC Document ED 234 973.

Barker, R., & Gump, P. (1964). Big school, small school. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bass, G., & Berman, P. (1979). Funding mechanisms and their effects on rural areas: An analysis of two federal programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 172 969.

Beale, C. (1975). The revival of growth in nonmetropolitan America. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Butler, R., & Monk, D. (1985). The cost of public schooling in New York State: The role of scale and efficiency in 1978-1979. Journal of Human Resources, 23(3).

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chavis, K. (1979). A perspective on delivering educational services to special populations: Black and other minorities. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 172 986.

Conant, J. (1959). The American high school today. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cubberley, E. (1914). Rural life and education: A study of the rural school problem as a phase of the rural life problem. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Darnell, F., & Simpson, P. (1981). Rural education: In pursuit of excellence. Nedlands, Western Australia: National Center for Research on Rural Education.

De La Garza, C. (1979). Equity for migrant children in rural areas. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 172 983.

DeYoung, A. (1985a). Economic development and educational status in Appalachian Kentucky. Comparative Education Review, 29(1), 47-67.

DeYoung, A. (1985b). Inequality in school revenues: Comparing school district expenditures and income sources in four rural states. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 5(2), 107-118.

DeYoung, A., & Boyd, T. (1987). Urban school reforms for a rural district: A case study of school/community relations in Jackson County Kentucky, 1899-1986. Journal of Thought (in press).

Dunne, F. (1977). Choosing smallness: An examination of the small school experience in rural America. In J. Sher (Ed.) Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Dunne, F. (1983). Good government vs. self government: Educational control in rural America. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 252-256.

Dunne, F., & Carlson, W. (1981). Small rural schools in the United States: A statistical profile. Washington, DC: The National Rural Center.

Fuller, W. (1982). The old country school: The story of rural education in the middle west. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fratoe, F. (1978). Rural education and the rural labor force in the seventies. Washington, DC: Economics, Statistics, and Cooperative Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Research Report 5.

Fratoe, F. (1979). Education training programs and rural development. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 172 967.

Fratoe, F. (1980). The education of nonmetro blacks. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economics, Statistics, and Cooperative Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Research Report 21.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Guthrie, J. (1979). Organizational scale and school success. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1(1), 17-27.

Hecht, K. (1981). The educational challenge in rural Alaska: Era of local control. In J. Sher (Ed.) Rural education in urbanized nations: Issues and innovations. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Helge, D. (198)1. Problems in implementing comprehensive special education programming in rural areas Exceptional Children, 50(4), 294-305.

Helge, D. (1985). Establishing a national rural education research agenda. Bellingham, WA: National Rural Development Institute.

Hirsch, M. (1942). An experimental study of the East Kentucky mountaineers. Genetic Monographs, 3(3).

Hobbs, D. (1979). Education in rural America: Object or instrumentality of rural development. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 172 966.

Horn, J., Davis, P., & Hilt, R. (1985). Importance of areas of preparation for teaching in rural/small schools. Research in Rural Education, 3(1), 23-29.

Hubel, K., & Barker, B. (1986). Rural education association research agenda report. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University.

Huebner, E., Cummings, J., & McLeskey, J. (1985). The delivery of quality assessment services to rural handicapped children. Research in Rural Education, 2(4), 151-154.

Huebner, E., & Huberty, T. (1984). Burnout among rural school psychologists. Research in Rural Education, 2(3), 95-99.

Judd, C. (1911). Summary of typical school surveys. Thirteenth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. (1977). Educational research: A review and interpretation. In J. Karabel & A. Halsey (Eds.) Power and ideology in education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1-86.

Katz, M. (1977). From voluntarism to bureaucracy in American education. In J. Karabel & A. Halsey (Eds.) Power and ideology in education. New York: Oxford University Press, 383-397.

Kentucky Department of Education. (circa 1985). 1985-1986 Kentucky School Directory, 53(14). Frankfort: Author.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1985). Profiles of Kentucky public schools: Fiscal year 1984-85. Frankfort: Author.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1985). Public school financial analysis: Fiscal year 1984-85. Frankfort: Author.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1985). Pupil transportation, tentative calculation: Fiscal year 1984-85. Frankfort: Author.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1985). Receipts and expenditures: Fiscal year 1984-85. Frankfort: Author.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1986). Kentucky CJC's school year directory, school year 1986-87. Shelton, CT: Market Data Retrieval.

Key, C. (1932). The intelligence of isolated mountain children. Child Development, 3.

Lynd, R., & Lynd, H. (1937). Middletown in transition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Lindsay, P. (1982). The effect of high school size on student participation, satisfaction and attendance. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, (Spring).

Mack, D. (1979). Education of Indian and Alaska native children in rural areas: New horizons? Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 172 973.

Martin, J., & Spar, M. (1981). Growth in Virginia 1970-1980, 1980 census analysis series, volume 1. Charlottesville: University of Virginia.

Massey, S., & Crosby, J. (1983). Special problems, special opportunities: Preparing teachers for rural schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 265-269.

Mathes, W., & Carlson, R. (1986). Conditions for practice: Why teachers select rural schools. Journal of Rural and Small Schools, 1(1), 25-28.

McLeskey, J., Cummings, J., Huebner, E., & Waldron, N. (1983). An administrative perspective on psychological services in rural school settings. Research in Rural Education, 2(2), 85-88.

Nachtigal, P. (1980). Improving rural schools. Washington: National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 192 922.

Nash, R. (1980). Schooling in rural societies. London: Methuen.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1980). Statistics of local public school systems. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Page, A., & Clelland, D. (1978). The Kanawha County textbook controversy: A study in the politics of lifestyle concern. Social Forces, 57(1), 265-281.

Perkinson, H. (1968). The imperfect panacea: American faith in education, 1865-1976. New York: Random House.

Peshkin, A. (1978). Growing up American: Schooling and the survival of community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade. New York: Basic Books.

Reed, D., & Busby, D. (1985). Teacher incentives in rural schools. Research in Rural Education, 3(2), 69-73.

Rosenfeld, S. (1977). Centralization versus decentralization: A case study of rural education in Vermont. In J. Sher (Ed.) Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rosenfeld, S. (1981). A portrait of rural America: Conditions affecting vocational education policy. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Rosenfeld, S. (1983). Something old, something new: The wedding of rural education and rural development. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 270-273.

Rosenfeld, S., & Sher, J. (1977). The urbanization of rural schools. In J. Sher (Ed.) Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rottier, J., Kelley, K., & Tomhave, W. (1983). Teacher burnout - small and rural school style. Education, 104, 72-79.

Sher, J. (1977). Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sher, J. (1978). Revitalizing rural education: A legislatures handbook. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Sher, J. (1981). Rural education in urbanized nations: Issues and innovations. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sher, J. (1983). Bringing home the bacon: The politics of rural school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 279-283.

Sher, J. (1986). Heavy meddle: A critique of the North Carolina Department of Instruction's plan to mandate school district mergers throughout the state. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina School Boards Association.

Sher, J., & Tompkins, R. (1977). Economy, efficiency, and equality: The myths of rural school and district consolidation. In J. Sher (Ed.) Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 43-77.

Silver, R., & DeYoung, A. (1985). The ideology of rural/Appalachian education, 1895 - 1935: The Appalachian education problem as part of the Appalachian life problem. Educational Theory, 36(1), 51-65.

Stephens, E. (1985). Towards the construction of a research and development agenda for rural education. Research in Rural Education, 2(4), 167-171.

Tennessee Department of Education. Tennessee square miles. Nashville: Author.

Tennessee Department of Education. (circa 1985). Annual statistical report of the department of education for the scholastic year ending June 30, 1985. Nashville: Author.

Tennnessee Department of Education. (circa 1985). 1985-1986 Tennessee directory. Nashville: Author.

Tennessee Department of Education. (circa 1986). Annual statistical report of the department of education for the scholastic year ending June 30, 1986. Nashville: Author.

Tennessee Department of Education. (1986). Tennessee CIC's school directory, school year 1986-87. Shelton, CT: Market Data Retrieval.

Tompkins, R. (1977). Coping with sparsity: A review of rural school finance. In J. Sher (Ed.) Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 125-155.

Tyack, D. (1974). The one best system. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Virginia Department of Education. (1984). Fall membership in Virginia's public schools 1984-85. Richmond: Author.

Virginia Department of Education. (1986). Facing up-20: Statistical data on Virginia's public schools, 1984-1985 school year. Richmond: Author.

Virginia Department of Education. (1986). Virginia CIC's school directory, school year 1986-87. Shelton, CT: Market Data Retrieval.

Virginia Department of Education. (1987). Facing up-21: Statistical data on Virginia's public schools, 1985-1986 school year. Richmond: Author.

Warner, W., & Lunt, P. (1941). The social life of a modern community. Vol. 1, "Yankee City Series." New Haven: Yale University Press.

Weaver, T. (1977). Class conflict in rural education: A case study of Preston County, West Virginia. In J. Sher (Ed.) Education in rural America: A reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 159-203.

Webb, L. (1979). Fiscal implications of school district reorganization. Journal of Educational Finance, (Winter).

West Virginia Department of Education. (circa 1985). Annual report, volume II: 1984-85 educational statistical summary. Charleston: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education. (circa 1985). Annual report, volume III: 1984-85 educational statistical summary. Charleston: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education. (circa 1985). West Virginia education directory, 85-86. Charleston: Author.

West Virginia Department of Education. (1986). West Virginia CIC's school directory, school year 1986-87. Shelton, CT: Market Data Retrieval.

Wigginton, E. (1985). Sometimes a shining moment. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Kentucky Total Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1985-86

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Campbell County, Southgate	160	1
Bracken County, Augusta	270	2
Hardin County, West Point	287	3
Jefferson County, Anchorage	298	4
Pulaski County, Science Hill	311	5
Campbell County, Silver Grove	313	6
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	354	7
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	363	8
Breathitt County, Jackson	368	9
Robertson County	424	10
Henry County, Eminence	532	11
Bell County, Pineville	547	12
Grant County, Williamstown	565	13
Fulton County, Fulton	651	14
Hopkins County, Dawson Springs	674	15
Mason County, Maysville	676	16
Webster County, Providence	683	17
Kenton County, Beechwood	684	18
Wayne County, Monticello	751	19
Boone County, Walton Verona	848	20
Greenup County, Raceland	869	21
Franklin County, Frankfort	879	22
Johnson County, Paintsville	887	23
Muhlenberg County, Central City	894	24
Lyon County	904	25
Boyd County, Fairview	927	26
Carlisle County	944	27
Madison County, Richmond	964	28
Whitley County, Williamsburg	1,007	29
Hickman County	1,009	30
Campbell County, Bellevue	1,022	31
Muhlenberg County, Greenville	1,027	32
Kenton County, Ludlow	1,028	33
Letcher County, Jenkins	1,033	34
Gallatin County	1,047	35
Madison County, Berea	1,080	36
Owsley County	1,102	37
Harlan County, Harlan	1,116	38
Menifee County	1,121	39
Fulton County	1,128	40
Barren County, Caverna	1,133	41
Cumberland County	1,213	42

Table 1 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Trimble County	1,238	43
Bracken County	1,240	44
Spencer County	1,302	45
Perry County, Hazard	1,330	46
Nicholas County	1,332	47
Bourbon County, Paris	1,364	48
Pike County, Pikeville	1,365	49
Calloway County, Murray	1,382	50
Campbell County, Dayton	1,383	51
Taylor County, Campbellsville	1,419	52
Nelson County, Bardstown	1,476	53
Elliott County	1,479	54
Wolfe County	1,494	55
Lee County	1,596	56
Logan County, Russellville	1,602	57
Crittenden County	1,636	58
Hancock County	1,662	59
Ballard County	1,678	60
Graves County, Mayfield	1,687	61
Livingston County	1,772	62
Clinton County	1,812	63
Washington County	1,841	64
Green County	1,857	65
Owen County	1,858	66
Carroll County	1,862	67
Garrard County	1,933	68
Pulaski County, Somerset	1,938	69
Bath County	1,942	70
Trigg County	1,973	71
Campbell County, Fort Thomas	2,001	72
Whitley County, Corbin	2,005	73
Henry County	2,014	74
McLean County	2,041	75
Todd County	2,056	76
Boyce County, Danville	2,076	77
Hardin County, Elizabethtown	2,098	78
Edmonson County	2,130	79
Larue County	2,243	80
Monroe County	2,307	31
Butler County	2,316	82
Fleming County	2,332	83
Webster County	2,365	84
Taylor County	2,391	85
Barren County, Glasgow	2,393	86
Bourbon County	2,427	87

Table 1 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Hart County	2,433	88*
Pendleton County	2,433	88*
Mason County	2,435	90
Caldwell County	2,438	91
Grant County	2,498	92
Bell County, Middlesboro	2,517	93
Morgan County	2,524	94
Powell County	2,556	95
Boyle County	2,578	96
Jackson County	2,595	97
Allen County	2,614	98
Russell County	2,693	99
Breckinridge County	2,694	100
Anderson County	2,746	101
Casey County	2,804	102
Adair County	2,826	103
Greenup County, Russell	2,877	104
Harrison County	2,949	105
Simpson County	3,014	106
Calloway County	3,065	107
Rockcastle County	3,071	108
Wayne County	3,091	109
Logan County	3,095	110
Union County	3,117	111
Lewis County	3,151	112
Estill County	3,158	113
Marion County	3,200	114
Lawrence County	3,228	115
Barren County	3,253	116
Magoffin County	3,325	117
Rowan County	3,362	118
Breathitt County	3,436	119
Woodford County	3,472	120
Martin County	3,492	121
Leslie County	3,552	122
Meade County	3,666	123
Nelson County	3,690	124
Campbell County, Newport	3,695	125
Warren County, Bowling Green	3,763	126
Boyd County, Ashland	3,811	127
Lincoln County	3,965	128
McCreary County	4,026	129
Grayson County	4,060	130
Graves County	4,061	131
Campbell County	4,158	132

Table 1 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Knott County	4,198	133
Scott County	4,226	134
McCracken County, Paducah	4,251	135
Montgomery County	4,383	136*
Greenup County	4,383	136*
Shelby County	4,478	138
Ohio County	4,493	139
Marshall County	4,654	140
Muhlenberg County	4,707	141
Whitley County	4,725	142
Daviess, Owensboro	4,711	143*
Bell County	4,711	143*
Johnson County	4,773	145
Boyd County	4,925	146
Clay County	5,184	147
Jessamine County	5,416	148
Letcher County	5,490	149
Clark County	5,503	150
Carter County	5,538	151
Knox County	5,746	152
Kenton County, Covington	6,379	153
Perry County	6,449	154
Franklin County	6,430	155
Oldham County	6,437	156
Pulaski County	7,016	157
Madison County	7,086	158
Harlan County	7,709	159
Henderson County	7,984	160
Laurel County	8,473	161
Hopkins County	8,554	162
Daviess County	8,913	163
Boone County	8,996	164
Warren County	9,721	165
Christian County	9,741	166
Floyd County	9,798	167
Bullitt County	10,577	168
Kenton County	11,172	169
Hardin County	12,062	170
Pike County	16,205	171
Fayette County	31,450	172
Jefferson County	95,161	173

*Denotes a tie.

Table 2

Kentucky Regular Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1985-86

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Robertson County	424	1
Lyon County	904	2
Carlisle County	944	3
Hickman County	1,009	4
Gallatin County	1,047	5
Owsley County	1,102	6
Menifee County	1,121	7
Fulton County	1,128	8
Cumberland County	1,213	9
Trimble County	1,238	10
Bracken County	1,240	11
Spencer County	1,302	12
Nicholas County	1,332	13
Elliott County	1,479	14
Wolfe County	1,494	15
Lee County	1,596	16
Crittenden County	1,636	17
Hancock County	1,662	18
Ballard County	1,678	19
Livingston County	1,772	20
Clinton County	1,812	21
Washington County	1,841	22
Green County	1,857	23
Owen County	1,858	24
Carroll County	1,862	25
Garrard County	1,933	26
Bath County	1,942	27
Trigg County	1,973	28
Henry County	2,014	29
McLean County	2,041	30
Todd County	2,056	31
Edmonson County	2,130	32
Larue County	2,243	33
Monroe County	2,307	34
Butler County	2,316	35
Fleming County	2,332	36
Webster County	2,365	37
Taylor County	2,391	38
Bourbon County	2,427	39
Hart County	2,433	40*
Pendleton County	2,433	40*
Mason County	2,435	42

Table 2 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Caldwell County	2,438	43
Grant County	2,498	44
Morgan County	2,524	45
Powell County	2,556	46
Boyle County	2,578	47
Jackson County	2,595	48
Allen County	2,614	49
Russell County	2,693	50
Breckinridge County	2,694	51
Anderson County	2,746	52
Casey County	2,804	53
Adair County	2,826	54
Harrison County	2,949	55
Simpson County	3,014	56
Calloway County	3,065	57
Rockcastle County	3,071	58
Wayne County	3,091	59
Logan County	3,095	60
Union County	3,117	61
Lewis County	3,151	62
Estill County	3,158	63
Marion County	3,200	64
Lawrence County	3,228	65
Barren County	3,253	66
Magoffin County	3,325	67
Rowan County	3,362	68
Breathitt County	3,436	69
Woodford County	3,472	70
Martin County	3,492	71
Leslie County	3,552	72
Meade County	3,666	73
Nelson County	3,690	74
Lincoln County	3,965	75
McCreary County	4,026	76
Grayson County	4,060	77
Graves County	4,061	78
Campbell County	4,158	79
Knott County	4,198	80
Scott County	4,226	81
Montgomery County	4,383	82*
Greenup County	4,383	82*
Shelby County	4,478	84
Ohio County	4,493	85
Marshall County	4,654	86
Muhlenberg County	4,707	87

Table 2 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Whitley County	4,725	88
Bell County	4,711	89
Johnson County	4,773	90
Boyd County	4,925	91
Clay County	5,184	92
Jessamine County	5,416	93
Letcher County	5,490	94
Clark County	5,503	95
Carter County	5,538	96
Knox County	5,746	97
Perry County	6,449	98
Franklin County	6,430	99
Oldham County	6,437	100
Pulaski County	7,016	101
Madison County	7,086	102
Harlan County	7,709	103
Henderson County	7,984	104
Laurel County	8,473	105
Hopkins County	8,554	106
Daviess County	8,913	107
Boone County	8,996	108
Warren County	9,721	109
Christian County	9,741	110
Floyd County	9,798	111
Bullitt County	10,577	112
Kenton County	11,172	113
Hardin County	12,062	114
Pike County	16,205	115
Fayette County	31,450	116
Jefferson County	95,161	117

*Denotes a tie.

Table 3

Kentucky Independent Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1985-86

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Campbell County, Southgate	160	1
Bracken County, Augusta	270	2
Hardin County, West Point	287	3
Jefferson County, Anchorage	298	4
Pulaski County, Science Hill	311	5
Campbell County, Silver Grove	313	6
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	354	7
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	363	8
Breathitt County, Jackson	368	9
Henry County, Eminence	532	10
Bell County, Pineville	547	11
Grant County, Williamstown	565	12
Fulton County, Fulton	651	13
Hopkins County, Dawson Springs	674	14
Mason County, Maysville	676	15
Webster County, Providence	683	16
Kenton County, Beechwood	684	17
Wayne County, Monticello	751	18
Boone County, Walton Verona	848	19
Greenup County, Raceland	869	20
Franklin County, Frankfort	879	21
Johnson County, Paintsville	887	22
Muhlenberg County, Central City	894	23
Boyd County, Fairview	927	24
Madison County, Richmond	964	25
Whitley County, Williamsburg	1,007	26
Campbell County, Bellevue	1,022	27
Muhlenberg County, Greenville	1,027	28
Kenton County, Ludlow	1,028	29
Letcher County, Jenkins	1,033	30
Madison County, Berea	1,080	31
Harlan County, Harlan	1,116	32
Barren County, Caverna	1,133	33
Perry County, Hazard	1,330	34
Bourbon County, Paris	1,364	35
Pike County, Pikeville	1,365	36
Calloway County, Murray	1,382	37
Campbell County, Dayton	1,383	38
Taylor County, Campbellsville	1,419	39
Nelson County, Bardstown	1,476	40
Logan County, Russellville	1,602	41
Graves County, Mayfield	1,687	42

Table 3 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Pulaski County, Somerset	1,938	43
Campbell County, Fort Thomas	2,001	44
Whitley County, Corbin	2,005	45
Boyce County, Danville	2,076	46
Hardin County, Elizabethtown	2,098	47
Barren County, Glasgow	2,393	48
Bell County, Middlesboro	2,517	49
Greenup County, Russell	2,877	50
Campbell County, Newport	3,695	51
Warren County, Bowling Green	3,763	52
Boyd County, Ashland	3,811	53
McCracken County, Paducah	4,251	54
Daviess, Owensboro	4,711	55
Kenton County, Covington	6,379	56

Table 4

Tennessee Total Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Carrol County	0	1*
Gibson County	0	1*
**Marion County, Richard	219	3
Crockett County, Bells	341	4
Carroll County, South Carroll	373	5
Crockett County, Alamo	415	6
McMinn County, Etowah	491	7
Hawkins County, Rogersville	568	8
Rhea County, Dayton	637	9
**Gibson County, Bradford	690	10
Pickett County	797	11
Henderson County, Lexington	806	12
Cocke County, Newport	820	13
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	864	14
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	904	15
Van Buren County	911	16
Anderson County, Clinton	924	17
Moore County	996	18
Tipton County, Covington	1,006	19
Perry County	1,065	20
Trousdale County	1,070	21
Carroll County, West Carroll	1,112	22
Coffee County, Manchester	1,226	23
Monroe County, Sweetwater	1,312	24
**Henry County, Paris	1,320	25
Blount County, Alcoa	1,346	26
**Scott County, Oneida	1,388	27
**Carroll County, McKenzie	1,397	28
Houston County	1,416	29
Hancock County	1,424	30
Lake County	1,428	31
Claiborne County	1,441	32
**Gibson County, Trenton	1,496	33
Jackson County	1,543	34
**Carroll County, Huntingdon	1,566	35
Meigs County	1,642	36
Stewart County	1,711	37
Bledsoe County	1,756	38
Loudon County, Lenoir	1,790	39
Crockett County	1,842	40
Lewis County	1,851	41
Cannon County	1,900	42

Table 4 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
**Gibson County, Gibson	1,937	43
Sequatchie County	1,941	44
Decatur County	2,033	45
McMinn County, Athens	2,054	46
**Gibson County, Milan	2,168	47
Roane County, Harriman	2,181	48
Chester County	2,277	49
**Wilson County, Lebanon	2,328	50
Obion County, Union	2,339	51
Union County	2,402	52
Carter County, Elizabethton	2,517	53
Gibson County, Humboldt	2,544	54
Smith County	2,556	55
De Kalb County	2,603	56
Fentress County	2,700	57
Benton County	2,708	58
Johnson County	2,780	59
Greene County, Greeneville	2,791	60
Hickman County	2,832	61
Polk County	2,870	62
Wayne County	2,877	63
Macon County	2,882	64
**Williamson County, Franklin	2,889	65
Grundy County	3,035	66
Unicoi County	3,071	67
Coffee County, Tullahoma	3,144	68
Scott County	3,183	69
Blount County, Maryville	3,185	70
Dyer County, Dyersberg	3,252	71
Humphreys County	3,253	72
Coffee County	3,258	73
Rutherford County, Murfreesboro	3,334	74
Grainger County	3,348	75
Overton County	3,422	76
Morgan County	3,437	77
Dyer County	3,447	78
Henderson County	3,483	79
Henry County	3,598	80
White County	3,663	81
Marshall County	3,765	82
Sullivan County, Bristol	3,766	83
Loudon County	3,974	84
Lincoln County	4,275	85
Hardin County	4,374	86
Rhea County	4,382	87

Table 4 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Hamblen County	4,387	88
McNairy County	4,467	89
Obion County,	4,572	90
Anderson County, Oak Ridge	4,599	91
Cheatham County	4,648	92
Haywood County	4,467	93
Bradley County, Cleveland	4,693	94
Giles County	4,709	95
Fayette County	4,839	96
Monroe County	4,848	97
Lauderdale County	4,908	98
Marion County	4,948	99
Cocke County	5,023	100
Hardeman County	5,139	101
Sullivan County, Kingsport	5,227	102
Weakley County	5,271	103
Hamblen County, Morristown	5,428	104
Washington County, Johnson	5,663	105
Bedford County	5,664	106
McMinn County	6,006	107
Cumberland County	6,018	108
Jefferson County	6,030	109
Franklin County	6,136	110
Tipton County	6,248	111
Madison County, Jackson	6,378	112
Dickson County	6,382	113
Lawrence County	6,573	114
Warren County	6,575	115
Roane County	6,677	116
Carter County	7,139	117
Robertson County	7,289	118
Anderson County	7,337	119
Greene County	7,409	120
Madison County	7,621	121
Hawkins County	7,825	122
Campbell County	7,871	123
Putnam County	8,380	124
Sevier County	8,539	125
Wilson County	9,174	126
Maury County	9,366	127
Bradley County	9,444	128
Washington County	9,684	129
Williamson County	10,052	130
Blount County	10,441	131
Rutherford County	15,293	132

Table 4 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Montgomery County	16,017	133
Sullivan County	17,935	134
Sumner County	18,904	135
Hamilton County	20,738	136
Hamilton County, Chattanooga	25,322	137
Knox County, Knoxville	26,699	138
Knox County	28,331	139
Shelby County	30,350	140
Davidson County	65,978	141
Shelby County, Memphis	112,915	142

*Denotes a tie.
**Denotes a special school district.

Table 5

Tennessee Regular Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Carrol County	0	1*
Gibson County	0	1*
Pickett County	797	3
Van Buren County	911	4
Moore County	996	5
Perry County	1,065	6
Trousdale County	1,070	7
Houston County	1,416	8
Hancock County	1,424	9
Lake County	1,428	10
Claiborne County	1,441	11
Jackson County	1,543	12
Meigs County	1,642	13
Stewart County	1,711	14
Bledsoe County	1,756	15
Crockett County	1,842	16
Lewis County	1,851	17
Cannon County	1,900	18
Sequatchie County	1,941	19
Decatur County	2,033	20
Chester County	2,277	21
Union County	2,402	22
Smith County	2,556	23
De Kalb County	2,603	24
Fentress County	2,700	25
Benton County	2,708	26
Johnson County	2,780	27
Hickman County	2,832	28
Polk County	2,870	29
Macon County	2,882	30
Unicoi County	3,071	31
Scott County	3,183	32
Humphreys County	3,253	33
Coffee County	3,258	34
Grainger County	3,348	35
Overton County	3,422	36
Morgan County	3,437	37
Dyer County	3,447	38
Henderson County	3,483	39
Henry County	3,598	40
White County	3,663	41
Marshall County	3,765	42

Table 5 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Loudon County	3,974	43
Lincoln County	4,275	44
Hardin County	4,374	45
Rhea County	4,382	46
Hamblen County	4,387	47
McNairy County	4,467	48
Cheatham County	4,648	49
Haywood County	4,467	50
Giles County	4,709	51
Fayette County	4,839	52
Monroe County	4,848	53
Lauderdale County	4,908	54
Marion County	4,948	55
Cocke County	5,023	56
Hardeman County	5,139	57
Weakley County	5,271	58
Bedford County	5,664	59
McMinn County	6,006	60
Cumberland County	6,018	61
Jefferson County	6,030	62
Franklin County	6,136	63
Tipton County	6,248	64
Dickson County	6,382	65
Lawrence County	6,573	66
Warren County	6,575	67
Roane County	6,677	68
Carter County	7,139	69
Robertson County	7,289	70
Anderson County	7,337	71
Greene County	7,409	72
Madison County	7,621	73
Hawkins County	7,825	74
Campbell County	7,871	75
Putnam County	8,380	76
Sevier County	8,539	77
Wilson County	9,174	78
Maury County	9,366	79
Bradley County	9,444	80
Washington County	9,684	81
Williamson County	10,052	82
Blount County	10,441	83
Rutherford County	15,293	84
Montgomery County	16,017	85
Sullivan County	17,935	86
Sumner County	18,904	87

Table 5 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Hamilton County	20,738	88
Knox County	28,331	89
Shelby County	30,350	90
Davidson County	65,978	91

*Denotes a tie.

Table 6

Tennessee Independent Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
**Marion County, Richard	219	1
Crockett County, Bells	341	2
Carroll County, South Carroll	373	3
Crockett County, Alamo	415	4
McMinn County, Etowah	491	5
Hawkins County, Rogersville	568	6
Rhea County, Dayton	637	7
**Gibson County, Bradford	690	8
Henderson County, Lexington	806	9
Cocke County, Newport	820	10
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	864	11
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	904	12
Anderson County, Clinton	924	13
Tipton County, Covington	1,006	14
Carroll County, West Carroll	1,112	15
Coffee County, Manchester	1,226	16
Monroe County, Sweetwater	1,312	17
**Henry County, Paris	1,320	18
Blount County, Alcoa	1,346	19
**Scott County, Oneida	1,388	20
**Carroll County, McKenzie	1,397	21
**Gibson County, Trenton	1,496	22
**Carroll County, Huntingdon	1,566	23
Loudon County, Lenoir	1,790	24
**Gibson County, Gibson	1,937	25
McMinn County, Athens	2,054	26
**Gibson County, Milan	2,168	27
Roane County, Harriman	2,181	28
**Wilson County, Lebanon	2,328	29
Obion County, Union	2,339	30
Carter County, Elizabethton	2,517	31
Gibson County, Humboldt	2,544	32
Greene County, Greeneville	2,791	33
**Williamson County, Franklin	2,889	34
Coffee County, Tullahoma	3,144	35
Blount County, Maryville	3,185	36
Dyer County, Dyersberg	3,252	37
Rutherford County, Murfreesboro	3,334	38
Sullivan County, Bristol	3,766	39
Anderson County, Oak Ridge	4,599	40
Bradley County, Cleveland	4,693	41
Sullivan County, Kingsport	5,227	42

Table 6 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Hamblen County, Morristown	5,428	43
Washington County, Johnson	5,663	44
Madison Coun'y, Jackson	6,378	45
Hamilton County, Chattanooga	25,322	46
Knox County, Knoxville	26,699	47
Shelby County, Memphis	112,915	48

**Denotes a special school district.

Table 7

Virginia Total Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1984-85

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Cape Charles Town	221	1
Fries Town	428	2
Highland County	455	3
Colonial Beach Town	489	4
Lexington City	499	5
West Point Town	703	6
Craig County	720	7
South Boston City	864	8
King and Queen County	987	9
Bath County	992	10
Rappahannock County	999	11
Norton City	1,020	12
Falls Church City	1,060	13
Surry County	1,133	14
Bland County	1,176	15
Middlesex County	1,184	16
Charles City County	1,199	17
Mathews County	1,205	18
Richmond County	1,247	19
Galax City	1,286	20
Covington City	1,323	21
Buena Vista City	1,350	22
King William County	1,391	23
Northumberland County	1,429	24
Cumberland County	1,470	25
Amelia County	1,498	26
Essex County	1,505	27
Manassas Park City	1,506	28
Clarke County	1,601	29
Lancaster County	1,617	30
Greene County	1,634	31
Radford City	1,681	32
New Kent County	1,763	33
Madison County	1,794	34
Goochland County	1,804	35
Sussex County	1,893	36
Franklin City	1,939	37
Floyd County	1,976	38
Westmoreland County	2,018	39*
Fluvanna County	2,018	39*
Grayson County	2,105	41
Nelson County	2,165	42
Powhatan County	2,208	43

Table 7 (continued)

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Buckingham County	2,217	44
Poquoson City	2,236	45
Fredericksburg City	2,266	46
Lunenburg County	2,275	47
King George County	2,290	48
Prince Edward County	2,390	49
Appomattox County	2,392	50
Northampton County	2,403	51
Charlotte County	2,415	52
Southampton County	2,510	53
Waynesboro City	2,528	54
Nottoway County	2,604	55
Brunswick County	2,802	56
Harrisonburg City	2,834	57
Colonial Heights City	2,898	58
Bristol City	3,022	59
Staunton City	3,034	60
Patrick County	3,049	61
Winchester City	3,070	62
Rockbridge County	3,086	63
Giles County	3,287	64
Page County	3,426	65
Louisa County	3,432	66
Orange County	3,506	67
Alleghany Highlands County	3,541	68
Caroline County	3,651	69
Salem City	3,687	70
Manassas City	3,716	71
Isle of Wight Town	3,840	72
Warren County	3,857	73
Dinwiddie County	3,910	74
Hopewell City	4,203	75
Dickenson County	4,280	76
Botetourt County	4,386	77
Culpeper County	4,430	78
Carroll County	4,650	79
Gloucester County	4,462	80
Charlottesville City	4,662	81
Shenandoah County	4,749	82
Wythe County	4,859	83
Scott County	4,860	84
Amherst County	4,911	85
Prince George County	5,036	86
Williamsburg City	5,042	87
Accomack County	5,071	88
Mecklenburg County	5,316	89

Table 7 (continued)

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Lee County	5,458	90
Russell County	6,261	91
Smyth County	6,273	92
Franklin County	6,325	93
Halifax County	6,572	94
Petersburg City	6,615	95
Frederick County	6,969	96
Pulaski County	6,986	97
Fauquier County	7,117	98
Danville City	7,370	99
Bedford County	7,638	100
Buchanan County	8,207	101
Washington County	8,471	102
Montgomery County	8,553	103
Suffolk County	8,590	104
York County	8,678	105
Spotsylvania County	8,740	106
Campbell County	8,848	107
Albemarle County	8,869	108
Rockingham County	9,115	109
Augusta County	9,726	110
Wise County	9,776	111
Lynchburg City	9,804	112
Hanover County	9,870	113
Stafford County	10,149	114
Tazewell County	10,266	115
Henry County	10,307	116
Alexanderia City	10,549	117
Pittsylvania County	11,992	118
Loudoun County	12,619	119
Roanoke County	13,764	120
Arlington County	14,643	121
Roanoke City	14,804	122
Portsmouth City	18,753	123
Hampton City	20,108	124
Chesapeake City	24,977	125
Newport News City	25,215	126
Richmond City	29,626	127
Henrico County	30,596	128
Chesterfield County	35,727	129
Norfolk City	35,990	130
Prince William	36,014	131
Virginia Beach City	58,039	132
Fairfax County	123,163	133

*Denotes a tie.

Table 8

Virginia Regular Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1984-85

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Highland County	455	1
Craig County	720	2
King and Queen County	987	3
Bath County	992	4
Rappahannock County	999	5
Surry County	1,133	6
Bland County	1,176	7
Middlesex County	1,184	8
Charles City County	1,199	9
Mathews County	1,205	10
Richmond County	1,247	11
King William County	1,391	12
Northumberland County	1,429	13
Cumberland County	1,470	14
Amelia County	1,498	15
Essex County	1,505	16
Clarke County	1,601	17
Lancaster County	1,617	18
Greene County	1,634	19
New Kent County	1,763	20
Madison County	1,794	21
Goochland County	1,804	22
Sussex County	1,893	23
Floyd County	1,976	24
Westmoreland County	2,018	25*
Fluvanna County	2,018	25*
Grayson County	2,105	27
Nelson County	2,165	28
Powhatan County	2,208	29
Buckingham County	2,217	30
Lunenburg County	2,275	31
King George County	2,290	32
Prince Edward County	2,390	33
Appomattox County	2,392	34
Northampton County	2,403	35
Charlotte County	2,415	36
Southampton County	2,510	37
Nottoway County	2,604	38
Brunswick County	2,802	39
Patrick County	3,049	40
Rockbridge County	3,086	41
Giles County	3,287	42

Table 8 (continued)

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Page County	3,426	43
Louisa County	3,432	44
Orange County	3,506	45
Alleghany Highlands County	3,541	46
Caroline County	3,651	47
Warren County	3,857	48
Dinwiddie County	3,910	49
Dickenson County	4,280	50
Botetourt County	4,386	51
Culpeper County	4,430	52
Accomack County	5,071	53
Mecklenburg County	5,316	54
Lee County	5,458	55
Glouchester County	5,462	56
Carroll County	5,650	57
Shenandoah County	5,749	58
Wythe County	5,859	50
Scott County	5,860	60
Amherst County	5,911	61
Russell County	6,261	62
Smyth County	6,273	63
Franklin County	6,325	64
Halifax County	6,572	65
Frederick County	6,969	66
Pulaski County	6,986	67
Fauquier County	7,117	68
Bedford County	7,638	69
Buchanan County	8,207	70
Washington County	8,471	71
Montgomery County	8,553	72
Suffolk County	8,590	73
York County	8,678	74
Spotsylvania County	8,740	75
Campbell County	8,848	76
Albemarle County	8,869	77
Rockingham County	9,115	78
Augusta County	9,726	79
Wise County	9,776	80
Hanover County	9,870	81
Stafford County	10,149	82
Tazewell County	10,266	83
Henry County	10,307	84
Pittsylvania County	11,992	85
Loudoun County	12,619	86
Roanoke County	13,764	87

Table 8 (continued)

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Arlington County	14,643	88
Henrico County	30,596	89
Chesterfield County	35,727	90
Fairfax County	123,163	91

*Denotes a tie.

54

Table 9

Virginia Independent Public Schools
Ne: Enrollment, 1984-85

Division Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Cape Charles Town	221	1
Fries Town	428	2
Colonial Beach Town	489	3
Lexington City	499	4
West Point Town	703	5
South Boston City	864	6
Norton City	1,020	7
Falls Church City	1,060	8
Galax City	1,286	9
Covington City	1,323	10
Buena Vista City	1,350	11
Manassas Park City	1,506	12
Radford City	1,681	13
Franklin City	1,939	14
Poquoson City	2,236	15
Fredericksburg City	2,266	16
Waynesboro City	2,528	17
Harrisonburg City	2,834	18
Colonial Heights City	2,898	19
Bristol City	3,022	20
Staunton City	3,034	21
Winchester City	3,070	22
Salem City	3,687	23
Manassas City	3,716	24
Isle of Wight Town	3,840	25
Hopewell City	4,203	26
Charlottesville City	4,662	27
Prince George	5,036	29
Williamsburg City	5,042	29
Petersburg City	6,615	30
Danville City	7,370	31
Lynchburg City	9,804	32
Alexanderia City	10,549	33
Roanoke City	14,804	34
Portsmouth City	18,703	35
Hampton City	20,108	36
Chesapeake City	24,977	37
Newport News City	25,215	38
Richmond City	29,626	39
Norfolk City	35,990	40
Prince William	36,014	41
Virginia Beach City	58,039	42

Table 10

West Virginia Total Public Schools
Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Wirt County	1,107	1
Gilmer County	1,384	2
Pendleton County	1,437	3
Doddridge County	1,465	4
Pleasants County	1,584	5
Tucker County	1,623	6
Calhoun County	1,697	7
Pocahontas County	1,751	8
Hardy County	1,944	9
Grant County	2,044	10
Morgan County	2,074	11
Ritchie County	2,102	12
Tyler County	2,241	13
Monroe County	2,287	14
Clay County	2,500	15
Summers County	2,588	16
Webster County	2,601	17
Hampshire County	2,883	18
Braxton County	2,889	19
Taylor County	3,096	20
Roane County	3,226	21
Barbour County	3,269	22
Lewis County	3,439	23
Wetzel County	4,379	24
Upshur County	4,765	25
Mason County	5,097	26
Jackson County	5,143	27
Lincoln County	5,172	28
Brooke County	5,179	29
Randolph County	5,234	30
Mineral County	5,275	31
Nicholas County	5,934	32
Jefferson County	5,989	33
Preston County	6,288	34
Hancock County	6,521	35
Boone County	6,534	36
Greenbrier County	6,791	37
Ohio County	7,058	38
Marshall County	7,186	39
Putnam County	8,153	40
Wyoming County	8,243	41
Mingo County	8,942	42

Table 10 (continued)

District Name	Total Enrollment	Rank
Berkeley County	9,385	43
Wayne County	9,414	44
Monongalia County	10,280	45
McDowell County	10,599	46
Marion County	10,680	47
Fayette County	11,097	48
Logan County	11,122	49
Harrison County	13,303	50
Mercer County	13,406	51
Cabell County	16,888	52
Wood County	16,943	53
Raleigh County	17,081	54
Kanawha County	38,012	55

Table 11

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia Total Public Schools Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
Carroll County	TN	0	1*
Gibson County	TN	0	1*
Campbell County, Southgate	KY	160	3
**Marion County, Richard	TN	219	4
Cape Charles Town	VA	221	5
Bracken County, Augusta	KY	270	6
Hardin County, West Point	KY	287	7
Jefferson County, Anchorage	KY	298	8
Pulaski County, Science Hill	KY	311	9
Campbell County, Silver Grove	KY	313	10
Crockett County, Bells	TN	341	11
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	KY	354	12
Breckinridge County, C overport	KY	363	13
Breathitt County, Jackson	KY	368	14
Carroll County, South Carroll	TN	373	15
Crockett County, Alamo	TN	415	16
Robertson County	KY	424	17
Fries Town	VA	428	18
Highland County	VA	455	19
Colonial Beach Town	VA	489	20
McMinn County, Etowah	TN	491	21
Lexington City	VA	499	22
Henry County, Eminence	KY	532	23
Bell County, Pineville	KY	547	24
Grant County, Williamstown	KY	565	25
Hawkins County, Rogersville	TN	568	26
Rhea County, D vton	TN	637	27
Fulton County, Fulton	KY	651	28
Hopkins County, Dawson Springs	KY	674	29
Mason County, Maysville	KY	676	30
Webster County, Providence	KY	683	31
Kenton County, Beechwood	KY	684	32
**Gibson County, Bradford	TN	690	33
West Point Town	VA	703	34
Craig County	VA	720	35
Wayne County, Monticello	KY	751	36
Pickett County	TN	797	37
Henderson County, Lexington	TN	806	38
Cocke County, Newport	TN	820	39
Boone County, Walton Verona	KY	848	40
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	TN	864	41*

Table 11 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
South Boston City	VA	864	41*
Greenup County, Raceland	KY	869	43
Franklin County, Frankfort	KY	879	44
Johnson County, Paintsville	KY	887	45
Muhlenberg County, Central City	KY	894	46
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	TN	904	47*
Lyon County	KY	904	47*
Van Buren County		911	49
Anderson County, Clinton		924	50
Boyd County, Fairview	KY	927	51
Carlisle County	KY	944	52
Madison County, Richmond	KY	964	53
King and Queen County	VA	987	54
Bath County	VA	992	55
Moore County	TN	996	56
Rappahannock County	VA	999	57
Tipton County, Covington	KY	1,006	58
Whitley County, Williamsburg	KY	1,007	59
Hickman County	KY	1,009	60
Norton City	VA	1,020	61
Campbell County, Bellevue	KY	1,022	62
Muhlenberg County, Greenville	KY	1,027	63
Kenton County, Ludlow	KY	1,028	64
Letcher County, Jenkins	KY	1,033	65
Gallatin County	KY	1,047	66
Falls Church City	VA	1,060	67
Perry County	TN	1,065	68
Trousdale County	TN	1,070	69
Madison County, Berea	KY	1,080	70
Owsley County	KY	1,102	71
Wirt County	WV	1,107	72
Carroll County, West Carroll	TN	1,112	73
Harlan County, Harlan	KY	1,116	74
Menifee County	KY	1,121	75
Fulton County	KY	1,128	76
Surry County	VA	1,133	77*
Barren County, Caverna	KY	1,133	77*
Bland County	VA	1,176	79
Middlesex County	VA	1,184	80
Charles City County	VA	1,199	81
Mathews County	VA	1,205	82
Cumberland County	KY	1,213	83
Coffee County, Manchester	TN	1,226	84
Trimble County	KY	1,238	85
Bracken County	KY	1,240	86

Table 11 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
Richmond County	VA	1,247	87
Galax City	VA	1,286	88
Monroe County, Sweetwater	TN	1,312	89
**Henry County, Paris	TN	1,320	90
Covington City	VA	1,323	91
Blount County, Alcoa	TN	1,346	92
Buena Vista City	VA	1,350	93
Gilmer County	WV	1,384	94
**Scott County, Oneida	TN	1,388	95
King William County	VA	1,391	96
**Carroll County, McKenzie	TN	1,397	97
Houston County	TN	1,416	98
Hancock County	TN	1,424	99
Lake County	TN	1,428	100
Northumberland County	VA	1,429	101
Pendleton County	WV	1,437	102
Claiborne County	TN	1,441	103
Doddridge County	WV	1,465	104
Cumberland County	VA	1,470	105
**Gibson County, Trenton	TN	1,496	106
Amelia County	VA	1,498	107
Essex County	VA	1,505	108
Manassas Park City	VA	1,506	109
Jackson County	TN	1,543	110
**Carroll County, Huntingdon	TN	1,566	111
Pleasants County	WV	1,584	112
Clarke County	VA	1,601	113
Lancaster County	VA	1,617	114
Tucker County	WV	1,623	115
Greene County	VA	1,634	116
Radford City	VA	1,681	117
Calhoun County	WV	1,697	118
Pocahontas County	WV	1,751	119
New Kent County	VA	1,763	120
Madison County	VA	1,794	121
Hardy County	WV	1,944	122
Grant County	WV	2,044	123
Morgan County	WV	2,074	124
Ritchie County	WV	2,102	125
Tyler County	WV	2,241	126
Monroe County	WV	2,287	127

*Denotes a tie.
**Denotes a special school district.
Note: Kentucky net enrollment is for 1985-86.

Table 12

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia Regular Public Schools Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
Carrol County	TN	0	1*
Gibson County	TN	0	1*
Robertson County	KY	424	3
Highland County	VA	455	4
Craig County	VA	720	5
Pickett County	TN	797	6
Lyon County	KY	904	7
Van Buren County	TN	911	8
Carlisle County	KY	944	9
King and Queen County	VA	987	10
Bath County	VA	992	11
Moore County	TN	996	12
Rappahannock County	VA	999	13
Hickman County	KY	1,009	14
Gallatin County	KY	1,047	15
Perry County	TN	1,065	16
Trousdale Coun..	TN	1,070	17
Owsley County	KY	1,102	18
Wirt County	WV	1,107	19
Menifee County	KY	1,121	20
Fulton County	KY	1,128	21
Surry County	VA	1,133	22
Bland County	VA	1,176	23
Middlesex County	VA	1,184	24
Charles City County	VA	1,199	25
Mathews County	VA	1,205	26
Cumberland County	KY	1,213	27
Trimble County	KY	1,238	28
Bracken County	KY	1,240	29
Richmond County	VA	1,247	30
Spencer County	KY	1,302	31
Nicholas County	KY	1,332	32
Gilmer County	WV	1,384	33
King William County	VA	1,391	34
Houston County	TN	1,416	35
Hancock County	TN	1,424	36
Lake County	TN	1,428	37
Northumberland County	VA	1,429	38
Pendleton County	WV	1,437	39
Claiborne County	TN	1,441	40
Doddridge County	WV	1,465	41

Table 12 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
Cumberland County	VA	1,470	42
Elliott County	KY	1,479	43
Wolfe County	KY	1,494	44
Amelia County	VA	1,498	45
Essex County	VA	1,505	46
Jackson County	TN	1,543	47
Pleasants County	WV	1,584	48
Lee County	KY	1,596	49
Clarke County	VA	1,6[illegible]	50
Lancaster County	VA	1,617	51
Tucker County	WV	1,623	52
Greene County	VA	1,634	53
Crittenden County	KY	1,636	54
Meigs County	TN	1,642	55
Hancock County	KY	1,662	56
Ballard County	KY	1,673	57
Calhoun County	WV	1,697	58
Stewart County	TN	1,711	59
Pocahontas County	WV	1,751	60
Bledsoe County	TN	1,756	61
New Kent County	VA	1,763	62
Livingston County	KY	1,772	63
Madison County	VA	1,794	64
Goochland County	VA	1,804	65
Clinton County	KY	1,812	66
Washington County	KY	1,841	67
Crockett County	TN	1,842	68
Lewis County	TN	1,851	69
Green County	KY	1,857	70
Owen County	KY	1,858	71
Carroll County	KY	1,862	72
Sussex County	VA	1,893	73
Cannon County	TN	1,900	74
Garrard County	KY	1,933	75
Sequatchie County	TN	1,941	76
Bath County	KY	1,942	77
Hardy County	WV	1,944	78
Trigg County	KY	1,973	79
Henry County	KY	2,014	80
Decatur County	TN	2,033	81
McLean County	KY	2,041	82
Grant County	WV	2,044	83
Morgan County	WV	2,074	84
Ritchie County	WV	2,102	85
Tyler County	WV	2,241	86

Table 12 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
Chester County	TN	2,277	87
Monroe County	WV	2,287	88
Union County	TN	2,402	89
Smith County	TN	2,556	90

*Denotes a tie.
Note: Kentucky net enrollment is for 1985-86.

Table 13

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia Independent Public Schools Net Enrollment, 1984-85

District/Division Name	State	Total Enrollment	Rank
Campbell County, Southgate	KY	160	1
**Marion County, Richard	TN	219	2
Cape Charles Town	VA	221	3
Bracken County, Augusta	KY	270	4
Hardin County, West Point	KY	287	5
Jefferson County, Anchorage	KY	[illegible]3	6
Pulaski County, Science Hill	KY	311	7
Campbell County, Silver Grove	KY	313	8
Crockett County, Bells	TN	341	9
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	KY	354	10
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	KY	363	11
Breathitt County, Jackson	KY	368	12
Carroll County, South Carroll	TN	373	13
Crockett County, Alamo	TN	415	14
Fries Town	VA	428	15
Colonial Beach Town	VA	489	16
McMinn County, Etowah	TN	491	17
Lexington City	VA	499	18
Henry County, Eminence	KY	532	19
Bell County, Pineville	KY	547	20
Grant County, Williamstown	KY	565	21
Hawkins County, Rogersville	TN	568	22
Rhea County, Dayton	TN	637	23
Fulton County, Fulton	KY	651	24
Hopkins County, Dawson Springs	KY	674	25
**Gibson County, Bradford	TN	690	26
West Point Town	VA	703	27
Henderson County, Lexington	TN	806	28
Cocke County, Newport	TN	820	29
South Boston City	VA	864	30*
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	TN	864	30*
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	TN	904	32
Norton City	VA	1,020	33
Falls Church City	VA	1,060	34
Galax City	VA	1,286	35
Covington City	VA	1,323	36
Buena Vista City	VA	1,350	37

*Denotes a tie.
**Denotes a special school district.
Note: Kentucky net enrollment is for 1985-86.

Table 14

Kentucky Regular Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Powell County	$1,626.01	1
Menifee County	1,781.54	2
Knott County	1,861.34	3
Wolfe County	1,887.72	4
Lincoln County	1,890.49	5
Anderson County	1,926.04	6
Allen County	1,963.48	7
Marion County	1,991.27	8
Martin County	2,032.12	9
Jackson County	2,069.41	10
Madison County	2,095.47	11
Floyd County	2,119.82	12
Perry County	2,120.97	13
Pulaski County	2,149.27	14
Laurel County	2,172.60	15
Garrard County	2,177.46	16
Johnson County	2,186.42	17
Todd County	2,189.63	18
Pike County	2,206.61	19
Gallatin County	2,208.96	20
Casey County	2,213.04	21
Taylor County	2,233.38	22
Carter County	2,238.11	23
Crittenden County	2,250.24	24
Ohio County	2,265.25	25
McLean County	2,268.62	26
Ballard County	2,268.71	27
Mercer County	2,271.69	28
Butler County	2,273.88	29
Henry County	2,275.03	30
Pendleton County	2,288.86	31
Graves County	2,310.06	32
Fulton County	2,310.54	33
Shelby County	2,312.62	34
Rockcastle County	2,313.52	35
Hopkins County	2,322.78	36
Greenup County	2,331.52	37
Scott County	2,331.67	38
Simpson County	2,332.68	39
Edmonson County	2,337.67	40
Nelson County	2,338.88	41
Bell County	2,343.59	42

Table 14 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
McCracken County	$2,346.03	43
Whitley County	2,355.44	44
Livingston County	2,358.60	45
Russell County	2,358.94	46
Knox County	2,361.51	47
Morgan County	2,363.36	48
Leslie County	2,371.28	49
Meade County	2,377.91	50
Caldwell County	2,387.61	51
Rowan County	2,388.24	52
Marshall County	2,393.56	53
Bullitt County	2,395.87	54
Estill County	2,398.46	55
Owen County	2,409.03	56
Hardin County	2,410.30	57
Christian County	2,416.21	58
Harrison County	2,419.84	59
Barren County	2,423.41	60
Lewis County	2,425.98	61
Letcher County	2,426.30	62
Grayson County	2,431.48	63
Carlisle County	2,436.29	64
Mason County	2,439.58	65
Campbell County	2,440.79	66
Warren County	2,452.27	67
Boyle County	2,454.66	68
Larue County	2,454.76	69
Montgomery County	2,464.58	70
Boone County	2,468.09	71
Clay County	2,473.29	72
Adair County	2,480.59	73
Lyon County	2,517.58	74
Lee County	2,534.36	75
Union County	2,546.58	76
Kenton County	2,569.91	77
Monroe County	2,579.98	78
Cumberland County	2,585.60	79
Woodford County	2,592.79	80
Metcalfe County	2,593.28	81
Clinton County	2,595.43	82
Logan County	2,600.24	83
Calloway County	2,607.25	84
Henderson County	2,607.97	85
Clark County	2,608.20	86
McCreary County	2,617.44	87

Table 14 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Franklin County	$2,630.68	88
Nicholas County	2,635.73	89
Fleming County	2,645.95	90
Lawrence County	2,656.68	91
Jessamine County	2,656.96	92
Bracken County	2,682.31	93
Breckinridge County	2,708.71	94
Hancock County	2,711.20	95
Spencer County	2,742.95	96
Trimble County	2,749.17	97
Wayne County	2,761.20	98
Daviess County	2,768.30	99
Jefferson County	2,784.26	100
Hickman County	2,789.24	101
Hart County	2,806.74	102
Breathitt County	2,898.54	103
Oldham County	2,914.51	104
Washington County	2,940.04	105
Magoffin County	2.699.21	106
Boyd County	3,030.91	107
Trigg County	3,033.84	108
Elliott County	3,038.99	109
Muhlenberg County	3,039.24	110
Bath County	3,049.63	111
Robertson County	3,061.32	112
Owsley County	3,068.89	113
Bourbon County	3,080.64	114
Green County	3,087.79	115
Harlan County	3,315.60	116
Fayette County	3,361.39	117
Grant County	3,439.38	118
Carroll County	3,622.83	119
Webster County	4,780.53	120

Table 15

Kentucky Independent Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Barren County, Glasgow	$1,868.87	1
Wayne County, Monticello	2,151.90	2
Knox County, Barbourville	2,156.48	3
Bell County, Middlesboro	2,172.04	4
Greenup County, Russell	2,197.80	5
Madison County, Berea	2,229.84	6
Mercer County, Burgin	2,233.86	7
Whitley County, Williamsburg	2,260.28	8
Harlan County, Harlan	2,261.38	9
Perry County, Hazard	2,288.55	10
Boyle County, Danville	2,289.61	11
Whitley County, Corbin	2,300.00	12
Campbell County, Bellevue	2,318.68	13
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	2,319.13	14
McCracken County, Paducah	2,345.04	15
Campbell County, Southgate	2,359.74	16
Taylor County, Campbellsville	2,386.70	17
Pike County, Pikeville	2,396.03	18
Webster County, Providence	2,434.22	19
Campbell County, Silver Grove	2,443.00	20
Bourbon County, Paris	2,461.07	21
Kenton County, Covington	2,477.76	22
Kenton County, Ludlow	2,497.50	23
Barren County, Caverna	2,507.89	24
Graves County, Mayfield	2,529.92	25
Campbell County, Dayton	2,530.03	26
Boyd County, Fairview	2,598.38	27
Breathitt County, Jackson	2,599.15	28
Logan County, Russellville	2,601.05	29
Henry County, Eminence	2,606.17	30
Hardin County, West Point	2,617.74	31
Campbell County, Fort Thomas	2,660.75	32
Bracken County, Augusta	2,675.68	33
Hopkins County, Dawson Springs	2,695.45	34
Mason County, Maysville	2,698.05	35
Johnson County, Paintsville	2,714.10	36
Kenton County, Erlanger	2,760.18	37
Bell County, Pineville	2,772.64	38
Pulaski County, Somerset	2,778.95	39
Madison County, Richmond	2,789.33	40
Grant County, Williamstown	2,830.11	41
Greenup County, Raceland-Worthington	2,843.64	42

Table 15 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Boone County, Walton Verona	$2,855.60	43
Mercer County, Harrodsburg	2,885.07	44
Fulton County, Fulton	2,901.06	45
Boyd County, Ashland	2,907.86	46
Hardin County, Elizabethtown	2,968.00	47
Letcher County, Jenkins	3,072.49	48
Campbell County, Newport	3,108.92	49
Nelson County, Bardstown	3,193.63	50
Warren County, Bowling Green	3,257.92	51
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	3,365.72	52
Pulaski County, Science Hill	3,511.68	53
Kenton County, Beechwood	3,665.91	54
Calloway County, Murray	3,770.12	55
Franklin County, Frankfort	3,779.07	56
Daviess County, Owensboro	3,862.07	57
Jefferson County, Anchorage	4,789.97	58

Table 16

Tennessee Regular Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Carroll County	$0,000.00	1*
Gibson County	0,000.00	1*
Chester County	1,602.22	3
Lewis County	1,635.18	4
Wilson County	1,677.31	5
Macon County	1,683.57	6
Cannon County	1,718.09	7
Houston County	1,727.77	8
De Kalb County	1,750.03	9
Union County	1,755.00	10
Hardeman County	1,760.55	11
Bedford County	1,761.53	12
Van Buren County	1,763.74	13
Tipton County	1,764.61	14
Franklin County	1,765.25	15
Smith County	1,772.29	16
Grainger County	1,784.27	17
Dickson County	1,797.25	18
Cheatham County	1,809.77	19
Lauderdale County	1,818.71	20
McNairy County	1,836.07	21
Warren County	1,840.28	22
Trousdale County	1,844.40	23
Morgan County	1,845.85	24
Lincoln County	1,848.12	25
Henderson County	1,856.13	26
Jackson County	1,857.53	27
Monroe County	1,859.69	28
Putnam County	1,860.88	29
White County	1,862.92	30
Haywood County	1,865.67	31
Grundy County	1,875.75	32
Decatur County	1,876.90	33
Greene County	1,886.19	34
Washington County	1,900.73	35
Madison County	1,918.17	36
Cumberland County	1,930.94	37
Hancock County	1,938.14	38
Hawkins County	1,938.49	39
Campbell County	1,945.96	40
Wayne County	1,947.33	41
Weakley County	1,948.86	42

Table 16 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Robertson County	$1,949.34	43
Overton County	1,954.11	44
Sevier County	1,956.99	45
Crockett County	1,962.03	46
Johnson County	1,967.40	47
Bradley County	1,969.96	48
Hickman County	1,970.23	49
Fayette County	1,970.52	50
Meigs County	1,978.04	51
Rutherford County	1,981.21	52
Sumner County	1,989.41	53
Claiborne County	1,991.61	54
Rhea County	1,998.94	55
Marion County	1,999.76	56
Shelby County	2,025.04	57
Cocke County	2,027.58	58
Moore County	2,030.39	59
Hardin County	2,035.75	60
Benton County	2,037.96	61
Jefferson County	2,039.75	62
Maury County	2,044.80	63
Marshall County	2,049.18	64
Carter County	2,056.80	65
Henry County	2,061.18	66
Lake County	2,067.06	67
Fentress County	2,072.99	68
Unicoi County	2,074.10	69
Pickett County	2,076.31	70
Sequatchie County	2,082.62	71
Humphreys County	2,086.45	72
Polk County	2,104.08	73
Bledsoe County	2,105.04	74
Giles County	2,109.48	75
Lawrence County	2,115.27	76
Obion County	2,122.76	77
McMinn County	2,131.75	78
Williamson County	2,135.83	79
Roane County	2,142.26	80
Loudon County	2,168.61	81
Blount County	2,183.74	82
Stewart County	2,190.71	83
Knox County	2,252.14	84
Perry County	2,282.10	85
Montgomery County	2,294.09	86
Hamblen County	2,299.28	87

Table 16 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Coffee County	$2,326.60	88
Scott County	2,370.99	89
Hamilton County	2,429.80	90
Clay County	2,450.79	91
Dyer County	2,454.67	92
Sullivan County	2,630.09	93
Anderson County	2,728.88	94
Davidson County	3,221.45	95

*Denotes a tie.

Table 17

Tennessee Independent Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
**Marion County, Richard	$1,530.62	1
Crockett County, Alamo	1,665.83	2
Crockett County, Bells	1,695.03	3
**Carroll County, McKenzie	1,731.03	4
Rhea County, Dayton	1,743.12	5
Monroe County, Sweetwater	1,747.47	6
Carroll County, West Carroll	1,772.10	7
**Gibson County, Bradford	1,773.28	8
Henderson County, Lexington	1,780.68	9
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	1,793.33	10
**Wilson County, Lebanon	1,796.01	11
**Gibson County, Milan	1,798.65	12
**Scott County, Oneida	1,801.54	13
**Carroll County, Huntingdon	1,827.19	14
Carroll County, South Carroll	1,835.36	15
Gibson County, Humboldt	1,900.19	16
Anderson County, Clinton	1,953.99	17
Cocke County, Newport	1,967.99	18
McMinn County, Etowah	1,968.54	19
**Gibson County, Trenton	1,974.07	20
Loudon County, Lenoir	1,994.25	21
Tipton County, Covington	2,044.93	22
**Williamson County, Franklin	2,083.37	23
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	2,116.22	24
**Gibson County, Gibson	2,165.33	25
Obion County, Union	2,174.63	26
**Henry County, Paris	2,231.57	27
Rutherford County, Murfreesboro	2,247.41	28
Hawkins County, Rogersville	2,262.52	29
Roane County, Harriman	2,270.94	30
Dyer County, Dyersburg	2,287.75	31
Bradley County, Cleveland	2,292.74	32
McMinn County, Athens	2,324.68	33
Madison County, Jackson	2,411.59	34
Blount County, Maryville	2,435.51	35
Coffee County, Manchester	2,573.03	36
Carter County, Elizabethton	2,677.36	37
Shelby County, Memphis	2,715.67	38
Knox County, Knoxville	2,720.92	39
Coffee County, Tullahoma	2,816.52	40
Hamilton County, Chattanooga	2,819.15	41
Washington County, Johnson	2,941.77	42

73

Table 17 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Greene County, Greeneville	$3,032.99	43
Blount County, Alcoa	3,149.07	44
Sullivan County, Bristol	3,351.63	45
Sullivan County, Kingsport	3,373.13	46
Anderson County, Oak Ridge	3,710.03	47

**Denotes a special school district.

Table 18

Virginia Regular Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1985-86

Division Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Spotsylvania County	$2,525.00	1
Smyth County	2,565.00	2
Page County	2,580.00	3
Gloucester County	2,582.00	4
Grayson County	2,588.00	5
Appomattox County	2,612.00	6
Pittsylvania County	2,614.00	7
Craig County	2,626.00	8
Washington County	2,656.00	9
Wythe County	2,657.00	10
Bland County	2,681.00	11
Tazewell County	2,692.00	12
Scott County	2,695.00	13
Charlotte County	2,715.00	14*
Cumberland County	2,715.00	14*
Richmond County	2,720.00	16
Mecklenburg County	2,723.00	17
Franklin County	2,724.00	18
Pulaski County	2,728.00	19
Carroll County	2,732.00	20
Patrick County	2,747.00	21
Campbell County	2,750.00	22
Amherst County	2,759.00	23
Nottoway County	2,764.00	24
Fluvanna County	2,770.00	25
Lancaster County	2,773.00	26
Hanover County	2,778.00	27
Russell County	2,781.00	28
Botetourt County	2,782.00	29
Floyd County	2,785.00	30
Amelia County	2,786.00	31
Bedford County	2,814.00	32
Powhatan County	2,817.00	33
Halifax County	2,829.00	34
Prince Edward County	2,847.00	35
Lee County	2,862.00	36
King George County	2,867.00	37
Mathews County	2,873.00	38
Greene County	2,878.00	39
Lunenberg County	2,910.00	40
Warren County	2,916.00	41
Accomack County	2,941.00	42

Table 18 (continued)

Division Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Brunswick County	$2,962.00	43
Fauquier County	2,972.00	44
Buchanan County	2,977.00	45
Henry County	2,994.00	46
Frederick County	2,995.00	47
Wise County	3,016.00	48
Stafford County	3,020.00	49
Giles County	3,022.00	50
Caroline County	3,028.00	51
Middlesex County	3,036.00	52
Louisa County	3,040.00	53
Chesterfield County	3,052.00	54
Rockingham County	3,055.00	55
Greensville County	3,057.00	56
Northampton County	3,069.00	57
Augusta County	3,075.00	58
Rockbridge County	3,076.00	59
Orange County	3,078.00	60
Buckingham County	3,088.00	61
Northumberland County	3,114.00	62
Madison County	3,116.00	63
Rappahannock County	3,117.00	64
Southampton County	3,137.00	65
Montgomery County	3,139.00	66
Nelson County	3,140.00	67
Essex County	3,147.00	68
Isle of Wight County	3,152.00	69
King and Queen County	3,191.00	70
Culpeper County	3,193.00	71
York County	3,206.00	72
Shenandoah County	3,209.00	73
Prince George County	3,226.00	74
New Kent County	3,243.00	75
Westmoreland County	3,244.00	76
Clarke County	3,259.00	77
Sussex County	3,264.00	78
King William County	3,292.00	79
Highland County	3,323.00	80
Alleghany Highlands County	3,366.00	81
Goochland County	3,385.00	82
Dickenson County	3,388.00	83
Dinwiddie County	3,407.00	84
Charles City County	3,506.00	85
Prince William County	3,531.00	86
Henrico County	3,542.00	87

Table 18 (continued)

Division Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Loudoun County	$3,629.00	88
Albemarle County	3,761.00	89
Roanoke County	3,874.00	90
Surry County	4,092.00	91
Fairfax County	4,350.00	92
Bath County	4,598.00	93
Arlington County	5,738.00	94

*Denotes a tie.

Table 19

Virginia Independent Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1985-86

Division Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Fries Town	$2,122.00	1
South Boston City	2,541.00	2
Poquoson City	2,586.00	3
Lexington City	2,706.00	4
Virginia Beach City	2,717.00	5
Buena Vista City	2,722.00	6
Galax City	2,779.00	7
Manassas Park City	2,819.00	8
Colonial Beach Town	2,845.00	9
Franklin City	2,960.00	10
Staunton City	2,987.00	11
Cape Charles Town	3,003.00	12
Danville City	3,045.00	13
Suffolk City	3,071.00	14
Chesapeake City	3,087.00	15
Norton City	3,117.00	16
Radford City	3,202.00	17
Portsmouth City	3,235.00	18
Bristol City	3,289.00	19
Waynesboro City	3,337.00	20
Covington City	3,361.00	21
Martinsville City	3,365.00	22
Hampton City	3,377.00	23
Colonial Heights City	3,392.00	24
Lynchburg City	3,427.00	25
Newport News City	3,447.00	26
Salem City	3,451.00	27
Hopewell City	3,460.00	28
Petersburg City	3,472.00	29
Roanoke City	3,482.00	30
Harrisonburg City	3,494.00	31
Manassas City	3,551.00	32
Winchester City	3,663.00	33
Fredericksburg City	3,682.00	34
Williamsburg City	3,731.00	35
West Point Town	3,737.00	36
Norfolk City	3,858.00	37
Fairfax City	3,971.00	38
Richmond City	5,046.00	39
Charlottesville City	5,119.00	40
Alexandria City	5,680.00	41
Falls Church City	5,702.00	42

Table 20

West Virginia Regular Public Schools
Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Mercer County	$2,639.18	1
Mingo County	2,694.35	2
Wirt County	2,825.81	3
Taylor County	2,877.66	4
Preston County	2,883.38	5
Harrison County	2,908.12	6
Logan County	2,923.04	7
Mineral County	3,006.84	8
Putnam County	3,092.44	9
Clay County	3,131.73	10
Webster County	3,166.50	11
Roane County	3,213.85	12
Wayne County	3,269.87	13
Marshall County	3,285.81	14
Doddridge County	3,331.11	15
Wyoming County	3,339.71	16
Ritchie County	3,350.13	17
Raleigh County	3,460.04	18
Ohio County	3,482.17	19
Jefferson County	3,513.18	20
Hampshire County	3,534.20	21
Berkeley County	3,546.44	22
Greenbrier County	3,571.18	23
McDowell County	3,571.75	24
Hancock County	3,605.18	25
Barbour County	3,652.47	26
Wetzel County	3,658.63	27
Boone County	3,701.29	28
Lincoln County	3,713.33	29
Brooke County	3,721.15	30
Fayette County	3,750.31	31
Calhoun County	3,784.36	32
Lewis County	3,834.00	33
Kanawha County	3,858.09	34
Monongalia County	3,860.80	35
Grant County	3,875.08	36
Tyler County	3,876.46	37
Cabell County	3,899.05	38
Mason County	3,901.49	39
Nicholas County	3,973.87	40
Marion County	4,020.36	41
Wood County	4,020.87	42

Table 20 (continued)

District Name	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Monroe County	$4,058.72	43
Summers County	4,240.93	44
Braxton County	4,254.38	45
Tucker County	4,301.75	46
Pleasants County	4,353.08	47
Morgan County	4,484.59	48
Randolph County	4,514.01	49
Pendleton County	4,592.80	50
Jackson County	4,614.00	51
Upshur County	4,714.90	52
Gilmer County	4,906.35	53
Hardy County	5,490.40	54
Pocahontas County	6,479.43	55

Table 21

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia Regular Public Schools Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District/Division Name	State	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Carroll County	TN	$0,000.00	1*
Gibson County	TN	0,000.00	1*
Chester County	TN	1,602.22	3
Powell County	KY	1,626.01	4
Lewis County	TN	1,635.18	5
Wilson County	TN	1,677.31	6
Macon County	TN	1,683.57	7
Cannon County	TN	1,718.09	8
Houston County	TN	1,727.77	9
De Kalb County	TN	1,750.03	10
Union County	TN	1,755.00	11
Hardeman County	TN	1,760.55	12
Bedford County	TN	1,761.53	13
Van Buren County	TN	1,763.74	14
Tipton County	TN	1,764.61	15
Franklin County	TN	1,765.25	16
Smith County	TN	1,772.29	17
Menifee County	KY	1,781.54	18
Grainger County	TN	1,784.27	19
Dickson County	TN	1,797.25	20
Cheatham County	TN	1,809.77	21
Lauderdale County	TN	1,818.71	22
McNairy County	TN	1,836.07	23
Warren County	TN	1,840.28	24
Trousdale County	TN	1,844.40	25
Morgan County	TN	1,845.85	26
Knott County	KY	1,861.34	27
Wolfe County	KY	1,887.72	28
Lincoln County	KY	1,890.49	29
Anderson County	KY	1,926.04	30
Allen County	KY	1,963.48	31
Marion County	KY	1,991.27	32
Martin County	KY	2,032.12	33
Jackson County	KY	2,069.41	34
Madison County	KY	2,095.47	35
Floyd County	KY	2,119.88	36
Perry County	KY	2,120.97	37
Pulaski County	KY	2,149.27	38
Laurel County	KY	2,172.60	39
Garrard County	KY	2,177.46	40
Johnson County	KY	2,186.42	41

Table 21 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Todd County	KY	$2,189.63	42
Pike County	KY	2,206.61	43
Gallatin County	KY	2,208.96	44
Casey County	KY	2,213.04	45
Taylor County	KY	2,233.38	46
Carter County	KY	2,238.11	47
Crittenden County	KY	2,250.24	48
Ohio County	KY	2,265.25	49
McLean County	KY	2,268.62	50
Ballard County	KY	2,268.71	51
Mercer County	KY	2,271.69	52
Butler County	KY	2,273.88	53
Henry County	KY	2,275.03	54
Spotsylvania County	VA	2,525.00	55
Smyth County	VA	2,565.00	56
Page County	VA	2,580.00	57
Gloucester County	VA	2,582.00	58
Grayson County	VA	2,588.00	59
Appomattox County	VA	2,612.00	60
Pittsylvania County	VA	2,614.00	61
Craig County	VA	2,626.00	62
Mercer County	WV	2,639.18	63
Washington County	VA	2,656.00	64
Wythe County	VA	2,657.00	65
Bland County	VA	2,681.00	66
Tazewell County	VA	2,692.00	67
Mingo County	WV	2,694.35	68
Scott County	VA	2,695.00	69
Charlotte County	VA	2,715.00	70*
Cumberland County	VA	2,715.00	70*
Richmond County	VA	2,720.00	72
Mecklenburg County	VA	2,723.00	73
Franklin County	VA	2,724.00	74
Pulaski County	VA	2,728.00	75
Carroll County	VA	2,732.00	76
Patrick County	VA	2,747.00	77
Campbell County	VA	2,750.00	78
Amherst County	VA	2,759.00	79
Nottoway County	VA	2,764.00	80
Wirt County	WV	2,825.81	81
Taylor County	WV	2,877.66	82
Preston County	WV	2,883.38	83
Harrison County	WV	2,908.12	84
Logan County	WV	2,923.04	85
Mineral County	WV	3,006.84	86

Table 21 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
Putnam County	WV	$3,092.44	87
Clay County	WV	3,131.73	88
Webster County	WV	3,166.50	89
Roane County	WV	3,213.85	90
Wayne County	WV	3,269.87	91
Marshall County	WV	3,285.81	92

*Denotes a tie.
Note: Virginia expenditures are for 1985-86.

Table 22

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia Independent Public Schools Expenditure Costs Per Pupil, 1986-87

District/Division Name	State	Expenditures per Pupil	Rank
**Marion County, Richard	TN	$1,530.62	1
Crockett County, Alamo	TN	1,665.83	2
Crockett County, Bells	TN	1,695.03	3
**Carroll County, McKenzie	TN	1,731.03	4
Rhea County, Dayton	TN	1,743.12	5
Monroe County, Sweetwater	TN	1,747.47	6
Carroll County, West Carroll	TN	1,772.10	7
**Gibson County, Bradford	TN	1,773.28	8
Henderson County, Lexington	TN	1,780.68	9
Carroll County, H. R. Bruceton	TN	1,793.33	10
**Wilson County, Lebanon	TN	1,796.01	11
**Gibson County, Milan	TN	1,798.65	12
Barren County, Glasgow	KY	1,868.87	13
Fries Town	VA	2,122.00	14
Wayne County, Monticello	KY	2,151.90	15
Knox County, Barbourville	KY	2,156.48	16
Bell County, Middlesboro	KY	2,172.04	17
Creenup County, Russell	KY	2,197.80	18
Madison County, Berea	KY	2,229.84	19
Mercer County, Burgin	KY	2,233.86	20
Whitley County, Williamsburg	KY	2,260.28	21
Harlan County, Harlan	KY	2,261.38	22
Perry County, Hazard	KY	2,288.55	23
Boyle County, Danville	KY	2,289.61	24
Whitley County, Corbin	KY	2,300.00	25
Campbell County, Bellevue	KY	2,318.68	26
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	KY	2,319.13	27
McCracken County, Paducah	KY	2,345.04	28
South Boston City	VA	2,541.00	29
Poquoson City	VA	2,586.00	30
Lexington City	VA	2,706.00	31
Virginia Beach City	VA	2,717.00	32
Buena Vista City	VA	2,722.00	33
Galax City	VA	2,779.00	34
Manassas Park City	VA	2,819.00	35
Colonial Beach Town	VA	2,845.00	36
Franklin City	VA	2,960.00	37
Staunton City	VA	2,987.00	38

**Denotes a special school district.
Note: Virginia expenditures are for 1985-86.

Table 23

Kentucky Regular Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Lyon County	$279.69	1
Logan County	254.15	2
Green County	244.7?	3
Butler County	241.3o	4
Crittenden County	237.58	5
Trimble County	236.33	6
Leslie County	234.27	7
Henry County	232.54	8
Cumberland County	232.24	9
Simpson County	229.90	10
Barren County	228.83	11
Knox County	228.55	12
Caldwell County	226.61	13
Grayson County	221.81	14
Elliott County	220.67	15
Jefferson County	220.16	16
Bracken County	219.65	17
Hickman County	219.48	18
Owen County	218.56	19
Mercer County	217.66	20
Webster County	216.57	21
McLean County	216.13	22
Lewis County	215.86	23
Lawrence County	215.35	24
Ballard County	214.94	25
Morgan County	214.19	26
Rockcastle County	213.64	27
Wolfe County	213.10	28
Scott County	211.48	29
Wayne County	210.87	30
Hart County	209.11	31
Allen County	205.86	32
Jackson County	205.45	33
Owsley County	204.75	34
Spencer County	204.08	35
Breckinridge County	204.07	36
Calloway County	203.10	37
Edmonson County	200.31	38
Metcalf County	199.99	39
Graves County	199.23	40
Pike County	198.53	41
Bath County	198.23	42

Table 23 (continued)

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Breathitt County	$197.29	43
Livingston County	196.67	44
Garrard County	196.13	45
Whitley County	195.91	46
Taylor County	195.80	47
Bourbon County	194.84	48
Fleming County	194.52	49
Knott County	193.99	50
Magoffin County	193.52	51
Todd County	193.07	52
Warren County	192.83	53
Hopkins County	192.17	54
Nicholas County	191.59	55*
Hancock County	191.59	55*
Larue County	190.78	57
Johnson County	190.04	58
Henderson County	189.64	59
Grant County	188.00	60
Montgomery County	187.74	61
Menifee County	185.78	62
Lee County	185.13	63
Union County	184.15	64
Adair County	182.76	65
Boyd County	182.67	66
Greenup County	182.12	67
Boyle County	181.85	68
Russell County	180.93	69
Marion County	180.85	70
Fayette County	180.46	71
Laurel County	179.83	72
Clark County	178.96	73
Pulaski County	178.78	74
Floyd County	177.89	75
Martin County	177.34	76
Muhlenberg County	176.33	77
Anderson County	176.13	78
Casey County	175.40	79
Monroe County	175.32	80
Carroll County	175.28	81
Meade County	175.09	82
Madison County	173.97	83
Fulton County	173.67	84
Letcher County	172.67	85
Marshall County	172.25	86
Washington County	170.39	87

Table 23 (continued)

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Carlisle County	$170.16	88
Gallatin County	169.99	89
Ohio County	169.97	90
Nelson County	168.20	91
Trigg County	167.73	92
McCracken County	167.69	93
Estill County	164.93	94
Jessamine County	163.85	95
Carter County	163.74	96
Mason County	163.46	97
Shelby County	163.20	98
Christian County	162.67	99
Lincoln County	161.15	100
Perry County	160.79	101
Rowan County	160.67	102
Pendleton County	158.97	103
Clay County	158.73	104
McCreary County	154.50	105
Woodford County	153.91	106
Harrison County	153.83	107
Franklin County	152.71	108
Hardin County	151.76	109
Powell County	150.14	110
Robertson County	148.43	111
Bell County	144.57	112
Harlan County	142.15	113
Oldham County	139.06	114
Boone County	138.36	115
Erlanger-Elsme County	131.14	116
Bullitt County	122.71	117
Kenton County	111.21	118
Dawson Springs County	106.37	119
Daviess County	102.29	120
Campbell County	96.78	121
East Bernstadt County	69.74	122
Elizabethtown County	63.79	123

*Denotes a tie.

Table 24

Kentucky Independent Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Kenton County, Beechwood	$676.22	1
Campbell County, Newport	337.20	2
Campbell County, Southgate	290.44	3
Hardin County, West Point	283.47	4
Jefferson County, Anchorage	252.57	5
Kenton County, Covington	210.17	6
Warren County, Bowling Green	192.60	7
Johnson County, Paintsville	182.54	8
Pike County, Pikeville	182.22	9
Boone County, Walton Verona	157.12	10
Daviess County, Owensboro	154.75	11
Graves County, Mayfield	148.34	12
Madison County, Richmond	136.85	13
Logan County, Russellville	133.58	14
Muhlenberg County, Greenville	133.34	15
Bracken County, Augusta	125.42	16
Mercer County, Burgin	124.87	17
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	120.32	18
Campbell County, Silver Grove	118.29	19
Boyd County, Ashland	117.04	20
Calloway County, Murray	116.26	21
McCracken County, Paducah	114.44	22
Whitley County, Corbin	111.61	23
Perry County, Hazard	110.28	24
Campbell County, Fort Thomas	105.98	25
Barren County, Caverna	103.74	26
Bourbon County, Paris	103.52	27
Letcher County, Jenkins	102.06	28
Harlan County, Harlan	101.44	29
Franklin County, Frankfort	101.04	30
Barren County, Glasgow	94.99	31
Knox County, Barbourville	94.94	32
Madison County, Berea	93.09	33
Breathitt County, Jackson	92.11	34
Webster County, Providence	90.49	35
Greenup County, Raceland	90.36	36
Henry County, Eminence	86.66	37
Greenup County, Russell	86.21	38
Pulaski County, Science Hill	84.49	39
Bell County, Middlesboro	84.23	40
Pulaski County, Somerset	83.05	41
Taylor County, Campbellsville	82.67	42

Table 24 (continued)

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Mercer County, Harrodsburg	$80.27	43
Wayne County, Monticello	8 .10	44
Grant County, Williamstown	78.96	45
Campbell County, Dayton	72.51	46
Boyle County, Danville	68.02	47
Nelson County, Bardstown	67.31	48
Mason County, Maysville	64.58	49
Whitley County, Williamsburg	63.35	50
Boyd County, Fairview	59.44	51
Kenton County, Ludlow	56.30	52
Bell County, Pineville	53.48	53
Muhlenberg County, Central City	45.06	54

Table 25

Tennessee Regular Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Jackson County	$187.27	1
Giles County	184.81	2
Perry County	183.92	3
Cocke County	181.68	4
Anderson County	174.10	5
Coffee County	174.09	6
Sullivan County	166.49	7
Lincoln County	165.96	8
Cannon County	165.45	9
Hickman County	164.74	10
Hardin County	164.33	11
Bledsoe County	163.20	12
Grainger County	158.96	13
Henderson County	155.58	14
Bradley County	152.08	15
Obion County	151.81	16
Roane County	151.68	17
Stewart County	150.11	18
Decatur County	149.23	19
Moore County	148.99	20
Monroe County	148.44	21
Rutherford County	146.48	22
Davidson County	145.68	23
Henry County	145.46	24
Union County	145.33	25
Dyer County	144.29	26
Fayette County	143.62	27
Marion County	141.62	28
Wayne County	141.50	29
Williamson County	140.63	30
Clay County	139.24	31
Marshall County	138.44	32
Pickett County	137.98	33
Weakley County	134.22	34
Johnson County	133.87	35
Maury County	132.72	36
Hancock County	132.63	37
Sequatchie County	130.20	38
Fentress County	130.03	39
Benton County	129.41	40
Lawrence County	129.35	41
Humphreys County	128.68	42

Table 25 (continued)

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Putnam County	$128.57	43
Dickson County	125.96	44
Macon County	125.46	45
Cumberland County	123.56	46
Warren County	123.06	47
Scott County	121.81	48
Smith County	121.70	49
Haywood County	121.41	50
Overton County	120.49	51
Blount County	120.00	52
Shelby County	119.16	53
White County	119.14	54
Van Buren County	118.10	55
Polk County	117.56	56
Trousdale County	117.33	57
Morgan County	116.32	58
McMinn County	114.33	59
Campbell County	112.51	60
Knox County	112.22	61
De Kalb County	111.09	62
Carroll County	110.92	63
Lewis County	109.56	64
Hardeman County	107.74	65
Wilson County	107.64	66
Sumner County	107.57	67
Rhea County	107.48	68
Bedford County	106.34	69
Franklin County	106.09	70
Lake County	104.25	71
Montgomery County	103.98	72
Madison County	102.60	73
McNairy County	101.84	74
Claiborne County	101.71	75
Houston County	101.51	76
Meigs County	101.44	77
Crockett County	100.83	78
Hawkins County	100.55	79
Sevier County	100.30	80
Robertson County	98.94	81
Tipton County	98.87	82
Unicoi County	98.32	83
Carter County	96.63	84
Hamblen County	96.46	85
Greene County	94.66	86

Table 25 (continued)

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Washington County	$93.79	87
Cheatham County	92.13	88
Chester County	89.60	89
Hamilton County	86.32	90
Loudon County	84.90	91
Jefferson County	82.25	92
Grundy County	79.06	93
Lauderdale County	66.12	94

Note: Excludes those districts not reporting data.

92

Table 26

Tennessee Independent Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Knox County, Knoxville	$323.38	1
Shelby County, Memphis	194.28	2
**Gibson County, Gibson	172.97	3
**Gibson County, Bradford	156.67	4
Sullivan County, Kingsport	155.70	5
Loudon County, Lenoir	152.91	6
Madison County, Jackson	136.22	7
**Gibson County, Trenton	127.45	8
Hamilton County, Chattanooga	112.17	9
Blount County, Maryville	102.61	10
**Scott County, Onedia	101.37	11
Greene County, Greeneville	100.02	12
**Henry County, Paris	99.09	13
Carter County, Elizabethton	97.45	14
Bradley County, Cleveland	90.81	15
Gibson County, Humboldt	86.43	16
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	79.56	17
Hamblen County, Morristown	75.70	18
Rutherford County, Murfreesboro	73.36	19
**Gibson County, Milan	63.17	20
McMinn County, Etowah	54.65	21
McMinn County, Athens	48.36	22
Tipton County, Covington	33.89	23
Washington County, Johnson	23.44	24

**Denotes a special school district.

Note. Excludes those districts not reporting data.

Table 27

Virginia Regular Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

Division Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Bath County	$295.74	1
South Hampton County	264.18	2
King and Queen County	261.34	3
New Kent County	245.38	4
Nelson County	236.29	5
Brunswick County	233.93	6
Essex County	232.05	7
Sussex County	226.67	8
Floyd County	219.15	9
King William County	213.79	10
Surry County	209.20	11
Albemarle County	208.36	12
Dinwiddie County	207.13	13
Highland County	204.94	14
Northumberland County	200.41	15
Prince William County	199.50	16
Cumberland County	199.20	17
Goochland County	198.55	18
Caroline County	198.17	19
Loudoun County	189.62	20
Buckingham County	189.00	21
Bland County	188.88	22
Accomack County	188.85	23
Middlesex County	184.92	24
Charles City County	184.33	25
Powhatan County	184.10	26
Prince George County	180.97	27
Patrick County	180.77	28
Rappahannock County	180.02	29
Mathews County	178.80	30
Dickenson County	175.43	31
Westmoreland County	174.75	32
Fairfax County	172.72	33
Richmond County	171.53	34
Lancaster County	169.61	35
Lunenburg County	168.80	36
Rockbridge County	166.34	37
Isle of Wight County	166.12	38
Charlotte County	166.09	39
Amherst County	165.95	40
Halifax County	165.73	41
Hampton County	164.78	42

Table 27 (continued)

Division Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
King George County	$162.63	43
Grayson County	161.12	44
Madison County	160.19	45
Scott County	160.16	46
Mecklenburg County	158.26	47
Orange County	157.50	48
Rockingham County	157.38	49
Buchanan County	156.96	50
Bedford County	156.50	51
Pittsylvania County	155.78	52
Fauquier County	155.53	53
Franklin County	155.25	54
Louisa County	153.00	55
Frederick County	152.63	56
Amelia County	151.70	57
Lee County	151.59	58
Greensville County	150.52	59
Prince Edward County	150.50	60
Craig County	150.32	61
Botetourt County	149.05	62
Arlington County	147.85	63
Appomattox County	146.22	64
Carroll County	146.09	65
Page County	145.12	66
Henry County	144.09	67
Shenandoah County	144.79	68
Glouchester County	141.87	69
Greene County	141.24	70
Fluvanna County	140.81	71
Allegheny Highlands County	139.68	72
York County	137.98	73
Hanover County	137.96	74
Russell County	136.96	75
Augusta County	132.77	76
Clarke County	132.67	77
Northampton County	131.13	78
Nottoway County	126.51	79
Giles County	125.87	80
Pulaski County	124.13	81
Wise County	120.01	82
Wythe County	116.62	83
Washington County	116.31	84
Tazewell County	114.90	85
Culpeper County	114.68	86
Montgomery County	114.27	87

Table 27 (continued)

Division Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Warren County	$111.76	88
Campbell County	111.66	89
Spotsylvania County	111.47	90
Roanoke County	109.45	91
Henrico County	109.12	92
Stafford County	107.84	93
Chesterfield County	101.11	94
Smyth County	93.20	95

Table 28

Virginia Independent Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

Division Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Radford City	$1,077.65	1
Colonial Heights City	817.23	2
Bristol City	600.96	3
Staunton City	315.09	4
Alexandria City	243.53	5
Norfolk City	233.56	6
Richmond City	218.87	7
Falls Church City	200.71	8
Williamsburg City	195.28	9
Charlottesville City	181.20	10
Danville City	171.82	11
Hopewell City	167.95	12
Petersburg City	152.82	13
Suffolk City	143.84	14
Newport News City	129.53	15
Roanoke City	125.89	16
Lynchburg City	103.88	17
Chesapeake City	95.35	18
Harrisonburg City	94.04	19
Colonial Beach Town	93.66	20
Franklin City	93.54	21
Portsmouth City	93.40	22
Winchester City	88.42	23
Virginia Beach City	87.95	24
Manassas Park City	87.42	25
Salem City	82.06	26
Martinsville City	81.63	27
Fredericksburg City	81.30	28
Covington City	80.19	29
Manassas City	76.30	30
Galax City	69.93	31
Poquoson City	65.84	32
Norton City	58.71	33
West Point Town	56.10	34
Buena Vista City	34.58	35

Table 29

West Virginia Regular Public Schools
Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Pendleton County	$485.97	1
Hardy County	406.84	2
Pocahontas County	404.81	3
Gilmer County	390.06	4
Pleasants County	378.16	5
Calhoun County	377.51	6
Clay County	348.58	7
Monroe County	342.10	8
Doddridge County	339.76	9
Wirt County	339.04	10
Summers County	338.09	11
Grant County	337.73	12
Tyler County	332.37	13
Randolph County	320.29	14
Mason County	316.53	15
Nicholas County	310.07	16
Roane County	304.93	17
Marshall County	304.53	18
Taylor County	303.21	19
Braxton County	301.39	20
Ritchie County	296.66	21
Webster County	296.45	22
Wood County	295.36	23
Lincoln County	295.26	24
Hampshire County	287.18	25*
Cabell County	287.18	25*
Logan County	287.03	27
Harrison County	278.39	28
Wetzel County	275.88	29
Barbour County	268.98	30
Greenbrier County	267.97	31
Lewis County	267.95	32
Mineral County	265.44	33
Jackson County	264.17	34
Boone County	262.69	35
Upshur County	256.04	36
Wayne County	253.21	37
Mercer County	251.68	38
Marion County	251.05	39
Tucker County	249.39	40
Morgan County	238.28	41
Brooke County	238.25	42

Table 29 (continued)

District Name	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Monongalia County	$234.62	43
Putnam County	232.36	44
Fayette County	230.17	45
Kanawha County	228.45	46
Jefferson County	227.32	47
Wyoming County	226.56	48
McDowell County	222.62	49
Berkeley County	217.19	50
Hancock County	206.13	51
Mingo County	204.63	52
Ohio County	198.03	53
Raleigh County	194.82	54
Preston County	155.77	55

*Denotes a tie.

Table 30

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia Regular Public Schools Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District/Division Name	State	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Pendleton County	WV	$485.97	1
Hardy County	WV	406.84	2
Pocahontas County	WV	404.81	3
Gilmer County	WV	390.06	4
Pleasants County	WV	378.16	5
Calhoun County	WV	377.51	6
Clay County	WV	348.58	7
Monroe County	WV	342.10	8
Doddridge County	WV	339.76	9
Wirt County	WV	339.04	10
Summers County	WV	338.09	11
Grant County	WV	337.73	12
Tyler County	WV	332.37	13
Randolph County	WV	320.29	14
Bath County	VA	295.74	15
Lyon County	KY	279.69	16
South Hampton County	VA	264.18	17
King and Queen County	VA	261.34	18
Logan County	KY	254.15	19
New Kent County	VA	245.38	20
Green County	KY	244.71	21
Butler County	KY	241.36	22
Crittenden County	KY	237.58	23
Trimble County	KY	236.33	24
Nelson County	VA	236.29	25
Leslie County	KY	234.27	26
Brunswick County	VA	233.93	27
Henry County	KY	232.54	28
Cumberland County	KY	232.24	29
Essex County	VA	232.05	30
Simpson County	KY	229.90	31
Barren County	KY	228.83	32
Knox County	KY	228.55	33
Sussex County	VA	226.67	34
Caldwell County	KY	226.61	35
Grayson County	KY	221.81	36
Elliott County	KY	220.67	37
Jefferson County	KY	220.16	38
Bracken County	KY	219.65	39
Hickman County	KY	219.48	40
Floyd County	VA	219.15	41

Table 30 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Owen County	KY	$218.56	42
Mercer County	KY	217.66	43
Webster County	KY	216.57	44
McLean County	KY	216.13	45
Lewis County	KY	215.86	46
Lawrence County	KY	215.35	47
Ballard County	KY	214.94	48
Morgan County	KY	214.19	49
King William County	VA	213.79	50
Rockcastle County	KY	213.64	51
Wolfe County	KY	213.10	52
Scott County	KY	211.48	53
Wayne County	KY	210.87	54
Surry County	VA	209.20	55
Hart County	KY	209.11	56
Albemarle County	VA	208.36	57
Dinwiddie County	VA	207.13	58
Highland County	VA	204.94	59
Northumberland County	VA	200.41	60
Prince William County	VA	199.50	61
Cumberland County	VA	199.20	62
Goochland County	VA	198.55	63
Caroline County	VA	198.17	64
Loudoun County	VA	189.62	65
Buckingham County	VA	189.00	66
Bland County	VA	188.88	67
Accomack County	VA	188.85	68
Jackson County	TN	187.27	69
Middlesex County	VA	184.92	70
Giles County	TN	184.81	71
Perry County	TN	183.92	72
Cocke County	TN	181.68	73
Anderson County	TN	174.10	74
Coffee County	TN	174.09	75
Sullivan County	TN	166.49	76
Lincoln County	TN	165.96	77
Carnon County	TN	165.45	78
Hickman County	TN	164.74	79
Hardin County	TN	164.33	80
Bledsoe County	TN	163.20	81
Grainger County	TN	158.96	82
Henderson County	TN	155.58	83
Bradley County	TN	152.08	84
Obion County	TN	151.81	85
Roane County	TN	151.68	86

Table 30 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Stewart County	TN	$150.11	87
Decatur County	TN	149.23	88
Moore County	TN	148.99	89
Monroe County	TN	148.44	90
Rutherford County	TN	146.48	91
Davidson County	TN	145.68	92
Henry County	TN	145.46	93

162

Table 31

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia Independent Public Schools Transportation Costs Per Pupil, 1984-85

District/Division Name	State	Costs Per Pupil	Rank
Radford City	VA	$1,077.65	1
Colonial Heights City	VA	817.23	2
Kenton County, Beechwood	KY	676.22	1
Bristol City	VA	600.96	3
Campbell County, Newport	KY	337.20	2
Knox County, Knoxville	TN	323.38	1
Staunton City	VA	315.09	4
Campbell County, Southgate	KY	290.44	3
Hardin County, West Point	KY	283.47	4
Jefferson County, Anchorage	KY	252.57	5
Alexandria City	VA	243.53	5
Norfolk City	VA	233.56	6
Richmond City	VA	218.87	7
Kenton County, Covington	KY	210.17	6
Falls Church City	VA	200.71	8
Williamsburg City	VA	195.28	9
Shelby County, Memphis	TN	194.28	2
Warren County, Bowling Green	KY	192.60	7
Johnson County, Paintsville	KY	182.54	8
Pike County, Pikeville	KY	182.22	9
**Gibson County, Gibson	TN	172.97	3
Boone County, Walton Verona	KY	157.12	10
**Gibson County, Bradford	TN	156.67	4
Sullivan County, Kingsport	TN	155.70	5
Daviess County, Owensboro	KY	154.75	11
Loudon County, Lenoir	TN	152.91	6
Graves County, Mayfield	KY	148.34	12
Madison County, Richmond	KY	136.85	13
Logan County, Russellville	KY	133.58	14

**Denotes a special school district.

Table 32

Kentucky Regular Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Lyon County	3.37	1
Trigg County	3.66	2
Cumberland County	3.67	3
Hickman County	3.74	4
Robertson County	3.90	5
Crittenden County	4.16	6
Breckinridge County	4.59	7
Carlisle County	4.65	8
Fulton County	4.87	9
Butler County	4.88	10*
Livingston County	4.88	10*
Hart County	5.17	12
Todd County	5.28	13
Logan County	5.33	14
Menifee County	5.40	15
Owsley County	5.52	16
Bracken County	5.68	17
Metcalfe County	5.72	18
Owen County	5.95	19
Elliott County	5.97	20*
Washington County	5.97	20*
Lewis County	6.01	22
Green County	6.13	23
Wayne County	6.30	24
Nicholas County	6.33	25
Casey County	6.39	26
Breathitt County	6.43	27
Bath County	6.45	28
Morgan County	6.50	29
Fleming County	6.60	30
Spencer County	6.61	31
Barren County	6.62	32
Caldwell County	6.65	33
Monroe County	6.67	34
Edmonson County	6.74	35
Webster County	6.79	36
Adair County	6.81	37
Henry County	6.84	38
Ohio County	6.88	39
Ballard County	6.95	40
Graves County	6.96	41
Lee County	7.13	42

Table 32 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Lawrence County	7.23	43
Wolfe County	7.27	44
Bourbon County	7.32	45
Calloway County	7.33	46
Allen County	7.49	47
Grayson County	7.52	48
McLean County	7.71	49
Garrard County	7.72	50
Trimble County	7.79	51
Mercer County	8.10	52
Taylor County	8.21	53
Union County	8.22	54
Nelson County	8.24	55
Pendleton County	8.27	56
Larue County	8.40	57
Leslie County	8.43	58
Clinton County	8.53	59
Hancock County	8.59	60*
Jackson County	8.59	60*
McCreary County	8.81	62
Marion County	9.18	63
Whitley County	9.20	64
Russell County	9.28	65
Grant County	9.30	66
Rockcastle County	9.33	67
Gallatin County	9.56	68
Magoffin County	9.61	69
Mason County	9.67	70
Harrison County	9.68	71
Pulaski County	10.11	72
Clay County	10.14	73
Meade County	10.40	74
Rowan County	10.83	75
Knott County	11.03	76
Lincoln County	11.25	77
Greenup County	11.46	78
Shelby County	11.78	79
Bell County	11.98	80
Estill County	12.03	81
Simpson County	12.05	82
Christian County	12.46	83
Anderson County	12.60	84
Carroll County	12.76	85
Martin County	13.21	86
Marshall County	13.37	87

Table 32 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Boyle County	13.62	88
Carter County	13.70	89
Harlan County	13.86	90
Madison County	13.98	91
Muhlenberg County	14.03	92
Knox County	14.31	93
Scott County	14.80	94
Letcher County	15.06	95
Hopkins County	15.32	96
Johnson County	16.46	97
Henderson County	16.49	98
Woodford County	17.1[illegible]	99
Warren County	17.40	100
Daviess County	18.48	101
Laurel County	18.51	102
Hardin County	18.59	103
Perry County	18.69	104
Powell County	20.01	105
Clark County	20.44	106
Pike County	20.64	107
Montgomery County	23.61	108
Floyd County	23.82	10[illegible]
McCracken County	24.18	110
Campbell County	25.87	111
Franklin County	27.74	112
Jessamine County	28.99	113
Boyd County	31.04	114
Oldham County	32.51	115
Boone County	33.51	116
Bullitt County	34.07	11[illegible]
Kenton County	64.32	118
Fayette County	107.63	119
Jefferson County	241.83	120

*Denotes a tie.

Table 33

Kentucky Independent Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Mercer County, Burgin	21.11	1
Jefferson County, Anchorage	31.10	2
Boone County, Walton Verona	32.08	3
Henry County, Eminence	33.18	4
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	39.35	5
Letcher County, Jenkins	41.96	6
Grant County, Williamstown	44.38	7
Pulaski County, Science Hill	46.29	8
Hardin County, West Point	52.55	9
Barren County, Caverna	57.62	10
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	74.89	11
Bracken County, Augusta	84.57	12
Fulton County, Fulton	94.33	13
Nelson County, Bardstown	100.94	14
Bell County, Middlesboro	102.12	15
Greenup County, Raceland-Worthington	117.86	16
Pike County, Pikeville	120.22	17
Webster County, Providence	121.15	18
Harlan County, Harlan	154.29	19
Perry County, Hazard	159.01	20
Breathitt County, Jackson	161.82	21
Hopkins County, Dawson Springs	186.57	22
Whitley County, Williamsburg	206.52	23
Kenton County, Beechwood	209.38	24
Logan County, Russellville	218.71	25
Johnson County, Paintsville	220.27	26
Boyle County, Danville	229.43	27
Barren County, Glasgow	233.59	28
Campbell County, Southgate	238.57	29
Taylor County, Campbellsville	246.61	30
Knox County, Barbourville	248.50	31
Calloway County, Murray	259.62	32
Wayne County, Monticello	272.41	33
Campbell County, Silver Grove	279.09	34
Boyd County, Fairview	288.75	35
McCracken County, Paducah	300.44	36
Pulaska County, Somerset	301.94	37
Greenup County, Russell	306.63	38
Graves County, Mayfield	315.19	39
Mercer County, Harrodsburg	320.94	40
Bell County, Pineville	360.67	41
Campbell County, Fort Thomas	374.26	42

Table 33 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Hardin County, Elizabethtown	377.84	43
Boyd County, Ashland	402.89	44
Mason County, Maysville	406.11	45
Franklin County, Frankfort	430.00	46
Kenton County, Erlanger	468.80	47
Warren County, Bowling Green	468.96	48
Madison County, Berea	477.27	49
Whitley County, Corbin	495.79	50
Madison County, Richmond	535.00	51
Daviess County, Owensboro	549.02	52
Bourbon County, Paris	640.00	53
Kenton County, Ludlow	770.00	54
Campbell County, Bellevue	1,001.00	55
Kenton County, Covington	1,095.76	56
Campbell County, Newport	1,098.00	57
Campbell County, Dayton	1,299.00	58

Table 34

Tennessee Regular Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Carroll County	0.52	1
Perry County	2.42	2
Gibson County	3.07	3
Van Buren County	3.38	4
Stewart County	3.46	5
Wayne County	3.98	6
Jackson County	4.48	7
Pickett County	4.49	8
Bledsoe County	4.64	9
Hickman County	4.90	10
Decatur County	4.99	11
Fentress County	5.02	12
Clay County	5.33	13
Humphreys County	5.58	14
Scott County	5.71	15
Henry County	5.77	16
Lewis County	5.86	17
Benton County	5.96	18
Dyer County	6.13	19
Hancock County	6.14	20
Morgan County	6.18	21
Henderson County	6.39	22
Cannon County	6.61	23
Crockett County	6.64	24
Sequatchie County	6.74	25
Hardin County	6.90	26
Fayette County	7.02	27
Polk County	7.04	28
Overton County	7.08	29
Meigs County	7.11	30
Lincoln County	7.27	31
Houston County	7.29	32
Monroe County	7.30	33
Coffee County	7.36	34
Giles County	7.39	35
Moore County	7.45	36
Chester County	7.55	37*
McNairy County	7.55	37*
Lake County	7.79	39
Obion County	7.87	40
Hardeman County	7.98	41
De Kalb County	8.08	42

109

Table 34 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Smith County	8.30	43
Cumberland County	8.32	44
Johnson County	8.57	45
Haywood County	8.58	46
Grundy County	8.79	47
Weakley County	8.83	48
Macon County	9.05	49
Marion County	9.21	50
Trousdale County	9.34	51
Lauderdale County	9.42	52
Marshall County	9.47	53
White County	9.48	54
Union County	10.00	55
Grainger County	10.27	56
Franklin County	11.13	57
Lawrence County	11.39	58
Bedford County	11.45	59*
Cocke County	11.45	59*
Greene County	11.63	61
Tipton County	11.77	62
Claiborne County	12.10	63
Dickson County	12.41	64
Rhea County	13.27	65
McMinn County	13.30	66
Madison County	13.61	67
Warren County	13.87	68
Sevier County	14.11	69
Maury County	15.01	70*
Wilson County	15.01	70*
Robertson County	15.24	72
Loudon County	15.56	73
Campbell County	15.74	74
Hawkins County	15.81	75
Cheatham County	16.27	76
Roane County	16.37	77
Unicoi County	16.88	78
Blount County	17.36	79
Williamson County	17.54	80
Jefferson County	18.74	81
Carter County	19.59	82
Anderson County	20.53	83
Putnam County	20.54	84
Rutherford County	21.51	85
Montgomery County	27.25	86
Washington County	27.85	87

Table 34 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Bradley County	28.22	88
Sumner County	33.70	89
Hamilton County	34.43	90
Shelby County	37.10	91
Sullivan County	40.25	92
Knox County	49.41	93
Hamblen County	53.59	94
Davidson County	117.33	95

*Denotes a tie.

Table 35

Tennessee Independent Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Carroll County, South Carroll	3.01	1*
Carroll County, West Carroll	3.01	1*
**Gibson County, Gibson	4.33	3
**Gibson County, Trenton	9.20	4
Hawkins County, Rogersville	10.92	5
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	10.96	6
**Ca oll County, Huntingdon	19.99	7
Carter County, Elizabethton	27.54	8
Rhea County, Dayton	43.40	9
Anderson County, Oak Ridge	44.56	10
Sullivan County, Bristol	48.52	11
Roane County, Harriman	62.41	12
**Scott County, Oneida	63.30	13
**Gibson County, Bradford	67.80	14
Tipton County, Covington	74.21	15
**Wilson County, Lebanon	83.87	16
McMinn County, Etowah	85.17	17
**Marion County, Richard	87.60	18
**Henry County, Paris	109.83	19
Anderson County, Clinton	116.53	20
Rutherford County, Murfreesboro	118.64	21
Henderson County, Lexington	124.00	22
Coffee County, Tullahoma	148.70	23
Blount County, Alcoa	151.68	24
Lincoln County, Fayetteville	151.85	25
McMinn County, Athens	156.67	26
Coffee County, Manchester	160.29	27
Blount County, Maryville	161.63	28
Bradley County, Cleveland	168.23	29
Sullivan County, Kingsport	172.45	30
Madison County, Jackson	173.76	31
Hamilton County, Chattanooga	185.36	32
Washington County, Johnson	192.74	33
Cocke County, Newport	216.22	34
**Gibson County, Milan	227.40	35
**Williamson County, Franklin	240.88	36
Monroe County, Sweetwater	248.15	37
Greene County, Greeneville	258.88	38
Obion County, Union	262.75	39
Dyer County, Dyersburg	284.62	40
Crockett County, Bells	326.00	41

Table 35 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Shelby County, Memphis	367.86	42
Gibson County, Humboldt	459.33	43
Crockett County, Alamo	20,600.00	44

*Denotes a tie.
**Denotes a special school district.

Note: Excludes those districts not reporting data.

Table 36

Virginia Regular Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

Division Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Highland County	0.92	1
Bath County	1.82	2
Craig County	2.27	3
King and Queen County	2.97	4
Bland County	3.23	5
Buckingham County	3.74	6
Sussex County	3.84	7
Rappahannock County	3.85	8
Surry County	4.09	9
Southampton County	4.15	10
Amelia County	4.48	11
Nelson County	4.53	12
Brunswick County	4.69	13
King William County	4.86	14
Charlotte County	4.92	15
Cumberland County	4.93	16
Rockbridge County	4.94	17
Lunenburg County	5.15	18
Floyd County	5.20	19
Madison County	5.37	20
Grayson County	5.56	21
Essex County	6.02	22
Goochland County	6.11	23
Patrick County	6.36	24
Charles City County	6.59	25
Caroline County	6.63	26
Appomattox County	6.64	27*
Prince Edward County	6.64	27*
Richmond County	6.72	29
Louisa County	6.77	30
Fluvanna County	6.96	31
Northumberland County	7.13	32
Dinwiddie County	7.42	33
Botetourt County	7.99	34
Alleghany County	8.03	35
New Kent County	8.40	36
Mecklenburg County	8.44	37*
Nottoway County	8.44	37*
Scott County	8.69	39
Franklin County	8.70	40
Carroll County	9.04	41
Middlesex County	9.06	42

Table 36 (continued)

Division Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Westmoreland County	9.12	43
Giles County	9.18	44
Halifax County	9.42	45
Shenandoah County	9.43	46
Powhatan County	9.50	47
Clarke County	9.51	48
Orange County	9.90	49
Augusta County	9.93	50
Amherst County	10.32	51
Rockingham County	10.54	52
Bedford County	10.65	53
Accomack County	10.71	54
Greene County	10.73	55
Page County	10.75	56
Wythe County	10.81	57
Greensville County	10.97	58
Pittsylvania County	11.38	59
Culpeper County	11.51	60
Northampton County	11.80	61
Albemarle County	11.98	62
Lancaster County	11.99	63
Lee County	12.11	64
Isle of Wight County	12.15	65
Russell County	12.66	66
Dickenson County	13.19	67
Fauquier County	13.32	68
King George County	13.91	69
Smyth County	14.13	70
Mathews County	14.33	71
Washington County	14.34	72
Buchanan County	14.97	73
Campbell County	16.64	74
Warren County	17.47	75
Frederick County	17.55	76
Gloucester County	18.99	77
Prince George County	19.46	78
Tazewell County	19.58	79
Pulaski County	20.79	80
Hanover County	21.25	81
Montgomery County	21.38	82
Spotsylvania County	22.50	83
Wise County	23.73	84
Loudoun County	25.72	85
Henry County	26.47	86
Stafford County	39.58	87

Table 36 (continued)

Division Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Roanoke County	58.24	83
York County	76.25	89
Chesterfield County	86.03	90
Prince William County	109.12	91
Henrico County	134.12	92
Fairfax County	321.57	93
Arlington County	548.12	94

Table 37

Virginia Independent Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

Division Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Suffolk City	20.81	1
Chesapeake City	73.76	2
Norton City	113.63	3
Poquoson City	142.94	4
Galax City	157.13	5
Lexington City	167.00	6
South Boston City	170.00	7
Lynchburg City	199.92	8
Virginia Beach City	239.58	9
Salem City	249.64	10
Bristol City	274.73	11
Petersburg City	303.23	12
Martinsville City	306.82	13
Covington City	318.00	14
Radford City	323.00	15
Staunton City	337.22	16
Winchester City	341.22	17
Roanoke City	344.67	18
Waynesboro City	360.86	19
Hampton City	366.02	20
Newport News City	368.10	21
Colonial Heights City	378.38	22
Fredericksburg City	389.50	23
Danville City	404.39	24
Hopewell City	442.33	25
Buena Vista City	458.00	26
Charlottesville City	462.20	27
Franklin City	478.25	28
Harrisonburg City	479.17	29
Richmond City	487.22	30
Manassas City	490.25	31
Falls Church City	566.00	32
Portsmouth City	646.59	33
Alexandria City	680.07	34
Norfolk City	731.06	35
Manassas Park City	803.50	36
Williamsburg City	1,052.60	37

Note: Excludes those districts not reporting data.

Table 38

West Virginia Regular Public Schools
Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Pocahontas County	1.85	1
Pendleton County	2.10	2
Hardy County	3.33	3
Tucker County	3.80	4
Gilmer County	4.16	5
Hampshire County	4.57	6
Webster County	4.62	7
Grant County	4.66	8
Doddridge County	4.67	9
Wirt County	4.88	10
Monroe County	4.89	11
Randolph County	4.97	12
Ritchie County	5.10	13
Braxton County	5.71	14
Greenbrier County	6.69	15
Roane County	6.78	16
Summers County	6.91	17
Clay County	7.37	18
Calhoun County	7.50	19
Morgan County	8.37	20
Tyler County	8.66	21
Nicholas County	8.72	22
Barbour County	9.27	23
Lewis County	9.51	24
Preston County	9.55	25
Jackson County	10.82	26
Pleasants County	11.61	27
Mason County	11.73	28
Wetzel County	11.83	29
Lincoln County	12.32	30
Boone County	13.81	31
Upshur County	13.84	32
Wyoming County	17.40	33
Mineral County	17.97	34
Fayette County	18.00	35
Wayne County	18.68	36
Taylor County	18.69	37
McDowell County	19.67	38
Mingo County	21.25	39
Marshall County	23.15	40
Putnam County	23.68	41
Logan County	25.18	42

Table 38 (continued)

District Name	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Raleigh County	27.61	43
Monongalia County	27.79	44
Jefferson County	28.47	45
Berkeley County	31.45	46
Mercer County	31.89	47
Marion County	33.31	48
Harrison County	33.56	49
Kanawha County	41.35	50
Wood County	44.03	51
Brooke County	56.79	52
Cabell County	58.40	53
Ohio County	67.68	54
Hancock County	70.65	55

Table 39

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia Regular Public Schools Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District/Division Name	State	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Carroll County	TN	0.52	1
Highland County	VA	0.92	2
Bath County	VA	1.82	3
Pocahontas County	WV	1.85	4
Pendleton County	WV	2.10	5
Craig County	VA	2.27	6
Perry County	TN	2.42	7
King and Queen County	VA	2.97	8
Gibson County	TN	3.07	9
Bland County	VA	3.23	10
Hardy County	WV	3.33	11
Lyon County	KY	3.37	12
Van Buren County	TN	3.38	13
Stewart County	TN	3.46	14
Trigg County	KY	3.66	15
Cumberland County	KY	3.67	16
Hickman County	KY	3.74	17*
Buckingham County	VA	3.74	17*
Tucker County	WV	3.80	19
Sussex County	VA	3.84	20
Rappahannock County	VA	3.85	21
Robertson County	KY	3.90	22
Wayne County	TN	3.98	23
Surry County	VA	4.09	24
Southampton County	VA	4.15	25
Crittenden County	KY	4.16	26*
Gilmer County	WV	4.16	26*
Jackson County	TN	4.48	28*
Amelia County	VA	4.48	28*
Pickett County	TN	4.49	30
Nelson County	VA	4.53	31
Hampshire County	WV	4.57	32
Breckinridge County	KY	4.59	33
Webster County	WV	4.62	34
Bledsoe County	TN	4.64	35
Carlisle County	KY	4.65	36
Grant County	WV	4.66	37
Doddridge County	WV	4.67	38
Brunswick County	VA	4.69	39
King William County	VA	4.86	40

Table 39 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Fulton County	KY	4.87	41
Butler County	KY	4.88	42*
Livingston County	KY	4.88	42*
Wirt County	WV	4.88	42*
Monroe County	WV	4.89	45
Hickman County	TN	4.90	46
Charlotte County	VA	4.92	47
Cumberland County	VA	4.93	48
Rockbridge County	VA	4.94	49
Randolph County	WV	4.97	50
Decatur County	TN	4.99	51
Fentress County	TN	5.02	52
Ritchie County	WV	5.10	53
Lunenburg County	VA	5.15	54
Hart County	KY	5.17	55
Floyd County	VA	5.20	56
Todd County	KY	5.28	57
Logan County	KY	5.33	58*
Clay County	TN	5.33	58*
Madison County	VA	5.37	60
Menifee County	KY	5.40	61
Owsley County	KY	5.52	62
Grayson County	VA	5.56	63
Humphreys County	TN	5.58	64
Bracken County	KY	5.68	65
Scott County	TN	5.71	66*
Braxton County	WV	5.71	66*
Metcalfe County	KY	5.72	68
Henry County	TN	5.77	69
Lewis County	TN	5.86	70
Owen County	KY	5.95	71
Benton County	TN	5.96	72
Elliott County	KY	5.97	73*
Washington County	KY	5.97	73*
Lewis County	KY	6.01	75
Essex County	VA	6.02	76
Goochland County	VA	6.11	77
Green County	KY	6.13	78*
Dyer County	TN	6.13	78*
Hancock County	TN	6.14	80
Morgan County	TN	6.18	81
Wayne County	KY	6.30	82
Nicholas County	KY	6.33	83
Patrick County	VA	6.36	84

121

Table 39 (continued)

District/Division Name	State	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Casey County	KY	6.39	85*
henderson County	TN	6.39	85*
Breathitt County	KY	6.43	87
Bath County	KY	6.45	88
Morgan County	KY	6.50	89
Fleming County	KY	6.60	90
Cannon County	TN	6.61	91
Crockett County	TN	6.64	92

*Denotes a tie.

Table 40

Upper Quartile Each of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia Independent Public Schools Students Per Square Mile, 1986-87

District/Division Name	State	Students Per Square Mile	Rank
Carroll County, South Carroll	TN	3.01	1*
Carroll County, West Carroll	TN	3.01	1*
**Gibson County, Gibson	TN	4.33	3
**Gibson County, Trenton	TN	9.20	4
Hawkins County, Rogersville	TN	10.92	5
Carroll County, H. Rock Bruceton	TN	10.96	6
**Carroll County, Huntingdon	TN	19.99	7
Suffolk City	VA	20.81	8
Mercer County, Burgin	KY	21.11	9
Carter County, Elizabethton	TN	27.54	10
Jefferson County, Anchorage	KY	31.10	11
Boone County, Walton Verona	KY	32.08	12
Henry County, Eminence	KY	33.18	13
Breckinridge County, Cloverport	KY	39.35	14
Letcher County, Jenkins	KY	41.96	15
Rhea County, Dayton	TN	43.40	16
Grant County, Williamstown	KY	44.38	17
Anderson County, Oak Ridge	TN	44.56	18
Pulaski County, Science Hill	KY	46.29	19
Sullivan County, Bristol	TN	48.52	20
Hardin County, West Point	KY	52.55	21
Barren County, Caverna	KY	57.62	22
Chesapeake City	VA	73.76	23
Laurel County, East Bernstadt	KY	74.89	24
Bracken County, Augusta	KY	84.57	25
Fulton County, Fulton	KY	94.33	26
Nelson County, Bardstown	KY	100.94	27
Bell County, Middlesboro	KY	102.12	28
Norton City	VA	113.63	29
Poquoson City	VA	142.94	30
Fairfax City	VA	157.13	31
Lexington City	VA	167.00	32
South Boston City	VA	170.00	33
Lynchburg City	VA	199.92	34
Virginia Beach City	VA	239.58	35
Salem City	VA	249.64	36

*Denotes a tie.
**Denotes a special school district.

Table 41

Kentucky: Upper Quartile of Regular Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

County Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
Robertson	1	424	112	(3,061.32)	111	(148.43)	5	..90
Lyon	2	904	74	(2,517.58)	1	279.69	1	3.3/
Carlisle	3	944	64	(2,436.29)	88	(170.16)	8	4.65
Hickman	4	1,009	101	(2,789.24)	18	219.48	4	3.74
Gallatin	5	1,047	20	2,208.96	89	(169.99)	68	(9.56)
Owsley	6	1,102	113	(3,068.89)	34	(204.75)	16	5.52
Menifee	7	1,121	2	1,781.54	62	(185.78)	15	5.40
Fulton	8	1,128	33	(2,310.54)	84	(173.67)	9	4.87
Cumberland	9	1,213	79	(2,585.60)	9	232.24	3	3.67
Trimble	10	1,238	97	(2,749.17)	6	236.33	51	(7.79)
Bracken	11	1,240	93	(2,682.31)	17	219.65	17	5.68
Spencer	12	1,302	96	(2,742.95)	35	(204.08)	31	(6.61)
Nicholas	13	1,332	89	(2,635.73)	55*	(191.59)	25	6.33
Elliott	14	1,479	109	(3,038.99)	15	220.67	20*	5.97
Wolfe	15	1,494	4	1,887.72	28	213.10	44	(7.27)
Lee	16	1,596	75	(2,534.36)	63	(185.13)	42	(7.13)
Crittenden	17	1,636	24	2,250.24	5	237.58	6	4.16
Hancock	18	1,662	95	(2,711.20)	55*	(191.59)	60	(8.59)
Ballard	19	1,678	27	2,268.71	25	214.94	40	(6.95)
Livingston	20	1,772	45	(2,358.60)	44	(196.67)	10	4.88
Clinton	21	1,812	82	(2,595.43)		***	59	(8.53)
Washington	22	1,841	105	(2,940.04)	87	(170.39)	20*	5.97
Green	23	1,857	115	(3,087.79)	3	244.71	23	6.13
Owen	24	1,858	56	(2,409.03)	19	218.56	19	5.95
Carroll	25	1,862	119	(3,622.83)	81	(175.28)	85	(12.76)
Garrard	26	1,933	16	2,177.46	45	(196.13)	50	(7.72)
Bath	27	1,942	111	(3,049.63)	42	(198.23)	28	6.45
Trigg	28	1,973	108	(3,033.84)	92	(167.73)	2	3.66
Henry	29	2,014	30	2,275.03	8	232.54	38	(6.84)
McLean	30	2,041	26	2,268.62	22	216.13	49	(7.71)

*Denotes a tie.
***No data for this indicator.

Note: Net enrollment was derived from 1985-86 school year data. Transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil and students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.

Table 42

Kentucky: Upper Quartile of Independent Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

City Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
Southgate	1	160	16	(2,359.74)	3	290.44	29	(238.57)
Augusta	2	270	33	(2,675.68)	16	(125.42)	12	84.57
West Point	3	287	31	(2,617.74)	4	283.47	9	52.55
Anchorage	4	298	58	(4,789.97)	5	252.57	2	31.10
Science Hill	5	311	53	(3,511.68)	39	(84.49)	8	46.29
Silver Grove	6	313	20	(2,443.00)	19	(118.29)	34	(279.09)
East Bernstadt	7	354	14	2,319.13		***	11	74.89
Cloverport	8	363	52	(3,365.72)	18	(120.32)	5	39.35
Jackson	9	368	28	(2,599.15)	34	(92.11)	21	(161.82)
Eminence	10	532	30	(2,606.17)	37	(86.66)	4	33.18
Pineville	11	547	38	(2,772.64)	53	(53.48)	41	(360.67)
Williamstown	12	565	41	(2,830.11)	45	(78.96)	7	44.38
Fulton	13	651	45	(2,901.06)		***	13	94.33
Dawson Springs	14	674	34	(2,695.45)		***	22	(186.57)

***No data for this indicator.

Note: Net enrollment was derived from 1985-86 school year data. Transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil and students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.

Table 43

Tennessee: Upper Quartile of Regular Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

County Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
Carrol	1*	0	1*	0,000.00	63	(110.92)	1	0.52
Gibson	1*	0	1*	0,000.00		***	3	3.07
Pickett	3	797	70	(2,076.31)	33	(137.98)	8	4.49
Van Buren	4	911	13	1,763.74	55	(118.10)	4	3.38
Moore	5	996	59	(2,030.39)	20	148.99	36	(7.45)
Perry	6	1,065	85	(2,282.10)	3	183.92	2	2.42
Trousdale	7	1,070	23	1,844.40	57	(117.33)	51	(9.34)
Houston	8	1,416	8	1,727.77	76	(101.51)	32	(7.29)
Hancock	9	1,424	38	(1,938.14)	37	(132.63)	20	6.14
Lake	10	1,428	67	(2,067.06)	71	(104.25)	39	(7.79)
Claiborne	11	1,441	54	(1,991.61)	75	(101.71)	63	(12.10)
Jackson	12	1,543	27	(1,857.53)	1	187.27	7	4.48
Meigs	13	1,642	51	(1,978.04)	77	(101.44)	30	(7.11)
Stewart	14	1,711	83	(2,190.71)	18	150.11	5	3.46
Bledsoe	15	1,756	74	(2,105.04)	12	163.20	9	4.64
Crockett	16	1,842	46	(1,962.03)	78	(100.83)	24	6.64
Lewis	17	1,851	4	1,635.18	64	(109.56)	17	5.86
Cannon	18	1,900	7	1,718.09	9	165.45	23	6.61
Sequatchie	19	1,941	71	(2,082.62)	38	(130.20)	25	(6.74)
Decatur	20	2,033	33	(1,876.90)	19	149.23	11	4.99
Chester	21	2,277	3	1,602.22	89	(89.60)	37	(7.55)
Union	22	2,402	10	1,755.00	25	(145.33)	55	(10.00)
Smith	23	2,556	16	1,772.29	49	(121.70)	43	(8.30)

*Denotes a tie.
***No data for this indicator.

Note: Net enrollment and transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil and students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.

Table 44

Tennessee: Upper Quartile of Independent Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

City Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
**Richard	1	219	1	1,530.62		***	18	(87.60)
Bells	2	341	3	1,695.03		***	41	(326.00)
South Carroll	3	373	15	(1,835.36)		***	1	3.01
Alamo	4	415	2	1,665.83		***	44	(20,600)
Etowah	5	491	19	(1,968.54)	21	(54.65)	17	(85.17)
Rogersville	6	568	29	(2,262.52)		***	5	10.92
Dayton	7	637	5	1,743.12		***	9	43.40
**Bradford	8	690	8	1,773.28	4	156.67	14	(67.80)
Lexington	9	806	9	1,780.68		***	22	(124.00)
Newport	10	820	18	(1,967.99)		***	34	(216.22)
H. Rock Bruceton	11	864	10	1,793.33		***	6	10.96
Fayetteville	12	904	24	(2,116.22)	17	(79.56)	25	(151.85)

**Denotes a special school district.
***No data for this indicator.

Note: Net enrollment and transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil and students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.

Table 45

Virginia: Upper Quartile of Regular Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

County Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
Highland	1	455	80	(3,323.00)	14	204.94	1	0.92
Craig	2	720	8	2,626.00	61	(150.32)	3	2.27
King and Queen	3	987	70	(3,191.00)	3	261.34	4	2.97
Bath	4	992	93	(4,598.00)	1	295.74	2	1.82
Rappahannock	5	999	64	(3,117.00)	29	(180.02)	8	3.85
Surry	6	1,133	91	(4,092.00)	11	209.20	9	4.09
Bland	7	1,176	11	2,681.00	22	188.88	5	3.23
Middlesex	8	1,184	52	(3,036.00)	24	184.92	42	(9.06)
Charles City	9	1,199	85	(3,506.00)	25	(184.33)	25	(6.59)
Mathews	10	1,205	38	(2,873.00)	30	(178.80)	71	(14.33)
Richmond	11	1,247	16	2,720.00	34	(171.53)	29	(6.72)
King William	12	1,391	79	(3,292.00)	10	213.79	14	4.86
Northumberland	13	1,429	62	(3,114.00)	15	200.41	32	(7.13)
Cumberland	14	1,470	14	2,715.00	17	199.20	16	4.93
Amelia	15	1,498	31	(2,786.00)	57	(151.70)	11	4.48
Essex	16	1,505	68	(3,147.00)	7	232.05	22	6.02
Clarke	17	1,601	77	(3,259.00)	77	(132.67)	48	(9.51)
Lancaster	18	1,617	26	(2,773.00)	35	(169.61)	63	(11.99)
Greene	19	1,634	39	(2,878.00)	70	(141.24)	55	(10.73)
New Kent	20	1,763	75	(3,243.00)	4	245.38	36	(8.40)
Madison	21	1,794	63	(3,116.00)	45	(160.19)	20	5.37
Goochland	22	1,804	82	(3,385.00)	18	198.55	23	6.11
Sussex	23	1,893	78	(3,264.00)	8	226.67	7	3.84

Note: Net enrollment and transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil were derived from 1985-86 school year data. Students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.

Table 46

Virginia: Upper Quartile of Independent Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

City Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
Cape Charles	1	221	12	(3,003.00)		***		***
Fries	2	428	1	2,122.00		***		***
Colonial Beach	3	489	9	2,845.00	20	(93.66)		***
Lexington	4	499	4	2,706.00		***	6	167.00
West Point	5	703	36	(3,737.00)	34	(56.10)		***
South Boston	6	864	2	2,541.00		***	7	170.00
Norton	7	1,020	16	(3,117.00)	33	(58.71)	3	113.63
Falls Church	8	1,060	42	(5,703.00)	8	200.71	32	(566.00)
Galax	9	1,286	7	2,779.00	31	(69.93)	5	157.13
Covington	10	1,323	21	(3,361.00)	29	(80.19)	14	(318.00)
Buena Vista	11	1,350	6	2,722.00	35	(34.58)	26	(458.00)

***No data for this indicator.

Note: Net enrollment and transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil were derived from 1985-86 school year data. Students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.

Table 47

West Virginia: Upper Quartile of Regular Public Schools for Net Enrollment Plus Data on Other Indicators

County Name	Net Enrollment		Expenditure Costs Per Pupil		Transportation Costs Per Pupil		Students Per Square Mile	
	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number
Wirt	1	1,107	3	2,825.81	10	339.04	10	4.88
Gilmer	2	1,384	53	(4,906.35)	4	390.06	5	4.16
Pendleton	3	1,437	50	(4,592.80)	1	485.97	2	2.10
Doddridge	4	1,465	15	(3,331.11)	9	339.76	9	4.67
Pleasants	5	1,584	47	(4,353.08)	5	378.16	27	(11.61)
Tucker	6	1,623	46	(4,301.75)	40	(249.39)	4	3.80
Calhoun	7	1,697	32	(3,784.36)	6	377.51	19	(7.50)
Pocahontas	8	1,751	55	(6,479.43)	3	404.81	1	1.85
Hardy	9	1,944	54	(5,496.40)	2	406.84	3	3.33
Grant	10	2,044	36	(3,875.08)	12	337.73	8	4.66
Morgan	11	2,074	48	(4,484.59)	41	(238.28)	20	(8.37)
Ritchie	12	2,102	17	(3,350.13)	21	(296.66)	13	5.10
Tyler	13	2,241	37	(3,876.46)	13	332.37	21	(8.66)
Monroe	14	2,287	43	(4,058.72)	8	342.10	11	4.89

Note: Net enrollment and transportation costs per pupil were derived from 1984-85 school year data. Expenditure costs per pupil and students per square mile were derived from 1986-87 school year data.

Numbers in "Rank" columns represent rank order within the state for that indicator only. Numbers in parentheses represent out-of-upper quartile positions.