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Canadian educational governance at the school board level has been described by critics as being unrepresentative and unresponsive. It has been suggested by some writers in education that the infusion of party politics into school board elections would help boards to perform better the functions that are basic to responsive government.

This study addresses the following major questions concerning partisan school board elections: Do trustee candidates belonging to different civic parties differ in their educational attitudes and opinions; and, do elected trustees belonging to different civic parties differ in their representative and consultative behaviours?

The study was divided into two parts. Part One consisted of a questionnaire distributed to candidates running for election in two suburban school boards in the Lower Mainland of B.C. This questionnaire gathered information on the educational opinions and attitudes of the candidates plus demographic data on age, sex, level of education and occupational ranking. Part Two consisted of a second questionnaire distributed to those candidates who were elected as school board members. This questionnaire gathered information on the representative and consultative behaviours of the trustees.

The results of this study indicate that there are only moderate differences in the educational attitudes and opinions between the two
parties in one of the districts. These moderate differences are also apparent in the post-election behaviours of the elected trustees. Few consistent differences were evident in the second district. Where differences did occur they were generally in accord with the political ideologies of the respective parties. This study suggests that the existence of political parties at the school board level does not guarantee clearly defined differences between the candidates or in the operating behaviours of the elected trustees.
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Educational governance at the school board level has often been described by critics as being both unrepresentative and unresponsive. Elections of school trustees are usually issueless, apolitical affairs with moderate voter turnout (Levin, 1975, p. 23; Coleman, 1975, pp. 32-33; CEA Task Force, 1979, pp. 57, 59; Jennings, 1975, p. 240). Once elected, many trustees are accused of being co-opted by their professional staffs, becoming rubber stamps for the legitimization of administrative policies (Wiles, 1972, p. 33).

It has been suggested by some writers in education that the infusion of party politics into educational governance will strengthen the position of trustees in dealing with their professional staffs and will make school boards more responsive to the needs of their constituents (Jennings, 1975; Zeigler and Jennings, 1974). Partisan elections in school districts, it is argued, would result in greater competition for office, more calls for policy change, more challenge of senior professional staff, and more responsiveness to community demands.

For partisan school boards to be more representative and responsive there must be genuine, perceptible differences between the competing parties. This study will investigate whether there are, in fact, perceptible differences in the personal characteristics, educational
attitudes, and educational opinions of school board candidates belonging to different civic parties. The study will also investigate whether there are perceptible differences in the consultative and representative behaviours of elected trustees belonging to different civic parties.

If differences do exist between the parties in the above areas this should then result in a clearer set of choices for the voter, not only through opinions expressed by the candidates at election time but also by the modes of representation indicated by the party members' behaviours in the previous term of office.

Thus the party label may help the voter to support candidates belonging to the party that best reflects the voter's own opinions and attitudes on education in general and who also follow a representative mode of behaviour agreeable to the voter.

A study of this nature has several inherent limitations and difficulties, the understanding of which are essential before drawing any conclusions from the findings. Firstly, part one of this study is a replication of an earlier study made by Nielsen of the 1978 Vancouver School Board elections (Nielsen, 1980). This, in part, has predetermined certain aspects of the study involving instrumentation, methodology and terminology.

Secondly, the topic of partisan school board elections is not a well developed field. Literature on the role of elected representatives in Canadian municipal politics is sparse and the published materials on
the behaviour of and characteristics of partisan school boards is almost non-existent.

The third and most serious limitation of this study is the extremely small sample that was used. The study was limited to two cases only and within each case we are dealing with a two member and a four member party.

As a result of these limitations, firm conclusions are not possible. This work must therefore be regarded as an exploratory study, the findings of which must remain speculative and tentative.
Statement of the Problem

Central Problem

Do trustee candidates who belong to different civic parties differ in their educational opinions and attitudes; and, do elected trustees who belong to different civic parties differ in their consultative and representative behaviours?

Sub-Problems

Deriving from the central problem of the relationship between partisanship and school board members are the more specific sub-problems of the study.

Sub-Problem 1. To what extent are the personal characteristics (i.e., age, sex, occupational ranking, and level of education) of school board candidates characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong? That is, to what extent do school board candidates belonging to different civic parties differ in their personal characteristics?

Sub-Problem 2. To what extent are the educational opinions of school board candidates characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong? That is, to what extent do school board candidates belonging to different civic parties differ in their educational opinions?

Sub-Problem 3. To what extent are the educational attitudes of school board candidates characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong? That is, to what extent do school board candidates belonging to different civic parties differ in their educational attitudes?
Sub-Problem 4. To what extent are the consultative behaviours (as shown by the amount of consultation that would take place prior to making decisions) of the elected trustees characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong? That is, to what extent do elected trustees belonging to different civic parties differ in their consultative behaviours?

Sub-Problem 5. To what extent are the representative behaviours (as shown by constituent versus superintendent influence in trustee policy decisions) of elected trustees characteristic of the civic party to which they belong? That is, to what extent do elected trustees belonging to different civic parties differ in their representative behaviours?

Sub-Problem 6. To what extent are the representative behaviours (as shown by constituent influence versus personal judgement in trustee decision making) of elected trustees characteristic of the civic party to which they belong?

Sub-Problem 7. To what extent are the elected trustees' perceptions of constituent satisfaction characteristic of the civic party to which they belong? That is, do elected trustees belonging to different civic parties differ in their perceptions of constituent satisfaction?
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The Origins of Non-Partisanship

The origins of non-partisanship in Canada can initially be traced to influences from the United States in the late 1800's. An excellent description of the political environment of the day is given by McCaffrey in his article, Politics in the Schools: A Case for Partisan Board Elections.

The use of the technocracy in American society included a growing emphasis on the role of experts in production efficiency. The affairs of organizations were handled by individuals with specific skills in particular areas. As society developed its cult of experts in the private business sector, it became apparent that public institutions could be improved by similar processes. Evidence of corruption and patronage in government, revealed extensively by the muckrakers of the early part of the century, indicated that the type of expertise which contributed to the efficient operation of public organizations was not possessed by politicians. Many people judged the worth of government by political activity. The search for excellence in the administration of public institutions became a search for apolitical skills on the assumption that running government on 'good business principles' would clean it up.

(McCaffrey, 1971, p.53)

The corruption of party-dominated city politics at this time was added to by the power of political patronage, the needs of a large immigrant population and the absence of social welfare programs (Masson & Anderson, 1972, p.3). The disillusionment with the politics of the day
was further aided by a growing disparity of wealth in the cities with the "massive increase in urban poor resulting in a sense of moral outrage" (Hawley, 1973, p.9).

The outcome of the public's distaste for the evils of the party machines was the formation of the National Municipal League in 1884, which included in its platform:

(a) the introduction of the non-partisan ballot;
(b) separation of the dates of local and state and national elections; and
(c) the commission and city manager form of government.

(Masson & Anderson, 1972, p.3)

The American municipal reformers held the beliefs "that urban problems were apolitical, requiring little more than the application of honesty and good business practices ... that certain citizens were more fit to govern than others" (Hawley, 1973, p.9) and "that parties were inherently corrupt" (Masson & Anderson, 1972, p.3).

Non-Partisanship in Canada

Despite the strong cultural similarity between English-speaking Canada and the United States consistent patterns of differences exist between the two countries (Lipset, 1968, p.31). Lipset attributes some of these differences in ideology to the American Revolution, a radical and egalitarian act, which added to the conservative and elitist nature of Canadian society due to the influx of large numbers of Loyalists. This more conservative political and cultural outlook helped to reduce the rise of civic political parties (Lipset, 1968, p.51).
The Canadian pattern of westward expansion and the rural agrarian domination of the Canadian political process are factors cited by Lightbody that further promoted acceptance of local non-partisanship (Lightbody, 1972, p. 196). The emphasis of the rural life-style is on community co-operation fostered by the common enemy in nature. Lightbody also points to the federal-provincial and provincial-municipal power relationships as contributory factors of non-partisanship in Canada. The federal structure of Canadian institutions places greater rewards on the capture of provincial power than municipal (Lightbody, 1972, p. 196). Further, due to provincial influence over the cities there was less independence, "giving little incentive for organized partisan activity" (Lightbody, 1972, p. 196).

To these Canadian factors, Wickett adds that there were basic differences between American and Canadian cities which prevented the growth of urban parties:

... the explanation of this exemption from political interference will be found mainly in the smallness of many of the cities, the homogeneity of the population, and the predominance of local interests and influences.

(Wickett, 1972, p. 24)

Anderson adds that Canadian cities lacked the same degree of immigration influence as the U.S. cities and that the smaller Canadian centres had less need for representative parties, having more face-to-face contact with the politicians (Anderson, 1972, p. 10). These indigenous Canadian factors prevented the entrenchment of partisanship in Canadian municipal elections. The resulting non-partisanship was further
strengthened by the American reform movement "despite the fact that the party system had not been a feature of the politics of Canadian government" (Masson & Anderson, 1972, p.4).

By the time Canadian cities reached the size and complexity sufficient to make them attractive to political parties, the reform ideology imported from the United States had become firmly established and provided an effective barrier to the entry of parties." (Wicket, 1972, p.12)

Partisanship Examined

Before proceeding to an investigation of partisanship and its relationship to educational governance it will be helpful to first have an understanding of the function of political parties and how individuals affiliate with them.

A political party is "an organization existing to organize public opinion and communicate demands to the center of governmental power and

---

1. Although the prime focus of this paper is Canadian partisanship it is necessary to refer to American as well as Canadian authors. This is due, in part, to the strong American influence on Canadian school board politics and the dominance of American studies on educational governance research. Furthermore, there is a general lack of Canadian material on the topic of school board elections and partisanship.

It is accepted that differences between American and Canadian educational governance exist. However, the general functioning of the respective school boards and the role of the trustee as discussed in this paper are similar enough in both countries to allow the use of American references in the Canadian context.
decision" (Lapalombara, 1966, p.3). A political party also helps citizens interpret political information and to channel their political participation (Milbrath, 1966, p.96). The existence of more than one party indicates a certain degree of diversity within the constituency. Partisanship is an expression by some of the constituents that their interests are neither congruent nor compatible with the interests of other groups. If parties do reflect real cleavages among the constituents then it is logical that individuals would affiliate with the party that is the most congruent with their own beliefs. This is assuming that the individual is aware of the parties' ideologies, and is motivated enough to participate to some degree.

Participation can range from a low level of voting for a particular party to actually running as a party candidate. A person who would consider running as a party candidate obviously has a high level of motivation and awareness of the party. Individuals may become active in a party because they are committed to specific ideals and goals or because they are motivated by material incentives (Lawson, 1965, p.95).

The actual selection of individuals to run as party candidates is usually performed by the party members and is referred to as recruitment. To be recruited by a party to run as a candidate the individual must first be eligible, both legally and socially. Social eligibility means that you are socially acceptable to the recruiting group, generally in social and economic terms (Cistone, 1975, p.54). Eligible individuals usually serve an apprenticeship in less formal community organizations or in the lower ranks of party membership. This apprenticeship period gives
the recruiting body an opportunity to assess the eligibility of the individual. Thus, party recruitment acts as a screening process to bring like-minded people into the party (Cistone, 1975, p.56). Party affiliation, therefore, is clearly a mutual process. The individual must make an informed selection of the party he wishes to affiliate with (generally along ideological lines) and then he must be accepted and recruited by the party itself. This mutual selection and screening process should bring about a degree of party distinctness and therefore, partisanship.

Considering the influence of the American municipal reform movement and Canada's indigenous factors, it would seem at first glance that there could be little argument in favour of civic partisanship. Judging, however, from a review of current literature the converse may be true. Partisanship, it seems, may promise some attractive benefits for both electors and elected alike.

Popular criticism of present school board elections are summarized by Boyd in the following:

The non-partisan board elections usually were issueless and resulted in board members who had little sense of connection or responsibility to any defined public constituency.

(Boyd, 1975, p.117)

Anderson further criticizes present school boards for their methods of recruitment of new members:

... many candidates are recruited by organized community groups whose members are almost always individuals of high status ... In addition, self-recruited, candidates, motivated by a private sense of 'noblesse oblige',
frequently run in non-partisan elections. Those elected to office from these two main groups are, as one would expect, quite unrepresentative of the social and class configuration of the local population.

(Anderson, 1972, p.6)

Lutz and Iannaccone comment on trustees' attitudes regarding representation, based on their recent study of school boards:

... the vast majority of school board members believe that they are under no obligation to behave as school board members, based on the wishes of the public .... 87 percent of members surveyed said they voted as they felt best even if that was opposed to what the public wished.

(Lutz & Iannaccone, 1978, p.102)

Boyd, in citing Kerr, makes the following points regarding staff relationships with a non-partisan board:

Kerr found that the interaction of an array of influences associated with non-partisan structure and ideology of school government ... convert the school boards into rubber stamps for the approval and legitimization of policies developed by the administrative staff.

(Boyd, 1975, p.117)

Proponents of partisanship suggest that the introduction of parties into civic elections will improve the recruitment of new board members by offering better candidates due to increased competition (Jennings, 1975, p.243), and by acting as a screening agency for candidates (Cistone, 1975, p.51)

One of the major arguments in favour of partisan elections is the clarity of choice afforded the electors. Fowler and Goldrick suggest that in urban areas
... a large population, heterogeneity, specialization, complexity of issues require institutionalized means to aggregate interests and to provide voters and politicians with a kind of political shorthand with which to sort out issues and appropriate responses.

(Fowler & Goldrick, 1972, p.51)

Hawley makes several strong points on the advantages of a partisan system in informing the voter. He believes that the party labels give the voter an organizing reference point and "serve to increase the voter's consciousness of the relationship ... between the party's position and his own interests" (Hawley, 1973, p.146). He concludes that parties can and often do enhance voter rationality, especially for low income groups" (Hawley, 1973, p.149).

The existence of political parties serves to collect into identifiable groups the candidates' attitudes and opinions which presumably reflect the spectrum of attitudes and opinions found in the general electorate. These grouped attitudes and opinions would be expressed by the candidates during pre-election debate, thus giving voters a clearer set of choices among ideological and policy alternatives (Robinson & Hansen, 1981, p.5).

Jennings (1975), Hawley (1973), Kaplan (1972) and McCaffrey (1971) all suggest that a partisan board is a more responsive board, able to provide strong leadership and to resist the diffusion of power that is experienced by many boards. Partisan boards are less likely to be co-opted by their district staff (Boyd, 1975, p.117), are more able to challenge the superintendency and to formulate and carry out a program based on issues relevant to the electorate (Jennings, 1975, p.243).
It is also likely that partisan boards may be more accountable than non-partisan boards. The basic function of a party, as outlined by Jennings:

... is to contest for and win offices. Rational-activist voters select the party of their choice. After the election the party seeks to press its platform through its members on the school board ... the rational-activist public assesses the party's performance while in office or in opposition; and, come the ensuing elections, vote according to whether their preferences have been satisfied by the party incumbents or by new candidates.

(Jennings, 1975, p.242)

In non-partisan boards there is no readily identifiable group in office to call to account if the voters are unhappy with the board's performance. Non-partisan incumbents are able to shelter themselves in the corporate nature of the board, disclaiming personal responsibility for unpopular decisions, whereas, a candidate of a party will supposedly put forward and support a predetermined platform based on a set ideology. The voters not only know what they are getting when they elect a candidate but have a reference point by which to evaluate the individual's performance for the next election.

Although partisanship promises many advantages over non-partisan systems it is important to point out that the existence of a party label does not automatically guarantee that these advantages will be forthcoming. This is more a function of the degree of partisanship that actually exists as measured by several factors such as party organization, post-election activity and unanimity of member attitudes and opinions.
Any group of individuals who are willing to seek election under a common political label may be considered to be a party. Party activity however, can range from the highly organized (including such activities as candidate selection, having a platform, and bloc voting) to the very loosely organized party which has no real infrastructure and comes together only at election time.

Joyce divides civic parties into three types depending on their origins and level of organization (Joyce, 1970). The "national civic parties" are parties that have grown directly out of one of the federal political parties. These civic parties tend to have a stronger party ideology than the other types since it is based on the ideology of the national party and applied to the local scene. This ideology, in fact, is often the reason for the party's formation rather than some local issue. This clearer ideology often results in the party members being more like-minded than those of other party types. The national civic parties also tend to be more highly organized, borrowing methods and resources from the parent party. These can include an active membership, candidate nominations, the establishment of a party platform, a well organized election mechanism, party caucuses on policy issues, bloc voting, and the expectation that elected party members will operate and vote within party lines.

The second level of civic party is the "local civic party". These parties are usually formed in response to some local need or issue rather than on ideological grounds. The local civic parties tend to develop a
purely local political philosophy which may not be as strong or as consistent as those of the national civic parties.

This type of party is usually not as highly organized. It may have a platform that it puts forward at election time and members would be expected to operate within that platform. They are normally, however, expected to act as independents on non-platform matters.

The third type of party described by Joyce is the "non-partisan civic party". This is the most loosely organized of the three types. Members of this type of party usually only come together during elections to pool their resources for more economic and efficient campaigning. There is rarely a clearly defined platform and no expectations for members to follow a particular party line.

In his study of Canadian civic parties Joyce found that the local civic parties are by far the most numerous of the three types (Joyce, 1970). National parties, however, are now taking a greater interest in municipal elections and are becoming more active in starting and supporting civic parties. Many civic parties see themselves as being non-partisan because they are not directly supported by a national party. However, because of their level of organization they are actually closer to the local civic party type.

Representational Modes of School Board Members

It has been suggested that partisan school boards are more representative than non-partisan boards. To properly examine this claim one must have an understanding of the concept of representation, both in the general sense and as it relates to school boards.
Pitkin has defined representation as acting in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them (Pitkin, 1967, p.4). This implies actions being taken on behalf of someone else. This is necessary since direct participation in government is not possible for the majority of citizens. Representation then, becomes the standard method of self-government. For representation to be valid there should be "a correspondence between what the representatives do and what the represented would have them do" (Mann, 1977, p.79). Representation, therefore, also contains the concept of responsiveness. The representative acts not just in place of the constituent but also with reference to the constituent. Responsiveness does not preclude the elected representative from acting contrary to the constituents' wishes as long as he feels that he is still acting in their best interest (Mann, 1977, p.80).

The potential for conflict between the wishes of the constituents and the judgement of the representative raises the issue of representational styles. Representational styles, or modes, are classically divided into two categories. At one extreme there are those who maintain that the elected representatives must exercise their independent judgement at all times when making decisions. At the other end of the spectrum are those who maintain that representatives should vote as instructed by their constituents (Teichman, 1974). These opposing positions have been given the respective labels of "trustee" and "delegate". (The "trustee" type is also referred to as an "independent". This label is more convenient in the context of school boards to avoid
confusion with the usual title of trustee given to all elected board members.) Briefly defined, the "independent" type of representatives typically believe that they should make their decisions based on their own judgement even if this is contrary to the expressed interests of the people being represented. The "delegates", on the other hand, believe that they have been chosen to accurately reflect the wishes of their constituents even if these wishes are against their own better judgement (Mann, 1977, p.80).

Several theorists feel that the entire dichotomy of representational types is too restrictive to accurately describe the behaviour of most elected representatives. A third mode, falling between the "independent" and "delegate" types has been identified and labeled the "político". The politico "borrows from either the trustee (independent) or delegate styles as dictated by situations but has some internally consistent rationale for doing so" (Mann, 1977, p.80). Kornberg, in his study of the 20th Canadian Parliament (Kornberg, 1967) and Teichman, in her study of Toronto school board members (Teichman, 1974) both found that few representatives operated in either the true delegate or independent modes.

Another dimension of representation that must be considered is the make-up of the community being represented. One may theorize that good representation involves acting on the wishes of the community but this presumes that the members of the community are both aware of the issues at hand and are capable of making informed, rational suggestions to the
representatives. Zeigler and Jennings, however, report that "the majority of the mass public has only the slimmest grasp of the cause-effect relationships with respect to school district problems and their solutions" (Zeigler and Jennings, 1974, p.131).

Mann suggests that responsiveness can be enhanced by a diverse and complex community since divergent interest groups will form and attempt to influence the representatives to act on their behalf. As "metropolitanism increases, school board representatives shift their attention from cues coming from individuals to those coming from groups" (Mann, 1977, p.82).

This relationship between the type of community and the resulting representation has prompted some theorists to classify communities by the degree of accordance among the community members.

Jennings describes various possible "linkage processes" that can occur between the school board and the constituents as a means of communicating the community's preferences (Jennings, 1975). A community with a high degree of homogeneity may not require any formal mechanism to communicate its wishes because the elected members share the same values as their constituents. Jennings calls this the "preference-sharing" model.

The "rational-activist" model describes a community that is actively involved in the representation process. Constituents have clear ideas about what they want in the educational system and act to achieve these goals in a rational manner, usually through the electoral process.
Voters support independent candidates who best reflect their issue preferences. Elected members who have not performed adequately are turned out of office at the next election. This model relies heavily on the electoral process to guarantee responsive behaviour by the elected board member.

The issue preferences of the constituents can be collected into formal groups to form local political parties. The party seeks to win offices and press its platform on the school board. This is the "political party" model. As in the rational-activist model, the voters will assess the party's performance and vote accordingly in the next election. The difference is that the party is being assessed rather than an individual. As discussed earlier, the political party model (i.e. partisanship) offers some distinct advantages over the other models.

Jennings' fourth model is the "interest group" model. This is similar to the political party model in that a recognizable group acts as an intermediary between the constituents and the board. Interest groups are not as formalized as political parties although they may still be involved in recruiting and sponsoring candidates. Interest groups attempt to bring pressure to bear on board policy decisions which directly involve their particular interests. The distinction between interest groups and political parties is not always a clear one and appears to be determined by the degree of structure within the group plus the existence of an ideology that affects the group's opinions in various areas. The previously discussed Joyce typology may be helpful in making distinctions between interest groups and political parties (Joyce, 1970). Organized
Interest groups may be considered to be non-partisan civic parties or even local civic parties depending on their degree of internal structure.

Kaplan describes urban communities as being "non-factional" if there are no organized groups active at election time. "Factional" communities have groups that put forward slates of candidates during the election but become inactive after the election. In "partisan" communities the organized groups remain a cohesive, policy forming unit after the election (Kaplan, 1972).

McCarty and Ramsey expand upon the concept of factional communities by suggesting four possible power structures and their resulting school board types. The "dominated" power structure is a community influenced by a decision making group usually made up of the economic elite. The "factional" power structure has durable factions that compete for control over important issues. In a "pluralistic" power structure the power is dispersed among several poles of power. The "inert" power structure displays no active power groups (McCarty and Ramsey, 1971).

Of particular interest to this study are the school boards that exist within factional and pluralistic power structures. Factional boards are made up of members who represent the viewpoint of one of the community factions. These divergent viewpoints often result in hotly contested, partisan elections. The pluralistic power structure results in a "status-congruent" board where board members are not necessarily bound to one ideology and are free to act as independents.
McCarty and Ramsey suggest that when political parties actively participate in elections a factional board is guaranteed. They suggest that suburban communities often result in status-congruent boards due to the similarities in the values and life styles of the inhabitants. (McCarty and Ramsey, 1971, p.92).

These typologies, along with Joyce's previously discussed classification of civic parties, point out that the formalization of community factions is not an "all or nothing" proposition. They suggest that there are degrees of factionalism therefore groups can display varying degrees of partisanship. The question is not just whether political groups exist within a community but also the degree of partisanship they display.

It has been suggested that partisan school boards are more representative since political parties can better articulate the divergent interests within the community. This presumes that there are in fact divergent interests requiring party representation and that the political parties are organized enough to express these interests in a consistent and meaningful way.

Current Trends

Although historically there was little desire or need for the involvement of political parties in Canadian civic elections, and although a large proportion of school boards remain non-partisan (Nielsen, 1979, p.13) there seems to be a growing shift towards partisanship, if not yet in actual numbers then at least in the calls for it.
Perhaps the most obvious reason for the increased demands for a move away from non-partisan elections is that the conditions which once made non-partisanship desirable no longer exist. The days of the homogeneous community, issueless school board elections and separated school and general governments are rapidly disappearing. Urban areas in both the United States and Canada are becoming increasingly complex and diverse. Strong educational issues are becoming more prominent and political as are the special interest groups that promote them. (Wiles, 1972, p.35; Coleman, 1975, p.33; Usden, 1975, p.266).

The following commentary by Usden on issues affecting American school boards is accurate within the recent Canadian context as well:

Within a brief period of time ... major issues such as race, teacher militancy, community control student activism, inflation and concomitant concerns about escalating school costs, and demands for accountability have cascaded upon boards of education. The recent confluence of education and such volatile issues has politicized local school districts in unprecedented ways and irrevocably pulled them into the mainstream of the body politic.

(Usden, 1975, p.266)

These increased demands and the inability of many trustees to cope with them have resulted in an increased dissatisfaction with education and calls for greater responsiveness by the public (McCaffrey, 1971, p.193)

In the light of this increased complexity and the resulting increase in the demands put on the school board it is understandable that trustees will rely more on interest groups for decision making guidance
and in turn become more responsive (Ziegler & Jennings, 1974, p.80). Trustees are being faced by interest groups which are becoming increasingly political in their strategies to gain support and recognition. It has been suggested that if trustees are to survive in the increasingly politicized educational environment in which they exist they must broaden and deepen their base of lay support (Usden, 1975, p.175).

An added dimension to the effects of these current trends on civic politics in general is that national political parties are taking a greater interest in municipal elections and the power that the urban vote represents. The federal and provincial parties realize the need for a strong urban base and are becoming actively involved in the formation and support of civic parties. These national civic parties tend also to put forth candidates in school board elections. Joyce predicts a rapid increase in the number of national civic parties in the near future (Joyce, 1970, p.58).

Proponents of partisanship suggest that if school boards are to remain viable in the political arena in which they realistically exist then they must themselves become officially political. Furthermore, as suggested earlier, to have a meaningful degree of partisanship there must be distinct and observable differences between the various parties.

In her 1978 study of the Vancouver school board Valerie Nielsen investigated whether there were meaningful differences among the three Vancouver civic parties (Nielsen, 1980). This was done by comparing the responses of school board candidates on several questions concerning
educational attitudes and opinions. The results of the study indicate that there were measurable differences in the educational attitudes and opinions of trustee candidates belonging to different civic parties. Individuals with similar educational attitudes and opinions tended to be associated with particular parties.

This initial study by Nielsen served as the genesis for this investigation as it raised further questions regarding civic party distinctness within school boards. Firstly, do trustee candidates who belong to different suburban civic parties differ in their educational opinions and attitudes; and secondly, do elected trustees who belong to different suburban civic parties differ in their representative and consultative behaviours?

The wearing of a party label must have meaning beyond the pre-election speeches. The voter must be able to identify a party label with a stated platform and a record of performance. Genuine partisanship will mean more than collections of candidates with similar educational attitudes and opinions. It will affect the way in which those attitudes are reflected in the trustee's representative and consultative styles. The extent to which the political parties display differing attitudes and behaviours is, in effect, a measure of the potential benefit of school board partisanship to the public. It is the degree of difference between the parties in these educational attitudes, opinions, and operating behaviours that this study investigates.
Definition of Terms

**Civic Party**: a group which frames policy only on those issues that fall within the responsibility of municipal governments and puts forth candidates for election at this level of activity.

**Delegate**: an elected representative whose decision making is based on the expressed wishes of those being represented even when these wishes are in conflict with the representative's better judgement.

**Independent**: an elected representative whose decision making is based on his/her own judgement even when it is in conflict with the expressed wishes and interests of those being represented.

**Non-Partisan**

an individual or a group who claims to have no ideological framework within which policy is determined.

**Occupational Status**: a scale on which occupations are arranged hierarchically in accordance with the amount of education needed, the amount of responsibility that they entail, and the amount of their earning power. This scale is then said to reflect the status of each occupation, with those at the top of the scale being held in higher regard than those at the bottom.

**Partisan**

referring to formal organizations which embrace particular systems of social and political values and which have as their primary purpose the selection and support of candidates for office.
CHAPTER III

Method

Data Required

In order to address the central and sub-problems of this thesis it was necessary to gather the following data: (1) personal characteristics, i.e. age, sex, occupation and level of occupation; (2) opinions on items dealing with current international, national and local educational issues; (3) attitudes towards traditionalism and progressivism in education; (4) data relating to the consultative behaviours of school board trustees in various, typical, policy-making situations; (5) data relating to the representative behaviours of elected school board members; and (6) trustees' perceptions of the degree of constituent satisfaction.

The Sample

Since this study investigates differences between the parties both before and after the election it was necessary to work with two groups of subjects: (1) all candidates who ran for election in the selected school boards; and (2) those candidates who were elected as school board members.

As previously mentioned, the 1978 Nielsen study described differences in the educational opinions and attitudes of school board
candidates in the city of Vancouver. Part One of this study attempts to replicate the Nielsen study using a sample taken from three suburban Vancouver districts to investigate whether the pre-election party differences cited by Nielsen are also evident in these less metropolitan areas. The districts chosen for this study were the Lower Mainland municipalities of Richmond, Burnaby and Surrey.

Part One. In the 1979 municipal elections in Richmond eleven candidates were running for the seven school board seats. These candidates were sponsored by one of the following three civic parties: (1) The Independent New Democrats (IND), sponsored five candidates. The IND are New Democratic Party supporters with essentially a moderately leftist political ideology; (2) The Richmond Electors' Action League (REAL) sponsored only one candidate and are described as being left of the IND in ideology; (3) The Richmond Independent Voters' Association (RIVA) sponsored five candidates. RIVA has been described as a loose amalgamation of Conservative, Liberal and Social Credit supporters ostensibly organized to counter the IND. All eleven of the Richmond candidates responded to the questionnaire.

In the 1979 civic election in Burnaby the seven school board seats were sought by fifteen candidates, eleven of whom responded to the questionnaire. Seven of the candidates were sponsored by the Burnaby Voters' Association (BVA) which has a rightist political ideology. Five of the seven BVA candidates responded. The Burnaby Citizens' Association (BCA) also sponsored seven candidates, six of whom responded. The BCA
has a leftist political ideology. The eleventh candidate ran independently and did not respond to the questionnaire.

The Surrey sample was more complicated since the district's seven school board seats are not all contested at the same time and one of these seats is voted for only by residents in the White Rock area of Surrey. (White Rock has a separate municipal council but shares a common school board with Surrey). The White Rock seat was contested in 1979 at which time three independents ran. In the same year there were two other Surrey seats up for election with five candidates running. The Surrey Municipal Electors (SME) supported two candidates, only one of whom responded. The SME is a leftist party. The Surrey Voters' Association (SVA), a rightist party, also sponsored two candidates with only one responding to the questionnaire. The fifth candidate was sponsored by the Surrey Alternate Movement (SAM), a Communist supported party. This candidate also responded to the questionnaire.

In 1980 the remaining four Surrey seats were up for election with ten candidates in the running: four from SME with one responding; two from SAM with one responding; three from SVA all responding; and one independent, also responding. Therefore, for the seven Surrey seats over the two elections, four SVA, two SME, and two SAM candidates responded.

Part Two. Since part Two of this study looks at post-election party differences the sample consisted of those candidates who were elected in the 1979/1980 school board elections in the three previously mentioned districts. In Richmond all seven trustees responded to the questionnaire. These included: four from RIVA; two from IND; and one
from REAL. In Burnaby six of the seven trustees responded. These were: four from BVA; and two out of a possible three from BCA. In Surrey five of the seven trustees responded. These were: two out of a possible four from SME; two from SVA; and one independent.

In both parts questionnaires returned by independent candidates and those candidates who were the sole representative of their party were not included in the analysis since any statement regarding differences among these groups would be meaningless.

Instrumentation

Part One. For part One of the study (investigating pre-election party differences of educational attitudes and opinions of partisan candidates) a questionnaire modeled after that used by Nielsen in her Vancouver study was used (see Appendix A). Nielsen devised her questionnaire to measure the opinions of the candidates on local, national and international educational issues. These issues were determined in part by reviewing Vancouver school board minutes and by the Gallup Education Poll published through the Phi Delta Kappan magazine. Issues taken from these sources and used in the Nielsen questionnaire were: (1) the biggest problems schools face today; (2) the particularly good points about schools today; (3) methods to improve schools today; (4) school consultative committees and the amount of power/authority they should have; (5) budget cuts; (6) attitudes toward grants to independent schools; (7) attitudes toward the idea of smaller class size; (8) public education today vs. public education at the time the candidates were in
school; and (9) raising of local taxes for specific educational programs.

To discover whether candidates belonging to different parties have different educational attitudes the Nielsen questionnaire used the Educational Scale VII described below:

The Educational Scale VII utilized in the study was developed by Kerlinger and Pedhazer (1967). This scale is a thirty item, seven point summated rating scale developed to measure educational attitudes on two main factors, Progressivism and Traditionalism. The ESVII was developed to extend and improve items from earlier scales to cover better the educational attitude domain and increase the scale reliability. The analysis indicated that attitudes toward education were based on two relatively uncorrelated factors (traditionalism and progressivism). These factors were stable over different samples. These two dimensions of attitudes toward education are perhaps due to the culture in which the individual learned his attitudes and to a general cognitive process of dichotomous categorizing (Bruner, Goodnow, & Austin, 1956, Ch.1).

Thus empirically the implications of the scale are that there are two main educational attitudes measured by the two general factors mentioned above. They account for most of the common variance of educational attitude items. These factors emerged consistently in second order factor analysis yielding two relatively uncorrelated (orthogonal) sets of factors. Naturally the sub-factors within the two sets were positively correlated. The scale (ESVII) when tested (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1967) showed statistically significant reliability coefficients which averaged around values of .80.

(Nielsen, 1980 p.26)

Traditionalism is defined by strong positive responses to issues such as:

- Children need and should have more discipline than they get.
- Learning is essentially a process of increasing one's store of information about various fields of knowledge.
- Teachers should keep in mind that pupils have to be made to work.
Traditionalism is related to general conservatism and moralism.

Progressivism is defined by strong positive responses to statements such as:

- Learning is experimental; the child should be taught to test alternatives before accepting any of them.
- Education and educational institutions must be sources of new social ideas.
- We should fit the curriculum to the child and not the child to the curriculum.

Progressivism is related to social learning theory and personalism (concern for individual growth and development rather than conformity to social role performance).

**Part Two.** Since part Two of the study involved a different sample, a separate questionnaire was required (see appendix B). The questionnaire, devised by the author and LaRocque was designed to measure the amount of consultation typically engaged in by trustees prior to policy making decisions on various local policy items, as well as constituent vs. superintendent and constituent vs. personal influence in reaching policy decisions. The above behaviours were measured in three hypothetical, yet relevant, policy scenarios: (1) formation of a student reporting policy with changes to the current report card format; (2) annual budget setting where the provisional budget appears to be 15% to 20% over last year's budget; and (3) the formation of a policy concerning the use of drugs and alcohol during school-sponsored activities. Section Two of the second questionnaire was designed to measure the trustees'
perceptions of the degree of satisfaction of their constituents in the following areas: (1) the meeting of community needs by the school board; (2) the degree of public input into the decision-making process; (3) the degree of accordance between the recommendations of the superintendent and the needs of the community and; (4) the degree of accordance between the recommendations of the teachers' associations and community needs.

Section Three of the second questionnaire was designed to measure the amount of actual consultation engaged in by the trustees during the previous four month period.

The background for most of the second questionnaire came from a 1974 Toronto study of school board trustees done by J. Teichman (Teichman 1974). The Teichman study investigated: (1) the degree to which school board trustees assumed either the delegate or independent model of representation; (2) whether or not differences in trustee role perception are related to attitudes on other issues; (3) the relationship between trustee role perception and selected socio-economic and demographic characteristics; and (4) the relationship between trustee role perception and their perception of issues at election time. Teichman found that fundamental differences in role perception did exist and that these differences tended to be related to the trustees' attitudes on a number of educational issues. Although part Two of this study did not intend to look specifically at the representative types continuum, the Teichman study served as a model of measurable trustee behaviours. It was decided to measure of the consultative and representative behaviours of the trustees within three separate scenarios since an individual's behaviours
in these areas may vary depending on the situation. The policy issues chosen come under frequent and heated debate suggesting underlying normative differences. The behaviours of consultation prior to reaching policy-making decisions, with respect to which groups are consulted and which individuals and groups have influence on the trustees, were chosen because it was felt that policy-making is the main function of the trustees (Coleman, 1978), and that the ways in which they reach their policy-making decisions is of importance to constituents; particularly if the constituents are concerned with increasing their amount of input into the decision-making process.

The questionnaire for part Two was piloted in the Vancouver and Delta school districts. Trustees involved in the pilot study indicated that the situations and questions in the questionnaire were realistic and reflective of typical trustee decision-making behaviours.

Data Collection

Part One. An introductory phone call was made to each candidate seeking their cooperation in participating in the study. A questionnaire package was then mailed to each candidate. This package included a covering letter outlining the study (Appendix C), the questionnaire for part One (Appendix A), a stamped return envelope, and a verification of return post card. After a reasonable period of time each candidate was phoned to confirm receipt and return of the questionnaire. In some cases additional questionnaires were hand delivered to replace those that had not arrived or had been discarded. The number of responses may have been
decreased because the questionnaires were not initially hand delivered or
picked up. Also, at this time, some of the trustees were very involved
with labour disputes within their school districts and wished not to
participate in the study despite the brief time commitment necessary.
Delivery and return by mail was initially chosen due to the large number
of candidates who were spread over the three municipalities.

Part Two. An introductory letter to part Two of the study was sent
to those candidates elected in their respective districts (Appendix D).
Each trustee was then contacted by phone to make arrangements for the
hand delivery and pick-up of the second questionnaire (Appendix B). This
method was chosen due to the problems encountered in the mail delivery
and return utilized in part One. Completed questionnaires were picked up
from all trustees consenting to participate in the study.

Analysis

Due to the small number of candidates and trustees involved in each
district, analysis of each part of the study was restricted to
descriptive methods only. This is a natural limitation of the study due
to the fixed number of candidates and trustees compounded by the few who
decided not to participate.

Due to a particularly low response rate from the Surrey sample and
the added complications of split board elections, an independent White
Rock seat and singularly represented parties in some cases, it was
decided to omit the Surrey results from the analysis. Although omitting
the Surrey sample reduces the breadth of the study it was felt that it
would not be possible to approach any conclusions with such limited returns.

Part One. Although the number of candidates in both Richmond and Burnaby was too small to allow statistical analysis the questionnaires were coded and analysed by computer to give a comparison of means for various questions.

The data were coded by using the number circled by the respondent in questions 1, 2 and 3 as the code on the key punch card (see questionnaire, Appendix A). In questions where there was an option that was not a pre-coded response these options were coded from 1 through to the final option. In the case of yes/no or favor/oppose responses, the codes 1 and 0 were used. The Education Scale VII allowed the respondents 6 options: (1) very strongly agree; (2) strongly agree; (3) agree; (4) disagree; (5) strongly disagree; and (6) very strongly disagree. These responses had corresponding values of +3, +2, +1, -1, -2, -3 and were coded from 6 (for +3) through to 1 (for -3). The demographic data were coded as follows: for age the specific age was used; sex was coded 0 for female and 1 for male; level of education was coded from 1 to 7 with 1 for "elementary school" through to 7 for "post graduate degree"; civic party was coded 1 for IND, 2 for RIVA, 3 for REAL; (4, 5, 6, for Surrey has been omitted as previously explained) 7 for BVA, and 8 for BCA; provincial party normally supported was coded 1 for NDP, 2 for Liberal, 3 for Progressive Conservative, 4 for Social Credit, and 5 for "Other"; for occupational status the Blishen and McRoberts (1976) revised socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada was used. This scale is
based on income level, educational status, and prestige rankings. Occupations are ranked in the following class intervals:

- 70+
- 60.00 - 69.99
- 50.00 - 59.99
- 40.00 - 49.99
- 30.00 - 39.99

The candidates' occupations were ranked according to this scale and then coded by class interval, (e.g. 70+ was coded 01, 60.00 - 69.99 was coded 02, etc. to a code of 07 for unemployed or those candidates listing "homemaker" as their occupation).

The above coding procedure resulted in the use of two keypunched cards for each candidate. A candidate code, district code and card number were placed in columns 77 to 80 of each card to act as identifiers. Card 1 contained all coded variables (using columns 1 through 50 and identifier codes in columns 77 to 80) except the ESVII scale which appeared in its entirety on card two for each candidate (using columns 1 through 38 and identifier codes in columns 77 to 80).

Since statistical procedures were not used in part One (due to the naturally small numbers) analysis of the data was restricted to looking for trends in the tables, as shown by clustering of responses or the use of a selected value as an apparent difference between responses.

For sub-problem 1 candidates' responses were arranged in table form and studied for evidence of clustered responses.
Data for sub-problems 2 and 3 (tables 5 to 15) made use of an "apparent difference" value which varied from +.50 to +1.00. Tables using +1.00 as an apparent difference reflect questions which had several possible responses. A difference of +1.00 in the means of the responses of each party represents a difference of one whole response category. For example, a mean of 3.00 on table 5 indicated that the party considers the issue in question to be only moderately serious. A mean of 4.00 however, indicated that the issue is a major problem. We must assume that respondents who select a "4" instead of a "3" do so for a reason and perceive a difference between the response choices. The individual responses were grouped by civic party and averaged to find a mean response for that party for each question. The presumption made here is that a difference of +1.00 in the mean score reflects the same perceived differences in response choices for the party as a whole as it did for individual respondents.

Tables using +.50 as an apparent difference reflect questions having only two possible responses; yes or no and therefore indicates a 50 percent difference between the parties.

Part Two. Since part Two of the study dealt with only seven subjects in each district, with only two or three subjects per civic party in some cases, computer analysis was not feasible.

Therefore, the questionnaire for part Two was analysed using raw scores only on a per question basis. However, the questionnaires were coded with values and displayed on an 80 column entry sheet to facilitate
the descriptive analysis. Responses to part "a" of questions 1, 2 and 3 were coded with a value of 1.

Responses for part "b" of these questions were also coded with the value of 1.

Parts "c" and "d" of questions 1, 2 and 3 were coded 1 or 2 in order of the option chosen. Questions 4 to 7 allowed respondents six options ranging from 1 for strongly agree through to 6 for strongly disagree. The data for these responses were coded using the number circled by the respondent. Questions 8 and 9 were coded with the actual number of meetings entered per group by the respondent.

Analysis of part Two was restricted to descriptive methods as well. The majority of tables in this section are arrays of the raw data and were analysed by looking for clustering of trustee responses. For example, on table 17 all four of the RIVA trustees indicated that the superintendent was the most important person to consult with on budget decisions compared to none of the IND trustees.

Empty cells appear on several of the tables in part Two indicating response options not chosen. These have purposely been left in so that the tables will show constituent groups trustees would not consult with.

For tables 22 and 23 a difference of +1.00 was chosen as being apparent since in all but one case the highest mean recorded was 3.00. Therefore, +1.00 represents over a 30% difference in the number of meetings attended. For table 30 a difference of +1.00 represents a difference of one whole response rating.
The analysis of part Two assumes that the responses made by the trustees to the three hypothetical situations reflect fairly accurately their probable behaviours had the situations actually occurred. There is added confidence in this assumption since the situations chosen in questions 1, 2 and 3 are realistic problems faced by most urban school boards in recent years.

Summary

In this chapter, the research methodology has been outlined. The rationale for the use of the various questions was established, the data required for the study was outlined and the samples for the two parts were described. The method of analysis was described and the limitation and assumptions of the study were stated.
CHAPTER IV

Results and Discussion

Sub-Problem 1

To what extent are the personal characteristics (i.e. age, sex, occupational ranking, and level of education) of school board candidates characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong?

Findings. There were no noticeable trends in the personal characteristics of candidates in either municipality for the categories of age, sex and educational level (see Tables 1, 2, 4). In the category of occupational ranking (Table 3) the candidates for all four parties tended to cluster towards the ends of the Blishen and McRoberts scale. The IND and BCA parties had slightly more candidates at the lower end of the scale while RIVA and the BVA had more candidates at the high end of the scale.

Discussion. The characteristics of age, sex, occupation and education were included in an attempt to define possible causes of the anticipated differences in educational attitudes and opinions among the members of the different civic parties. Studies of federal politics in Canada show that the three national parties attract different kinds of voters in terms of age, sex, and occupational ranking (Meisel, 1975). One might expect a similar pattern to be evident with civic parties attracting a particular kind of voter and candidate.
Table 1
Comparison of Candidates' Age and Civic Party Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Party</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

Comparison of Sex of Candidates and Civic Party Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Party</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

Comparison of Occupational Ranking of Candidates and Civic Party Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Party</th>
<th>Blishen and McRoberts Scale Scores</th>
<th>Below 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

Comparison of Educational Level of Candidates and Civic Party Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Party</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>Technical/ Business</th>
<th>Some University</th>
<th>University Graduate</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection of the distribution of candidates' age, sex and level of education reveals that there is no relationship between these demographic variables and party affiliation of the school board candidates in these municipalities. These results are consistent with the Nielsen study (1980) of Vancouver candidates which showed a similar lack of correlation.

The clustering of the occupational rankings may possibly be explained by considering the reasons that individuals may have for running for school board membership. The candidates that appear at the lower end of the occupational rankings for the most part are housewives or working mothers who have children in the school system. It is likely that these individuals' interest in running for school board is related to their having children in the system. The candidates at the upper end of the scale for the most part are males with professional occupations and/or are well placed on the socio-economic scale as reflected by their level of education. These candidates may be running for office partially out of a sense of "noblesse oblige". However, this is only conjecture at this point and requires further research on the reasons given for running for office by candidates, compared with demographic variables of sex and occupational ranking.

The fact that both the IND and BCA have slightly more candidates at the low end of the occupational ranking scale is consistent with the political ideologies and NDP backing of these two groups. The RIVA and BVA parties, on the other hand, have a greater number of candidates on the high end of the scale which again is consistent with their rightist
ideology. Data collected by Meisel (1975) in a study of the 1968 Federal election showed the majority of Liberal and Conservative support came from higher ranking occupations such as professionals and sales people while the majority of the NDP vote came from the lower ranking occupations on the scale such as skilled labour and farmers. Although the differences in the Richmond, Burnaby study are rather small due to the restricted size of the sample the data for occupational ranking tend to support the Meisel findings.

Since there was no apparent correlation of age, sex, and educational level with party affiliation one must conclude that either the Meisel findings for these attributes do not carry over to civic parties in a reliable way or that the ideological differences between the parties are not very distinct.

Sub-Problem 2

To what extent are the educational opinions of school board candidates characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong?

Findings. A comparison of means by civic party on each of the 50 items (see Tables 5-13) revealed that there were apparent differences between the educational attitudes of the parties within the respective districts.

The total number of apparent differences between the parties on the 50 items was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond Parties</th>
<th>Number of Apparent Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND/RIVA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA/BVA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on the
Biggest Problems in Schools - Richmond\textsuperscript{a} and Burnaby\textsuperscript{b}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent\textsuperscript{c}</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent\textsuperscript{c}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>BVA Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pupils' lack of interest</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crime/vandalism</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of discipline</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of drugs</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of proper financial support</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Poor curriculum</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of proper facilities</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Racial problems</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teacher lack of interest</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Classes too large</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parent lack of interest</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Management of funds/programs</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Difficulty of getting good teachers</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Poor administration at the district level</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Low academic standards</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating possibilities for each problem are: 1=not a serious problem; 2=minor problem; 3=moderately serious problem; 4=major problem; 5=very serious problem.

\textsuperscript{a} For Richmond the candidates' n for IND=5; for RIVA=5. On some items the n's are reduced because of omitted responses.
\textsuperscript{b} For Burnaby the candidates' n for BVA=5; for BCA=6. On some items the n's are reduced because of omitted responses.
\textsuperscript{c} An apparent difference between the means is defined as $\pm 1.00$
Table 6
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on
Good Features of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Features</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The teachers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The curriculum</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extra curricular activities</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School facilities</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student/teacher relationship</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equal opportunities for all students</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small classes</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Up-to-date teaching methods</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parental interest/participation</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Race relations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The school principal</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Student behaviour</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating possibilities for each good feature are: 1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=average; 4=good; 5=very good.

a. An apparent difference between the means is defined as ± 1.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Devoting more time to teaching basic skills</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emphasizing moral development in schools</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enforcing stricter discipline</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instituting district-wide examinations</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increasing the amount of homework</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Raising teachers' salaries</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating possibilities for each practice are: 1=very low importance; 2=low importance; 3=moderate importance; 4=high importance; 5=very high importance

a. An apparent difference between means is defined as $\pm 1.00$
Table 8
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Granting
More Authority to School Consultative Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Areas</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Determining school curriculum offerings</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Selection of school principal</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selection of school's teaching staff</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget allocation within schools</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating for authority areas was as follows: yes = 1; no = 0.

a. An apparent difference between parties is defined as + .50
Table 9
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Forced Budget Cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce the number of counsellors</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce the number of educational administra-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eliminate subsidized educational leave for teachers</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduce school maintenance</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduce special services - speech, hearing, reading therapy</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eliminate community education programs</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discontinue summer school programs</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating for these problems was as follows: Favor = 1; Oppose = 0.

<sup>a</sup> An apparent difference between the means is defined as ± .50
Table 10
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Agreement
or Opposition to Grants to Independent (Private and
Parochial) Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent$^a$</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>BVA Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating for this problem was as follows: Favor = 1; Oppose = 0.

a. An apparent difference between the means is defined as ± .50
Table 11
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Smaller Classes Affecting the Learning Outcome of the Average Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>BVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.00  .40  Yes  

1.00  .75

NOTE: Rating scale for this problem was as follows: Yes = 1; No = 0.

a. An apparent difference is defined as a difference between the means greater than ± .50
Table 12
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Whether Elementary Secondary Education is Better/Worse/No Different Today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparenta</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparenta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>BVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating scale for this problem was as follows:
Better = 2; Worse = 0; No Difference = 1.

a. An apparent difference between the means is defined as $\pm 1.00$
Table 13
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Being in Favor of or Opposing Raising Local Taxes if School Board Officials Needed More Money for Educational Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.80 1.00 1.00 .20 Yes

NOTE: Rating for this problem is as follows: Favor = 1; Oppose = 0.

<sup>a</sup> An apparent difference between the means is defined as ±.50.
Table 14
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Traditional Factor on the ESVII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Difference</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.38      4.13                        4.20     4.10

NOTE: Rating scale for this issue is as follows: 7 = agree very strongly; 6 = agree strongly; 5 = agree; 4 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree; 2 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree very strongly.

<sup>a.</sup> An apparent difference between the means is defined as ±1.00.
Table 15
Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Progressive Factor on the ESVII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparenta</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparenta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.67  3.17  Yes  5.26  5.03

NOTE: Rating scale for this issue is as follows:
7 = agree very strongly; 6 = agree strongly;
5 = agree; 4 = neither agree nor disagree;
3 = disagree; 2 = disagree strongly;
1 = disagree very strongly.

a. An apparent difference between the means is defined as \( \pm 1.00 \).
Discussion. The results suggest that the educational opinions of the trustee candidates in the Burnaby School District do not differ to any significant degree between the two parties.

In Richmond a difference on 20 of the 50 items shows a slightly greater degree of difference between the two parties. Furthermore, an inspection of these items indicates that the differences in opinion between the parties that were evident follow a pattern that is consistent with the professed political ideologies of the parties. For example, the leftist IND party rated lack of proper financial support and class size as major problems whereas the RIVA party did not see these areas as contributing problems.

It would appear from this sub-problem that different political labels do not guarantee a difference in educational attitudes in the Burnaby School District. The more apparent differences in Richmond may be a result of fundamental differences in the political ideologies of the party members. The IND members are all NDP supporters and the RIVA members are generally Socred supporters provincially.

Sub-Problem 3

To what extent are the educational attitudes of school board candidates characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong?

Findings. The results for Richmond (see Tables 14 and 15) show an apparent difference between the IND and RIVA parties on only the Progressivism factor of the ESVII. There was little pronounced difference between the two parties on the Traditionalism factor.
The results for Burnaby shown in Tables 14 and 15 also revealed little difference between the BCA and BVA in their Traditionalism and Progressivism scores.

Discussion. The results in this sub-problem are similar to those of sub-problem 2. The Burnaby parties once again show very little difference in their educational attitudes. The lack of clear differences for Burnaby in the first three sub-problems may be a result of a general lack of difference in party ideologies. If this is the case, then one would question the purpose of the party labels and why the parties continue to exist.

The apparent lack of differences may also be a result of other factors that are independent of the parties' ideologies, such as the influence of a strong superintendent. Another consideration is that the two Burnaby parties primarily exist to elect members to the municipal council but support school board candidates as well. It is possible that whatever basic differences exist between the two parties at the municipal level do not overlap into educational differences.

The lack of differences in the educational attitudes between the two Burnaby parties indicate that these parties are probably closer to the non-partisan variety as described earlier by Joyce (Joyce, 1970). The party existence at the city council level is based on weak ideological differences which do not appear to affect educational attitudes in any meaningful way.

Sub-Problem 4

To what extent are the consultative behaviours of elected trustees as shown by the amount of consultation that would take place prior to
making policy decisions characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong?

Findings. This problem was analyzed by looking at the results of a number of questions from part Two of the study. Trustees were asked to indicate on a list of given groups the single most important group plus any other groups they would consult with on the specified issue. This was repeated for three separate issues (student reporting, budget setting, and drug use policy).

In addition, trustees were asked to list the number of meetings they actually had in a given four month period with various groups in both a consulting and non-consulting role.

Tables 16, 17 and 18 show the single most important group the parties would consult with on the three respective issues.

On the issue of student reporting (Table 16) 3 of the 4 RIVA trustees in Richmond felt that parents were the most important group to consult whereas the IND trustees were split between parents and students. In Burnaby there was no apparent difference between the two parties on this issue.

On the issue of budget setting (Table 17) again the two parties in Richmond differed on who they considered the most important group. The RIVA trustees unanimously chose the superintendent and his staff. Significantly, neither of the IND trustees chose the superintendent but split between consulting with parents and taxpayers. In Burnaby, both parties were in total agreement by choosing the superintendent.
Table 16
Single Most Important Group Parties Would Consult
on Issue #1 (Student Reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th></th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA  n = 4</td>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>BVA  n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent and his staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local principals' assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local teachers' assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17
Single Most Important Group Parties Would Consult on Issue #2 (Budget Setting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND $n=2$</td>
<td>RIVA $n=4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and his staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local principals'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local teachers'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Single Most Important Group Parties Would Consult on Issue #3 (Drug and Alcohol Use Policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Richmond IND (n = 2)</th>
<th>Richmond RIVA (n = 4)</th>
<th>Burnaby BCA (n = 2)</th>
<th>Burnaby BVA (n = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent and his staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local principals' assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local teachers' assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On issue #3 (Table 18), drug and alcohol use policy, the majority of RIVA trustees felt that parents were the most important group to consult whereas the IND were split between consulting with parents and students.

In Burnaby all of the BCA trustees and 2 of the BVA trustees indicated the superintendent was the most important person to consult with on this issue. It is interesting to note the strong reliance of both Burnaby parties on the superintendent in all three issues.

The consultative behaviours of the trustees was also measured by asking them to indicate which other groups they would consult with on the same three issues of student reporting, budget setting and drug and alcohol policy setting.

Tables 19, 20 and 21 show few differences between the respective parties on this question.

Table 22 shows a comparison of means of meetings actually attended by the trustees. In Richmond there were three apparent differences in meetings attended with the leftist IND meeting more with community/neighbourhood councils and the rightist RIVA party meeting with more specific ad hoc committees.

A similar pattern is seen in Burnaby, also showing three apparent differences. Here as well the leftist BCA met more with neighbourhood councils and the rightist BVA had the majority of ad hoc committee meetings.

Table 23 shows a comparison of means of meetings actually attended with the express purpose of finding out opinions of that group. Richmond
### Table 19

Other Groups Parties Would Consult on

Issue #1 (Student Reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th>Burnaby&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND $n=2$</td>
<td>RIVA $n=4$</td>
<td>BCA $n=2$</td>
<td>BVA $n=4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and his staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local principals'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local teachers'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Total responses are greater than $n$ since multiple responses are allowed.
Table 20
Other Groups Parties Would Consult on
Issue #2 (Budget Setting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond$^a$</th>
<th></th>
<th>Burnaby$^a$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND $n = 2$</td>
<td>RIVA $n = 4$</td>
<td>BCA $n = 2$</td>
<td>BVA $n = 4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and his staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local principals'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local teachers'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Total responses are greater than $n$ since multiple responses are allowed.
Table 21
Other Groups Parties Would Consult on
Issue #3 (Drug and Alcohol Use Policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Burnaby&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent and his staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local principals' assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local teachers' assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Total responses are greater than n since multiple responses are allowed.
Table 22

Comparison of Means by Civic Party of Meetings Attended with Specific Groups in a Four Month Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent(^a)</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND (\bar{x})</td>
<td>RIVA (\bar{x})</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA (\bar{x})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/neighborhood councils</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent consultative committees/home and school, etc.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational committee of political party</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratepayer association</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher associations</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local labour councils</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc committees on specific issues</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) An apparent difference between the means is defined as ± 1.00.
Comparison of Means by Civic Party of Meetings Attended with Specific Groups with the Express Purpose of Finding Out the Opinions of that Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/neighbourhood councils</td>
<td>$\times$</td>
<td>$\times$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\times$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent consultative committees/home and school, etc.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational committee of political party</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratepayer association</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher associations</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local labour councils</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc committees on specific issues</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An apparent difference between the means is defined as $\pm 1.00$. 
parties had two apparent differences, again with neighbourhood and ad
hoc councils, while Burnaby showed only one apparent difference.

Discussion. Although the differences in Richmond are far from
overwhelming it is apparent that the two parties do differ in their
consulting behaviours. Furthermore, the differences follow a pattern
that is consistent with the expressed political ideologies of the two
parties with the rightist RIVA group putting more emphasis on the
superintendent and the leftist IND putting their emphasis on parents,
students and taxpayers.

In Burnaby there was less of a difference between the two parties.
This may be partially due to the strong influence that the superintendent
appears to have with the Burnaby trustees.

The findings on which other groups the parties would consult and
the comparison of meetings actually attended show, to a lesser degree, a
similar pattern in the consulting behaviours of the trustees. That is,
where differences exist they are usually consistent with the political
ideologies of the parties involved.

Sub-Problem 5

To what extent are the representative behaviours of elected
trustees as shown by constituent versus superintendent influence in
trustee policy decisions characteristic of the civic parties to which
they belong?

Findings. Results for this sub-problem tended to vary depending on
which policy item was in question. For the Richmond parties the only
difference of any significance was on the issue of budget setting (table 25). On this issue all of the IND trustees would follow the superintendent's recommendations. On the other two issues both parties indicated that they would be influenced more by their constituents.

In Burnaby the parties differed on two of the three issues (tables 25 and 26).

It is interesting to note that both the IND and the BCA consistently indicated that they would be influenced more by their constituents.

Discussion. For the Richmond School District it is difficult to say that parties differ in their representative behaviours. Although they differed on only one of the three issues, budget setting decisions are probably the most likely to show up fundamental ideological differences. Furthermore, the fact that the leftist IND consistently chose constituents over the superintendent is predictable.

In Burnaby this pattern is repeated with the leftist BCA consistently choosing the constituents.

Relating these findings to the representational types of delegate versus independent as defined by Mann (1977) and applied to school boards by Teichman (1974) in her Toronto study, it would appear that both the IND and the BCA trustees adopt a "delegate" form of representation and that RIVA and BVA trustees operate more in the "independent" mode. If the school board members tend to operate within particular representational types and if these representative behaviours are different for the two parties then it would be to the voters' advantage
Table 24
Influence of Constituents versus Superintendent on Trustee Decision-making in Issue #1 (Student Reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND(^a)</td>
<td>RIVA(^n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of constituents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Total responses are less than \( n \) since not all trustees responded to this question.
Table 25

Influence of Constituents versus Superintendent on Trustee Decision-making in Issue #2 (Budget Setting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 2</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would follow recommendations of constituents
2       1       2       1

Would follow recommendations of superintendent
0       3       0       3
Table 26

Influence of Constituents versus Superintendent on Trustee Decision-making in Issue #3 (Drug and Alcohol Use Policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>RIVA ( n = 4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of constituents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Total responses are less than \( n \) since not all trustees responded to this question.
to be able to identify and support the party which best reflects their representational preference. The party label in this case could act as an indicator to the voter as to the type of representation they can expect if they support that particular party.

Sub-Problem 6

To what extent are the representative behaviours of elected trustees as shown by constituent influence versus personal judgement in trustee policy decisions characteristic of the civic party to which they belong?

Findings. The Richmond results on these questions indicate a split in each of the parties as to whether or not the recommendations of the constituents would be followed over personal judgement.

Table 27 shows that the majority of the RIVA trustees would follow constituent recommendations in the area of student reporting. The IND trustees are split on this issue. Both parties are split in this regard on the issue of budget setting (Table 28). On the issue of setting a drug use policy (Table 29), the RIVA trustees reversed their roles and indicated that the majority of them would follow their personal judgements over the wishes of their constituents. The IND is divided on this issue as well.

In Burnaby, a similar situation occurs with the BCA trustees being split on each of the three issues. The BVA is also split on the issue of student reporting (Table 27) but is more consistent in the areas of budget setting and drug policy setting (tables 28 and 29) indicating that
they would follow their own judgement over the recommendations of their constituents on these two issues.

Discussion. The Richmond results are interesting due to the apparent lack of consistency and also the politically unpredictable responses of the RIVA trustees. Although the rightist RIVA trustees did suggest that they would follow their own judgement with regards to the drug use policy, a politically consistent response, they reversed their position on the issue of student reporting.

Although the results are more consistent in Burnaby, the continual split of the BCA party, like that of the IND in Richmond, raises questions as to the predictability of the representational modes chosen by these parties. However, it must be remembered that both of these parties consist of only two members and that one of the two trustees in each party responded to these questions in a politically predictable manner.

More research is needed to explore why the IND and BCA trustees appear politically consistent in their choice of superintendent versus constituents but are less sure of their positions when it comes to the constituents versus their own judgement.

Sub-Problem 7

To what extent are the trustees' perceptions of the degree of constituent satisfaction characteristic of the civic parties to which they belong?
Table 27
Recommendations of Constituents versus Personal Judgement in
Trustee Decision-making in Issue #1 (Student Reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th></th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND (n = 2)</td>
<td>RIVA (n = 4)</td>
<td>BCA (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of constituents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow personal judgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Recommendations of Constituents versus Personal Judgement in Trustee Decision-making in Issue #2 (Budget Setting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>RIVA ( n = 4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of constituents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow personal judgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29
Recommendations of Constituents versus Personal Judgement in
Trustee Decision-making in Issue #3 (Drug and Alcohol Use Policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th></th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND (n = 2)</td>
<td>RIVA (n = 4)</td>
<td>BCA (n = 2)</td>
<td>BVA(^a) (n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow recommendations of constituents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would follow personal judgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Total responses are less than \(n\) since not all trustees responded to this question.
Findings. In this sub-problem trustees were asked to indicate their perception of constituent satisfaction on whether community needs are being met (Table 30), the degree of public input into the decision-making process (Table 31), the degree of accordance between superintendent recommendations and community needs (Table 32), and the degree of accordance between teacher association recommendations and community needs (Table 33).

As shown on Tables 30 to 33 apparent differences occurred between the parties in Richmond on all four questions and in three out of four questions for the Burnaby parties.

Discussion. The results on this sub-problem show fairly distinct differences in the trustees' perceptions of the degree of constituent satisfaction. Furthermore, the scores on each of the questions occur in a consistent and politically predictable pattern. In Richmond the leftist IND trustees indicated a high level of disagreement with all four statements about constituent satisfaction. The rightist RIVA trustees, on the other hand, consistently rated the degree of constituent satisfaction as being high.

This pattern is repeated in Burnaby except that the degree of disagreement with the four statements is not as high for the leftist BCA party as it was for the leftist IND party in Richmond. However, as in Richmond, the Burnaby rightist party, BVA, consistently indicated a high degree of constituent satisfaction.

In her 1974 study of Toronto trustees Teichman used similar questions about the trustees' perceptions of the degree of constituent
Table 30

Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Trustees' Perceptions as to Whether the Community's Needs are Being Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Differencea</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.50 / 1.75</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating scale for this question is as follows: 1 = strongly agree; to 6 = strongly disagree.

a. An apparent difference between the means is defined as \pm 1.00
Table 31

Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Trustees' Perceptions as to Whether the Public has Adequate Input into the Decision-making Process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5.50 | 3.25 | Yes | 3.50 | 2.25 | Yes |

NOTE: Rating scale for this question is as follows: 1 = strongly agree; to 6 = strongly disagree.

<sup>a</sup> An apparent difference between the means is defined as ± 1.00
Table 32

Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Trustees' Perceptions as to Whether the Recommendations of the Superintendent are in Accordance with the Needs of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>RIVA</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rating scale for this question is as follows: 1 = strongly agree; to 6 = strongly disagree.

<sup>a</sup> An apparent difference between the means is defined as $\pm 1.00$
Table 33

Comparison of Means by Civic Party on Trustees' Perceptions as to Whether the Recommendations of the Teachers' Association are in Accordance with Community Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Difference</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Apparent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|              | 4.00     | 2.25                             | Yes     | 3.00                             | 3.00     |

**NOTE:** Rating scale for this question is as follows: 1 = strongly agree; to 6 = strongly disagree.

<sup>a</sup>. An apparent difference between the means is defined as $\pm 1.00$
satisfaction to measure representational modes. Teichman found that trustees operating in the independent mode tended to indicate a high degree of constituent satisfaction whereas trustees operating in the delegate mode of representation tended to indicate a low degree of constituent satisfaction.

Even without reference to representational modes and Teichman’s Toronto study it is evident that differences exist between the parties in both districts in their perceptions of constituent satisfaction. The rightist parties in both districts feel that their constituents are quite satisfied. The leftist parties in both districts generally feel that constituents are not satisfied. The origins of these differences are not immediately evident and more research is needed to determine whether they exist solely due to differences in political ideology, differences in representational modes, or perhaps even a result of the fact that the parties indicating constituent dissatisfaction hold minority positions on their boards. Regardless of the origins, since the differences exist and occur by political party, it may be to the voters’ advantage to identify candidates by political label and thereby support those candidates whose perceptions accurately reflect the constituents’ degree of satisfaction.
CHAPTER V

Conclusions

The results of this study indicate that there are moderate differences in the educational attitudes and opinions of the two Richmond parties and that these differences are also evident in the post-election operating behaviours of the elected trustees. Little meaningful difference was evident between the Burnaby parties. The findings also suggest that meaningful partisanship is not as well established in these suburban districts as it is in the city of Vancouver as shown in the Nielsen study (Nielsen, 1980).

The lesser degree of partisanship that occurs as one moves into the suburbs, as evidenced by this study, raises interesting questions as to the causes of this phenomenon. One can conjecture that it is possibly a factor that the suburban issues are less intense and heated than those of the city, or that the provincial and even federal parties are more involved in the funding, selecting and supporting of candidates in the city, thereby increasing the differences between the civic parties. Another possible reason is that partisanship has been a reality for a longer period of time in the city and therefore is more entrenched and effective than in the suburbs. Other factors to be considered are differences in population density, the size of the districts, and the effect that these factors would have on the constituents' sense of
control over the political environment. Residents of the smaller, more homogeneous suburbs may feel they have closer contact and control over their civic politics therefore having less need for partisan groups.

More research in the area of civic party partisanship is needed to discover the cause of the varying degrees of differences as one moves away from the city. Similar studies should be conducted in other suburban districts as well as rural areas to verify if such a pattern actually exists.

As suggested in Chapter II, the existence of civic parties in school board elections does not necessarily guarantee that the parties will reflect distinct and meaningful differences. Using Joyce's typology of civic parties (Joyce, 1970) it may be possible to explain the moderate to weak partisanship indicated by the Richmond and Burnaby results.

The IND candidates and trustees generally were the most consistent in giving politically predictable responses. This would suggest that the IND displays a higher degree of partisanship than the other parties questioned indicating a stronger party ideology. Although these party members label themselves as "Independent" New Democrats, thereby disqualifying themselves as a national civic party, they are clearly NDP supporters and thereby have a fairly well defined, homogenous ideology.

The RIVA candidates and trustees profess not to be a true civic party and are in fact a collection of Liberal, Conservative, and Socred supporters gathered to oppose the IND. Despite their comments to the contrary, this anti-NDP attitude tends to result in a degree of like-
mindedness in the party members. Thus the RIVA orientation is essentially negative in nature. The threat posed by the NDP oriented IND party has resulted in the RIVA members forming what is in effect, an opposition party.

The apparent lack of difference between the two Burnaby parties indicates an absence of well formed party ideologies in this district. In his study of Canadian civic parties Joyce classified the Burnaby parties as being non-partisan in nature. Although they have continued to exist for another decade since that time this study indicates a continued lack of focus in the party orientations.

The Joyce typology may also be helpful in understanding why the Richmond parties showed stronger differences than the Burnaby parties. The Burnaby parties are basically non-partisan civic parties with little organization and no distinct ideology. The Richmond parties probably fit better into the local civic party category with the apparent differences resulting chiefly from the NDP, anti-NDP ideologies of its respective parties. If it were not for the presence of the IND party the RIVA group would most likely also constitute a non-partisan civic party.

Applying the McCarty and Ramsey typology of communities and boards to these districts it would seem that Burnaby, in essence, has a pluralistic power structure. The power is not factionalized in any real sense and the board members are basically free to act as individuals. Richmond may be better described as having a factional power structure since there are apparent differences between the two main parties. As indicated by the study however, differences that exist are not overwhelming and the factionalism that exists is not blatant. Despite
the absence of classical factionalism there was at least a consistency in
the direction of the IND responses which was essentially different from
the direction of the RIVA responses. It is this consistency of direction
which is important here rather than the magnitude of the differences.

It is interesting to note that this partisanship is often denied by
the trustees themselves. In several telephone and personal interviews
with the various trustees it became evident that for some, the idea that
trustees of the same party tend to be like-minded, at least in their
educational attitudes and representative behaviours, was unacceptable.
The RIVA trustees of Richmond in particular insist that they are not a
party and only come together at election time since campaigning as a
group is more effective and economic than running as a true independent.
They insist that they have no united platform nor do they vote as a bloc
on policy issues. However, despite their intentions to the contrary,
members of this so called "non-party" party do have similar educational
attitudes and this is also reflected in their performance as trustees.
Many of the RIVA and BVA trustees indicated that it was important to them
that they be considered as, and allowed to function as, independents
rather than members of an organized party. However, it was also
mentioned by some that this is becoming more difficult due to the
increasingly political nature of the board. This may in part be due to
the increased interest in civic elections by both provincial and federal
parties which at one time had little to gain from civic politics. Now,
however, the city and suburban votes have become very important in
federal and provincial elections and the larger parties are offering support, both physically and financially to many civic parties. After his defeat in the November, 1980 civic elections in Vancouver, incumbent Mayor Jack Volrich blamed the New Democratic Party for his defeat, attributing the elected Mike Harcourt's victory "to the very effective operations of the big-city NDP machine" (Province, November 16, 1980, p.1).

It would appear from the results of this study that despite the professed advantages of partisan civic elections partisanship does not yet seem to exist in any meaningful way in the school board elections of these two districts. Although party labels are in existence they do not, for Burnaby at least, seem to indicate reliable differences between the parties. Although voters may receive better cues from the party labels in Richmond these differences do not seem to have resulted in true political civic parties with operating platforms. However, some degree of differing ideologies does exist between the two parties and this has caused some apparent differences between the two groups. In this regard the party labels may be of some benefit to the Richmond voters in identifying the party holding a compatible ideology. Furthermore, they can take some assurance from these findings that the Richmond trustees also tend to operate under their respective ideologies after the campaign signs have been taken down. Partisanship, however, still has room to grow in these suburban areas.
Appendix A

Questionnaire Part One
A SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL OPINIONS OF CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

A. Your Opinions

1. What do you think are the biggest problems with which schools in your district, as a whole, must deal? Rate the seriousness of each of the following problems by circling one number in the scale which follows each problem statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Not a Serious Problem</th>
<th>Minor Problem</th>
<th>Moderately Serious Problem</th>
<th>Major Problem</th>
<th>A Very Serious Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pupils' lack of interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crime/Vandalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of Proper Financial Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Poor Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of Proper Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Not a Serious Problem</td>
<td>Minor Problem</td>
<td>Moderately Serious Problem</td>
<td>Major Problem</td>
<td>A Very Serious Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Racial Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers' Lack of Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Classes too large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parents' Lack of Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Management of Funds/Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Difficulty of Getting Good Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Poor Administration at District Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Low Academic Standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In what ways are the schools in our district, as a whole, particularly good? Rate the following features of your district's schools by circling one number in the scale which follows each statement of the feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extra-curricular Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. School facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student - Teacher Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equal Learning Opportunities for all Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Up-to-Date Teaching Methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Academic Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parental Interest/Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Race Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The School Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is important in improving the quality of public school education overall? Evaluate each of the following suggestions in improving the quality of public education overall. Circle one number in the scale which follows each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Very Low Importance</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Moderate Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Very High Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Devote More Time to Teaching Basic Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emphasize Moral Development in Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Enforce Stricter Discipline

4. Institute District-wide Examinations

5. Increase Amount of Homework

6. Raise Teachers' Salaries

4: School consultative committees currently serve in an advisory capacity to local school staffs and principals in some districts. Do you think school consultative committees should have more authority in determining curriculum, staffs and budgeting for local schools? (check Yes or No)

1. Determination of curriculum offerings in the school

2. Selection of the school's principal

3. Selection of the school's teaching staff

4. Budget allocations within the school

5. Evaluation of teachers
5. If the school board was "forced" to cut some things from the budget, which of the cuts would you favour or oppose? (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favour</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce number of school counsellors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce the number of educational administrative personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eliminate subsidized educational leave for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduce school maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduce special services such as speech, reading, and hearing therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eliminate community education programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discontinue summer school programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Currently the provincial government makes grants to independent schools. Are you in favour of or opposed to provincial grants to independent schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Favour</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. In your opinion, are smaller classes important in affecting learning outcomes with the average student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
8. As you look on your own elementary or secondary education, is it your impression that children today get a better or worse education than you did?

Better
Worse
No Difference

9. At the present time, if school officials said they needed more money for educational programs and no provincial assistance was forthcoming, would you favour or oppose raising local taxes to get the money?

Favour
Oppose

10. Education Scale. Given below are 30 statements on educational ideas and problems about which we all have beliefs, opinions and attitudes. We all think differently about such matters, and this scale is an attempt to let you express your beliefs and opinions. Respond to each of the items as follows:

Agree very strongly +3
Agree strongly +2
Agree +1
Disagree very strongly -3
Disagree strongly -2
Disagree -1

For example, if you agree very strongly with a statement, you would write +3 on the short line preceding the statement, but if you happen to disagree with it, you would put -1 in front of it. Respond to each statement as best you can. Go rapidly but carefully. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, try to respond and then go on.

1. Learning is essentially a process of increasing one's store of information about the various fields of knowledge.
2. The curriculum consists of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.

3. The learning of proper attitudes is often more important than the learning of subject matter.

4. It is more important that the child learn how to approach and solve problems than it is for him to master the subject matter of the curriculum.

5. The true view of education is arranging learning so that the child gradually builds up a storehouse of knowledge that he can use in the future.

6. What is needed in the modern classroom is a revival of the authority of the teacher.

7. Teachers should keep in mind that pupils have to be made to work.

8. Schools of today are neglecting the three R's.

9. Standards of work should not be the same for all pupils; they should vary with the pupil.

10. The goals of education should be dictated by children's interests and needs, as well as by the demands of society.

11. Each subject and activity should be aimed at developing a particular part of the child's makeup: physical, intellectual, social, moral or spiritual.

12. Right from the very first grade, teachers must teach the child at his own level and not at the level of the grade he is in.

13. Teachers need to be guided in what they are to teach. No individual teacher can be permitted to do as he wishes, especially when it comes to teaching children.

14. Learning experiences organized around life experiences rather than around subjects is desirable in our schools.

15. We should fit the curriculum to the child and not the child to the curriculum.
16. Subjects that sharpen the mind, like mathematics and foreign languages, need greater emphasis in the public school curriculum.

17. Since life is essentially a struggle, education should emphasize competition and the fair competitive spirit.

18. The healthy interaction of pupils one with another is just as important in school as the learning of subject matter.

19. The organization of instruction and learning must be centered on universal ideas and truths if education is to be more than passing fads and fancies.

20. The curriculum should contain an orderly arrangement of subjects that represent the best of our cultural heritage.

21. True discipline springs from interest, motivation, and involvement in live problems.

22. Emotional development and social development are as important in the evaluation of pupil progress as academic achievement.

23. Education and educational institutions must be sources of new social ideas.

24. Children should be taught that all problems should be subjected to critical and objective scrutiny, including religious, moral, economic, and social problems.

25. One of the big difficulties with modern schools is that discipline is often sacrificed to the interests of children.

26. Teachers should encourage pupils to study and criticize our own and other economic systems and practices.

27. Children need and should have more supervision and discipline than they usually get.

28. Schools should teach children dependence on higher moral values.
29. The public school should take an active part in stimulating social change.

30. Learning is experimental; the child should be taught to test alternatives before accepting any of them.
B. ABOUT YOURSELF

1. Your age ______
2. Sex ______
3. Education (check which level completed)
   - Elementary school
   - Some secondary school
   - Secondary school graduate
   - Technical, trade or Business school
   - Some university
   - University graduate
   - Post-graduate degree
4. Your occupation ________________________________________
5. Civic Party (Please list):
   ________________________________________
   ________________________________________
   ________________________________________
6. Provincial Party you normally support:
   - Liberal ______
   - New Democratic ______
   - Progressive ______
   - Conservative ______
   - Social Credit ______
   - Other (Please list) ______________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

STEPHEN HANSEN,
Graduate Student
Appendix B

Questionnaire Part Two
SECTION I

Three different situations, typical of those which face school boards, are described below. Consider each situation carefully and then respond to the four questions which follow it. Please try to answer as you think you would behave in your role as a school board member.

1. Your board has decided to review the method of student reporting currently used in the district. Specifically, it intends to consider the format of the report card and the kinds of information included.

In order to obtain the necessary information on which to base your decision, you may wish to consult with one or more groups.

a) Which of the groups listed below do you believe is the single most important group to consult on a decision of this kind? Place a "1" on the line before the single most important group.

- parent groups (e.g., school consultative committees)
- individual parents whom you know
- the superintendent and his staff
- specific interest groups and other community organizations
- local principals' association
- individual principals whom you know
- local teachers' association
- individual teachers whom you know
- students
- other (Please specify)
b) Which of the other groups do you believe should be consulted on a decision of this kind? Place an "X" on the line before each of the other groups you believe should be consulted. You may indicate more than one.

____ parent groups (e.g., school consultative committees)
____ individual parents whom you know
____ the superintendent and his staff
____ specific interest groups and other community organizations
____ local principals' association
____ individual principals whom you know
____ local teachers' association
____ individual teachers whom you know
____ students
____ other (please specify)

c) As a school board member, you have been elected to represent a constituency, to make decisions on its behalf. If, on this issue, the recommendations of your constituents differed from those of the superintendent and his staff, whose recommendations would have more weight on your final decision? Place an "X" on the appropriate line.

____ the recommendations of my constituents
____ the recommendations of my superintendent and his staff

d) If, after considering the available information, your personal judgment differed from the recommendations made by your constituents, how would you vote at the school board meeting? Place an "X" on the appropriate line.

____ according to the recommendations of my constituents
____ according to my personal judgment.
2. The provisional annual budget for the district is being prepared. It appears that it will exceed last year's by 15% to 20%, which will mean a considerable increase in school taxes.

In order to obtain the necessary information on which to base your decision, you may wish to consult with one or more groups.

a) Which of the groups listed below do you believe is the single most important group to consult on a decision of this kind? Place a "1" on the line before the single most important group.

__ parent groups (e.g., school consultative committees)
__ individual parents whom you know
__ the superintendent and his staff
__ specific interest groups and other community organizations
__ local principals' association
__ individual principals whom you know
__ local teachers' association
__ individual teachers whom you know
__ students
__ other (please specify)
b) Which of the other groups do you believe should be consulted on a decision of this kind? Place an "X" on the line before each of the other groups you believe should be consulted. You may indicate more than one.

- parent groups (e.g., school consultative committees)
- individual parents whom you know
- the superintendent and his staff
- specific interest groups and other community organizations
- local principals' association
- individual principals whom you know
- local teachers' association
- individual teachers whom you know
- students
- other (please specify)

c) As a school board member, you have been elected to represent a constituency, to make decisions on its behalf. If, on this issue, the recommendations of your constituents differed from those of the superintendent and his staff, whose recommendations would have more weight on your final decision? Place an "X" on the appropriate line.

- the recommendations of my constituents
- the recommendations of my superintendent and his staff

d) If, after considering the available information, your personal judgment differed from the recommendations made by your constituents, how would you vote at the school board meeting? Place an "X" on the appropriate line.

- according to the recommendations of my constituents
- according to my personal judgment
3. At a recent high school dance, several students were intoxicated and alcohol was found on the premises. The school board has decided to formulate a policy on the use of drugs and alcohol during school-sponsored activities.

In order to obtain the necessary information on which to base your decision, you may wish to consult with one or more groups.

a) Which of the groups listed below do you believe is the single most important group to consult on a decision of this kind? Place a "1" on the line before the single most important group.

- parent groups (e.g., school consultative committees)
- individual parents whom you know
- the superintendent and his staff
- specific interest groups and other community organizations
- local principals' association
- individual principals whom you know
- local teachers' association
- individual teachers whom you know
- students
- other (please specify)

b) Which of the other groups do you believe should be consulted on a decision of this kind? Place an "X" on the line before each of the other groups you believe should be consulted. You may indicate more than one.

- parent groups (e.g., school consultative committees)
- individual parents whom you know
- the superintendent and his staff
- specific interest groups and other community organizations
- local principals' association
- individual principals whom you know
- local teachers' association
- individual teachers whom you know
- students
- other (please specify)
c) As a school board member, you have been elected to represent a constituency, to make decisions on its behalf. If, on this issue, the recommendations of your constituents differed from those of the superintendent and his staff, whose recommendations would have more weight on your final decision? Place an "X" on the appropriate line.

___ the recommendations of my constituents
___ the recommendations of my superintendent and his staff

If, after considering the available information, your personal judgment differed from the recommendations made by your constituents, how would you vote at the school board meeting? Place an "X" on the appropriate line.

___ according to the recommendations of my constituents
___ according to my personal judgment

SECTION II

For each of the statements which follow, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with it by circling the appropriate number.

4. In my school district the community's needs are being met.

/ strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly disagree
5. In my school district the public has adequate input into the decision-making process.

1  2  3  4  5  6
strongly agree strongly disagree

6. In my school district the recommendations of the superintendent and his staff are in accordance with community needs.

1  2  3  4  5  6
strongly agree strongly disagree

7. In my school district the recommendations of the teachers associations are in accordance with community needs.

1  2  3  4  5  6
strongly agree strongly disagree

SECTION III

8. As a school board member, you frequently attend meetings of community and specific interest groups. On the line before each group listed below, please write the number of meetings of that group you have attended since January 1, 1981.

____ community/neighbourhood councils
____ parent consultative committees, home and school groups, etc.
____ educational committee of a political party
____ ratepayer associations
____ teacher associations
____ local labour councils
____ ad hoc committees on specific issues
____ others (please specify)
9. How many of the meetings specified in question 8 did you attend with the express purpose of finding out the opinions of that group on specific educational issues?

- community/neighbourhood councils
- parent consultative committees, home and school groups, etc.
- educational committee of a political party
- ratepayer associations
- teacher associations
- local labour councils
- ad hoc committees on specific issues
- others (please specify)
Appendix C

Introductory Letter Part One
Re: Research Study on Educational Opinions of School Board Candidates

I am writing to ask for your assistance in a research study.

At the present time, I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University. The study, which seeks to gather information on the educational opinions of past and present school board candidates, is part of the requirements for my Master's degree.

Your involvement in this study will require approximately twenty minutes of time to complete a questionnaire that asks for your opinions on various educational matters plus certain background information on yourself.

All information given will be anonymous and will comment only on differences in opinion that exist or do not exist between the parties involved in present and past school board elections. No individual results will be reported. A summary of the study will be sent to you when the results have been tabulated.

I would appreciate it if you would complete the attached questionnaire at your earliest convenience and return it in the stamped envelope provided. I have also enclosed a stamped postcard which is to be mailed separately. This will inform me that your questionnaire has been returned while preserving its anonymity.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, please contact me during the day at 594-7588 or in the evening at 271-7267.

Thankyou for your participation.

Sincerely,

Stephen Hansen
Graduate Student
Appendix D

Introductory Letter Part Two
April 8, 1981

Dear Trustee,

You may have participated in the study of the educational opinions of Lower Mainland school board members which we conducted last December. Although the data analysis has not been completed, the preliminary findings are interesting. We would like to thank you again for your cooperation.

We are now ready to begin the second phase of the study, which is concerned with school board decision-making and styles of representation, two important aspects of educational governance. We therefore are asking once again for your cooperation in completing a brief questionnaire on the above topics. The results of this study should provide relevant and informative feedback to school trustees and to others involved in educational governance.

In order to facilitate collection of the completed questionnaires, we have decided to deliver and pick up the questionnaires in person. We will be telephoning you within the next two weeks to arrange a time convenient for you. We will be able to answer any questions you may have about the study at that time.

Your contribution to the study is greatly appreciated. We look forward to meeting with you later this month.

Sincerely,

Stephen Hansen
M.A. Candidate
Administrative Leadership Program
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