



8-1-1984

An Assessment of the Attitudes and Perceptions of School Board Members, Community Members, and State Legislators Toward Community Representation by Local School Boards in North Dakota

Michael L. Ward

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Ward, Michael L., "An Assessment of the Attitudes and Perceptions of School Board Members, Community Members, and State Legislators Toward Community Representation by Local School Boards in North Dakota" (1984). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1137.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/1137>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND STATE LEGISLATORS TOWARD
COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION BY LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS
IN NORTH DAKOTA

by
Michael L. Ward

Bachelor of Arts, California Baptist College, 1967
Master of Arts, Arizona State University, 1971
Master of Science, Black Hills State College, 1975

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
University of North Dakota
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August
1984

This Dissertation submitted by Michael L. Ward in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Donald K. Lerner
(Chairman)

Richard E. Lee

Scott G. Allen

Richard D. Landry

David E. Ramsell

This Dissertation meets the standards for appearance and conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

A. William Johnson 7/19/84
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

An Assessment of the Attitudes and Perceptions of School Board
Members, Community Members, and State Legislators toward
Title Community Representation by Local School Boards in North Dakota

Department Center for Teaching and Learning

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Michael J. Nard

Date July 6, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
CHAPTER III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	44
CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	59
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	103
APPENDIX	123
SELECTED REFERENCES	129

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Distribution of Survey Respondents by Group, District Size, Selected Sample Size, Survey Sample Response (N), Percent of Survey Sample Response, and Percent of Total Response	60
2.	Number and Percent of Those Participating in the Study by Sex	61
3.	Number, Percent, and Mean Age of Those Participating in the Study by Age	62
4.	Number and Percent of Those Participating in the Study by Education Levels	63
5.	Number and Percent of Those Participating in the Study by Occupations	64
6.	Number and Percent of Those Participating in the Study by Income Levels	65
7.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	66
8.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	67
9.	Scheffé Comparison of Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	67
10.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	68
11.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	69
12.	Scheffé Comparison of Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	70

13.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Sex of the Respondents	71
14.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Sex of the Respondents	72
15.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Age of the Respondents	73
16.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Age of the Respondents	73
17.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Income Levels of the Respondents	74
18.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Income Levels of the Respondents	75
19.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Occupations of the Respondents	76
20.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Occupations of the Respondents	76
21.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Education Levels of the Respondents	77
22.	Mean Perceptions of General Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Education Levels of the Respondents	78
23.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	79
24.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	79

25.	Scheffé Comparison of Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	80
26.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	81
27.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	81
28.	Scheffé Comparison of Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	82
29.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Sex of the Respondents	83
30.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Sex of the Respondents	84
31.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Age of the Respondents	85
32.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Age of the Respondents	85
33.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Income Level of the Respondents	86
34.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Income Level of the Respondents	87
35.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Occupations of the Respondents	88
36.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Occupations of the Respondents	88

37.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Education Levels of the Respondents	89
38.	Mean Perceptions of Policy Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Education Levels of the Respondents . . .	90
39.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	90
40.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	91
41.	Scheffé Comparison of Mean Perceptions of Representation at the State Legislative Level among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators	91
42.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	92
43.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	93
44.	Scheffé Comparison of Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared by Size of School District Enrollment	94
45.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Sex of the Respondents	95
46.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Sex of the Respondents	96
47.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Age of the Respondents	97
48.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Age of the Respondents	97

49.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Income Levels of the Respondents	98
50.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Income Levels of the Respondents	99
51.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Occupations of the Respondents	100
52.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Occupations of the Respondents	100
53.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Education Levels of the Respondents	101
54.	Mean Perceptions of State Representation among School Board Members, Community Members, and Legislators when Compared across Education Levels of the Respondents	102

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the course of writing this dissertation there were many who influenced the researcher and the dissertation which follows. The participants in the survey were very cooperative in providing the information that is so vital to successful research. It is to all of these for their kindness, support, and cooperation that this dissertation is dedicated.

The members of the doctoral committee have been generous with their time, knowledge, suggestions, and support throughout the study. In particular, Dr. Donald K. Lemon has given of his time and self to guide and support this researcher. He has been unwavering in his belief in my ability, and his high expectations motivated this effort. Dr. Richard Landry was diligent in his assistance in the technical aspects of the study, and Dr. Richard Hill stimulated me to probe for more meaningful, underlying notions in my work. Dr. Janet Ahler offered the moral support so critical to successful completion of the work, and Dr. David Ramsett gave willingly of his time and expertise in maintaining the standards of the Graduate School.

Finally, this dissertation has been a joint effort. My wife, Marlene, responded endlessly to idea after idea, edited, and supported this effort through her love and constant belief in my ability. Our children--Michael, David, Cherese, and Devyn--have been patient and understanding throughout. Without their love and support I could not have completed this research. We did it together.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the representativeness of school boards in North Dakota in terms of the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of the community. Hypotheses stated that perceptions of school boards did not differ significantly in areas of general representation, representation in policy development, and representation at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators. Additional variables considered in the study were sex, age, income level, occupation, education, and size of school district enrollment.

A survey instrument was mailed to randomly selected community members, all school board members, and all state legislators from a stratified random sample of school districts in North Dakota based on size of school district enrollment. The data consisted of biographical factors and responses to twenty-four statements about the responsiveness of school boards. The statistical tests included measures of reliability and analysis of variance. Findings were significant at the .05 level. Some of the conclusions drawn were:

1. School board members perceived the school board as more representative in the areas of general representation, representation in policy development, and in representation at the state legislative level than did community members and state legislators.

2. Biographical factors including age, sex, occupation, education, and income level did not significantly affect the perceptions

of survey respondents.

3. Size of school district enrollment did significantly affect the perceptions of the three groups--school board members, community members, and state legislators. School board members from large-sized school districts (enrollments greater than 500 students) perceived themselves to be more responsive than did school board members from small- and medium-sized districts, and community members and state legislators from all sizes of school districts.

The study provides a considerable amount of baseline data regarding the representative role of school boards. The research should prove to be of value to educators, school board members, and state legislators interested in the development of training for school board members, refinement of school district policy and procedures, and improvement of practices at the school board level.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

At the time this study was conducted there were approximately 16,000 school boards in the United States (Mitzel 1982). The approximate 99,000 persons who served as board members constituted the largest group of public officials in the nation. They were generally thought to be among the most selfless and public service minded of all public officials. The ideal for school board performance was stated over twenty-five years ago by the first executive secretary of the National School Boards Association:

. . . a non-partisan, broadly representative team spirited board of education, having clearly defined policies based on a thorough understanding of the educational process, conducting its business in open sessions as a committee of the whole, and possessing fiscal independence for the operation of its educational programs under the administration of a chief school officer.

The responsibility of the board of education towards its community is not only legal, but has civic, social, economic, and moral aspects which are no less important.

With the greatest good to the greatest number as its goals, the board should seek at all times to carry out the considered wishes of the majority of the people of the community within the framework of the law, whatever that may be. (Tuttle 1958, pp. 109-10)

The local boards of education were a purely American form of government and modeled the democratic ideal of representation. The role of the elected official in the democratic system had been debated

for centuries (Pitkin 1967). Tuttle's belief that school boards "should seek to carry out the wishes of the majority of the people of the community" was indicative of one view of the representative role of school board members. Proponents of this view maintained that elected officials were mandated to vote and act in a like manner to those who elected them. In essence, those officials were "stand-ins" for all those they represented who were not able to be there in person. Representation carried with it the notion of responsiveness to the expressed wishes and desires of the constituency.

The opposing viewpoint was characterized by freedom to vote one's own conscience. The proponents of this view maintained that once elected, officials may have acted and voted as their own consciences dictated. If their actions coincided with the constituency, it was coincidental, not obligatory. Constituent access to the elected official came at election time only.

The American school board was a highly visible unit of democracy in action. The role of board members as representatives remained a field of conflict and necessitated study to determine progress toward fulfilling the ideal as stated by Tuttle (1958).

The direction and control of American education historically had been a responsibility of lay boards elected at the local level. As early as 1647 the government of the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed a law requiring all towns of a certain size to establish and maintain schools, and delegated the responsibility of compliance with the law to local officials. These local officials usually directed the activities of the "semipublic" school through town meetings.

As populations expanded, enrollments grew, and the business of schools increased, the management of schools required more attention than was provided in a town meeting. Samuel Adams, of Revolutionary War fame, led in the development of a Boston school law that provided for the creation of a separate school committee comprised of twelve members (one from each ward) to be elected by the people. Samuel Adams' actions were precipitated by a concern "about the elitist tendencies he saw in Boston schools, so he worked to establish a system that would provide for more democratic control of the public schools" (Schultz 1973, pp. 12-13). In 1798 the Massachusetts Legislature passed legislation that recognized school committees as separate governing bodies of the city or town (Reeves 1954). It became required that school committees be entirely separate from other governing authorities through a law passed by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1826 (Reeves 1954).

These first efforts at democratic control of education were not immediately followed by other cities. For example, from 1805 to 1842 the Public School Society, a self-appointed philanthropic committee, controlled the New York city schools (Ravitch 1974). In 1842 the New York Legislature vested control of schools in the hands of elected commissioners (Ravitch 1974). Similarly, other towns and states struggled to settle the issue of public schools for all, governed by a locally selected body.

As the population of the United States expanded westward and people settled in remote areas of the country and in isolated parts of each state, settlers found the New England system of control over schools efficient. It allowed communities to run their own schools and

appealed to the states as an effective way to manage a broadly diffused educational system (Goldhammer 1964). The local school district and the school board were ready-made for constituting educational governing units to attend to the state's responsibility for the education of children in remote hamlets and in metropolitan centers.

The rapid expansion of the American public school system was dominated by the assumption that democracy would develop without a refinement of theory. Truman (1965), in his treatment of the development of political science, suggested that the nontheoretical consensus prevailing in the political system provided its own theory and that the task before political scientists was to facilitate the inevitable flowering of democracy. The failure to refine democratic theory had provided school councils in the nation's school districts the opportunity to deviate from the democratic idealism which they were purported to uphold.

The years between those first school boards established in Massachusetts and the beginning of the twentieth century were characterized by the establishment of thousands of school districts throughout the nation. These school districts were controlled by a variety of school councils. Some were controlled by town councils, while others were controlled by publicly elected boards with political parties having influence over the development of education programs.

By the beginning of the twentieth century many schoolmasters, business executives, and professional personnel sought reforms. The emphasis of reform was to be on centralization, expertise, professionalism, nonpolitical control, and efficiency. The goal of educators was to restructure the governance of schools so that school boards would be small, elected at large, and removed from all political

connections with political parties and general government officials such as mayors and councilmen (Wirt and Kirst 1972). Hence, at the beginning of the twentieth century, educators paid little attention to party politics and political scientists had limited interest in education.

The apolitical emphasis of educators and school boards dominated American education until the decade of the 1960s (Callahan 1975; Wirt and Kirst 1972). At that time, political scientists began to investigate the apolitical ideology established at the beginning of the century. People, such as Bailey (1962), controverted the ideology of "Keep Politics Out of Education" when he stated, "Education is one of the most thoroughly political enterprises in American life" (p. viii). Lutz and Iannacone (1969) claimed that the idea that politics were separate was partly based upon a narrow definition of politics, upon a parochial view of education, and upon the utility of the slogan to educators and politicians.

The effort to keep education apolitical resulted in avoiding the two-party system that dominated other municipal, state, and federal legislative arenas. But politics involved more than the interaction between two political parties; politics was the process of influence that resulted in an authoritative decision and had the force of law by a governmental body like a school board (Lutz and Iannacone 1969).

The school board had traditionally been identified as the linkage between the community and schools and as formally representing the people of the community. Kerr (1964) explored the school/community linkage in relation to community interests and suggested that the major contribution of school boards was their authorization of the school's

policies, and not the fulfillment of local demands.

Representation, as a form of linkage between the representative and a constituency, has been the topic of many books and articles (Beard and Lewis 1932; Ford 1924; Frederick 1948; Hermes 1956; Mayo 1960; Pitkin 1967). Two different definitions emerged from the literature on representation. Representation had been defined as responsiveness to the local community by attending to the needs of constituents, regardless of whether the constituents perceived those needs (Cistone 1975). Another definition emerging from the literature maintained that representation was responsiveness that reflected the "expressed desires, opinions, and wants of constituents" (Cistone 1975, p. 236).

Recent research into the politics of education was dominated by the study of urban education systems and, although the results of research on representation in education varied, the predominant opinion was that urban school boards were generally responsive in terms of the first definition of responsiveness: attending to the needs of constituents, regardless of whether the constituents perceived those needs. Research also indicated that urban school boards were under greater pressure to be more representative of the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of constituents. However, there was less pressure of this type in rural communities (Zeigler, Jennings, and Peak 1974).

Wakefield (1971) suggested different views of representation in urban and rural communities:

As school districts have grown in size and complexity, the problem of representation has become complicated. The early pattern of election of board members-at-large is being replaced by geographical area representation, which often puts rural citizens in a minority position.

The rural board member holds somewhat different views from his urban counterpart about representation and the apportionment of power. In the opinion of the rural school board member,

bureaucratic structures, unnecessary in rural life, are not needed in life generally and especially not in public life.

Moreover, publicly selected rural representatives are considered to be effective when they reflect rather than mold views of their constituents. (p. 71)

A 1975 Gallup study (National School Boards Association 1975) reported that most adults in the United States did not understand what school boards did and many had "no opinions" about their school boards. Only 50 percent of the parents of school children felt that school boards were doing an adequate job of representing the views of the community. The public appeared to want more local control and more community participation in determining the future of public education. However, according to the Gallup study, the public did not view boards as adequately representing their desires.

Need for the Study

The question of representation of the community had prevailed as a theme in urban education. Although research in urban education indicated an increased demand on school boards for representation, there was no substantial evidence that rural school boards were more or less representative of their local constituencies. Further inquiry into the form of responsiveness was necessary in order to better understand the role of the local school board in the political arena at both the local and state level.

With an increasing role of state legislative bodies in the governance of education in the 1970s, local school boards have had a reduced role in governing power (Rosenthal and Fuhrman 1981). And, with state equalization programs in such forms as funding, minimum competency standards, and curriculum standards, the local school board had an increasing responsibility to fulfill requirements of state law.

Implied through the increasing responsibility to the state and the law was a diminished ability of school boards to be responsive to the community.

Wakefield (1971) suggested that publicly selected rural representatives were considered to be effective when they reflected rather than molded the views of their constituencies. But, did this hold true after the turbulent changes of the seventies? The purpose of this study was to examine the representativeness of school boards in the state of North Dakota to determine if school boards were perceived as effective in reflecting the views of their constituencies.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose for conducting the study was to examine the representativeness of the school boards in North Dakota in terms of the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of the community. The study was based on the definition of representation proposed by Pitkin (1967) which stated that the representative must act in a manner responsive to their constituency, with little or no conflict, and consistent with the wishes of the represented.

A clarification of the responsiveness of the school board, as it was perceived by board members, community members, and state legislators, would provide valuable information on the representative role of the school board at the local and state level. The theoretical model used to compare perceptions of school board responsiveness was based on the democratic ideal suggested by Samuel Adams (Schultz 1973), Tuttle (1958), and further defined by Pitkin (1967). The tradition of democratic idealism suggested that elected representatives reflected the will of the people and carried out the expressed desires and wishes of the

people in their actions. This study was conducted to determine if school boards were perceived as conduits of the public's wishes and desires or if the board was perceived to be unresponsive and hence fall short of achieving the democratic idealism school boards were purported to uphold. In order to carry out the purpose for the study comparisons were made about the perceptions of the three groups on general representation, representation in policy development, and representation at the state level of school board members. Further comparisons of descriptive data about the three groups were also completed among the groups based upon school district size and biographical factors. After the data analysis, conclusions were drawn and developed for consideration by appropriate policymakers.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to:

1. Fifteen high school districts in the state of North Dakota. Five were selected from each of three categories based on the size of school district enrollment. Five were selected from districts with 100 or less students enrolled; five were selected from districts with enrollments ranging from 101 to 500; and, five were selected from school districts with enrollments greater than 500.
2. The following biographical factors for school board members, legislators, and community members: age, sex, occupation, income, and education.
3. The following factors of representation in terms of responsiveness to the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of constituents: general representation, representation at the state legislative level, and representation in policy development.

Assumptions

The following major assumptions were identified to assist the reader in interpreting the findings of the study:

1. The perceptions of school board members, community members, and state legislators were useful in clarifying the issue or representation in rural school districts.
2. The interview instrument which was developed to assess representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and legislators yielded valid, reliable, and appropriate data.
3. The interview instrument which was developed to assess representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and legislators was appropriately administered.
4. The respondents to the instrument provided accurate, honest, and forthright responses.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in the study with the identified meanings:

Policy. A "general statement of intent to act in a particular manner when confronted with a given situation or to achieve a given result at some future point in time" (Knezevich 1975, p. 321).

School board member. An elected state official who served as a member of a local school board. In North Dakota, school board members were elected on a nonpartisan basis.

Community member. A resident of voting age who resided within the boundaries of a given school district.

State legislator. An elected member of the North Dakota Senate or House of Representatives.

State legislative level. The arena of activity that occurred in conjunction with the members of the state legislature, such as testifying before committees, testifying before the House of Representatives or the Senate, or collaborating with the members of the state legislature or their council.

Research Questions

The study was intended to answer the following research questions:

1. Do legislators, community members, and school board members differ in their perceptions of the school board as representative of the local community?
2. Do legislators, community members, and school board members differ in their perceptions of the local school board as representative of the community in the development of local school district policy?
3. Do legislators, community members, and school board members differ in their perceptions of the local school board as representative of the community at the state legislative level?

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were identified for this study:

Null hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators.

Null hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared by size of school district enrollment.

Null hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across sex of respondents.

Null hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across age of respondents.

Null hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across income level of respondents.

Null hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across occupations of respondents.

Null hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative

of the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across education levels of respondents.

Null hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators.

Null hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared by size of school district enrollment.

Null hypothesis 10. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across sex of respondents.

Null hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across age of respondents.

Null hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across income levels of respondents.

Null hypothesis 13. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across occupations of respondents.

Null hypothesis 14. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across education levels of respondents.

Null hypothesis 15. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators.

Null hypothesis 16. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community

members, and state legislators when compared by size of school district enrollment.

Null hypothesis 17. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across sex of respondents.

Null hypothesis 18. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across age of respondents.

Null hypothesis 19. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across income levels of respondents.

Null hypothesis 20. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across occupations of respondents.

Null hypothesis 21. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state

legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across education levels of respondents.

These hypotheses were identified for the purpose of determining if the democratic ideology of representation, stated by Tuttle (1958) as "carrying out the wishes of the majority" (p. 109), was perceived to be practiced by school boards in North Dakota. As the linkage between the school district and the community, school board members comprised the largest body of elected officials in North Dakota and the significance of the research was considered important to the refinement of democratic practices in communities throughout the state and the nation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

It was the purpose of this study to examine the representativeness of school boards in North Dakota as perceived by school board members, community members, and legislators. In order to adequately examine the representativeness of school boards, a thorough review of the related literature was made. To understand school boards in this perspective, the school district was viewed as a social subsystem within the larger social system--the community.

The present chapter provides a review of literature pertinent to the study. The review is not intended to be exhaustive, but is directed at literature and research relevant to the major issues of the study--the school board and representation. The chapter begins with a review of the theories of representation. This is followed by a review of the theory about social systems and school boards. The chapter concludes with a review of research which seeks to analyze school board representation of the community from two perspectives: responsiveness to the community and biographical characteristics.

Theories of Representation

A review of the literature on representation provided numerous volumes of historical scholarship on the theory of representation. The

writings on representation were not without controversy. Theories of representation have been debated for centuries, as evidenced by the literature.

The earliest evidence of representation came from ancient Greece. Although the Greeks had no term meaning representative, they had some elected officials, which may be interpreted as a representative act (Pitkin 1967). However, as Elau (1967) suggested, the failure of the Greeks to develop the concepts of representation may have contributed to the Roman conquest of Greece.

The first English writing about representation appeared in Sir Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan in 1651. Hobbes's theory of formal representation was based on the concepts of the "artificial person" who was created for representative purposes. Hobbes differentiated the "artificial person" from the "natural person":

A person, is he, whose words or actions are considered, either as his own, or as representing the words or actions of another man, or of any other thing, to whom they are attributed, whether truly or by fiction. When they are considered as his own, then is he called a natural person; and when they are considered as representing the words and actions of another, then is he a feigned or artificial person. (Molesworth 1839-1845, p. 24)

This Hobbesian representation required popular consent in developing an initial social contract with a representative such as a monarch. The artificial person's actions were considered to be the actions of someone else--the represented. The represented accepted full responsibility for the actions of the representative. The relationship of the representative and the represented continued with tacit consent of the represented, as evidenced later, by giving obedience and remaining in the realm.

In the eighteenth century, Edmund Burke--the English statesman, orator, and writer--asserted that the Parliament should represent the interests of the nation as a whole and not individual or demographic interests. He stated:

Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, but Parliament is a deliberate assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole--where not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member, indeed; but when you have chosen him he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament. If the local constituent should have an interest or should form a hasty opinion evidently opposite to the real good of the rest of the community, the member for that place ought to be as far as any other from any endeavor to give it effect. (Hoffman and Levack 1949, p. 176)

For Burke, then, the representative had no obligation to consult his/her constituents, except in a very restricted sense that the Parliament needed an accurate reflection of popular "feelings." Burke conceived of the interests of the nation as objective and unattached and viewed government and politics as matters of knowledge and reason, not of opinion or will. He believed in the representation of interests rather than people; but those interests were national, not local or individual. He maintained that those interests could and would be recognized only by deliberation at the parliamentary level (Pitkin 1967).

Burke (cited in Hoffman and Levack 1949) wrote in 1790 that he believed that a "natural aristocracy should govern." He set forth the following reasons for this elite control:

A true natural aristocracy is not a separate interest in the state or separate from it. It is an essential integrant part of any large body rightly constituted. It is formed out of a class of legitimate presumptions, which, taken as generalities, must be admitted as actual truths. To be bred in a place of estimation; to see nothing low and sordid from one's self; to be habituated to the censorial inspection of the public eye; to look early to public opinion; to stand upon

such elevated ground as to be enabled to take a large view of the widespread and infinitely diversified combinations of men and affairs in a large society; to have leisure to read, to reflect, to converse; to be enabled to draw the court and attention of the wise and learned, wherever they are to be found; to be habituated in armies to command and to obey; to be taught to despise danger in pursuit of honor and duty; to be formed to the greatest degree of vigilance, foresight, and circumspection in a state of things in which no fault is committed with impunity and the slightest mistakes draw on the most ruinous consequences; to be led to a guarded and regulated conduct, from a sense that you are considered as an instructor of your fellow-citizens in their highest concerns, and that you act as a reconciler between God and man; to be employed as an administrator of law and justice, and to be thereby amongst the first benefactors to mankind; to be a professor of high science, or liberal and ingenuous art; to be amongst rich traders, who from their success are presumed to have sharp and vigorous understandings, and to possess the virtues of diligence, order, constancy, and regularity, and to have cultivated a habitual regard to commutative justice; these are the circumstances of men that form what I should call a natural aristocracy, without which there is no nation. (pp. 397-98)

Burke (cited in Hoffman and Levack 1949) held that the "natural aristocrats" were superior men of wisdom and ability, not average or typical or even popular men. These men were to be reasoning men who would be able to use the judgment, virtue, and wisdom which they had derived from experience to identify what was good for the whole nation.

The French political philosopher and writer also of the eighteenth century, Jean Jacques Rousseau, further challenged the idealism of representation by stating that legislative representation and representation of the general will were impossible. Rousseau (cited in Andrews 1901) stated:

Sovereignty cannot be represented, for the same reason that it cannot be alienated. It consists essentially of the general will, and will cannot be represented. Either it is itself or it is different. There is no middle term. The Deputies of the People are not, nor can they be, its representatives. They can be only its Commissioners. They can make no definite decisions. Laws which the People have not ratified in their own person are null and void. That is to say, they are not laws at all. The English people think that they are free, but in this belief they are profoundly wrong. They are free only when they are electing

members of Parliament. Once the election has been completed, they revert to a condition of slavery; they are nothing. Making such use of it in the few short moments of their freedom, they deserve to lose it. (p. 69)

Rousseau (cited in Andrews 1901) maintained that legislative representation was impossible because it meant "willing for others," and no person could will for another. A person could will instead of another, but Rousseau could find no reason to suppose that the representative's will was going to coincide with the will of the represented. Rousseau maintained that to have someone else's will substituted for his meant simply to be ruled by another.

The idea of formal representation of the people was more of an American tradition than a European one. Whether one chose Hobbes's theory of the "artificial person," Burke's theory of the interest-oriented "elitism," or Rousseau's criticism of representation of the general will, the idea of representation inclusive of the populace emerged in America with the establishment of the nation. Many of the representative ideals were set forth in The Federalist Papers in the 1770s by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay (Beloff 1948). Under the pseudonym of Publius, these statesmen explained the fundamentals of the United States Constitution to the people of New York. Hamilton presented representation as inclusive of the populace and advocated the concept of "elitism," but to a lesser degree than that suggested by Burke.

John Adams, who was well versed in representation theory, much to the chagrin of mother England, stated: "A representative legislature should be an exact portrait, in miniature, of the people at large, as it should think, feel, reason, and act like them" (1852-1865, p. 205). This miniature analogy was also voiced by Harris in his monograph, The True Theory of Representation in a State, published in 1857.

Swabey (1937), like many others, tended to equate representation with sampling. She stated:

The principle of sampling in democratic theory is that a smaller group, selected impartially or at random from a larger group, tends to have the character of the larger group. Accordingly, a part, if properly chosen, may be taken as truly representative of the whole and substituted for it. . . . Throughout modern "representative" democracy this principle of the valid substitution of the part for the whole is central. (p. 25)

Swabey (1937) argued that the principle of sampling existed on three levels in modern democratic government. The first level consisted of the voters who were considered a sample of all the people: "The government finds it necessary to interpret the recorded opinion of those who vote at elections as a fair, trustworthy sample of what the general opinion of the public would be if they expressed it" (p. 25). The second level consisted of the majority of voters, and they were taken to be a sample of all voters: "Having learned that the chances which give the mean character of a collection are more numerous than those representing the extremes, we tend to believe that the type of vote that occurs most frequently in the election is probably representative of what most of the people want" (p. 26). Finally, the third level held that the public officials who were elected should be regarded as a "sample of the nation" (p. 28). What was not clear about Swabey's theory was whether, in fact, she believed it to be a theory or if she believed that democracy actually worked that way.

Pitkin (1967) discussed other theories of representation in The Concept of Representation. Three major theories predominated representation according to Pitkin:

1. The "authorization view" maintained that the representative was authorized to act on behalf of the represented. This meant that

he/she had been given a right to act, a right he/she had not had before. The represented had then become responsible for the consequences of the representative's action as if they had done the act themselves. The rights of the representative had been enlarged and the representative's personal responsibilities had decreased.

2. The "standing for" representation, or "true representation" as many writers agreed, required that the legislature be so selected that its composition corresponded accurately to that of the whole nation; only then was it a really representative body. This view of representation was similar to that of John Adams's theory, as discussed earlier, which required that the representative body be an exact miniature of the greater populace.

3. The "mirror" concept of representation required that the legislature be a "mirror" of the nation or of public opinion. It must mirror the state of public consciousness or the movement of social and economic forces in the nation. Representation then was an accurate reflection of the community, of the general opinion of the nation, or of the variety of interests of the people.

After a review of the major theories on representation, Pitkin (1967) defined representation as

acting in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them. The representative must act independently; his action must involve discretion and judgment; he must be the one who acts. The represented must also be (conceived as) capable of independent action and judgment, not merely being taken care of. And, despite the resulting potential for conflict between representative and represented about what is to be done, that conflict must not normally take place. The representative must act in such a way that there is no conflict, or if it occurs an explanation is called for. He must not be found persistently at odds with the wishes of the represented without good reason in terms of their interest, without a good explanation of why their wishes are not in accord with their interest. (p. 209)

Similar theories of behavior of governing bodies had been developed in the 1970s and been applied to federal, state, and local institutions. Most of these theories set the representative apart from the represented. Bailey (1971) and his colleagues have studied governing councils using a model of behavior based on a continuum from "elite" to "arena" council behavior. At one extreme of the continuum, the elite council reached decisions in private with the minority acceding to the majority and enacting decisions in the public presence as though the decisions were always unanimous. At this "elite" extreme of the continuum of council behavior, the council also viewed itself as a trustee, apart from the public for whom they were guardians of a trusteeship. Decisions were carried out as executive-administrative functions. That is, the council not only made the decision but carried it out.

Lutz (1975) explained that the conditions which led to and supported the non-responsiveness of the school boards of the elite council type were part of an established culture. He suggested that over the last century a set of norms, values, beliefs, and expectations had emerged about school boards and their members. These norms, values, beliefs, and expectations supported the notion that education was too important to be political and that school board members were trustees for the public and not representatives of it. The norms held that school board members were to avoid representing any group within the school district and do what was good for every student in spite of what the community wanted.

At the "arena" extreme of council behavior the council members debated issues publicly and voted on issues in the public presence

(Bailey 1971). The arena council viewed itself as representative of the public and acted as a community council. In addition, the arena council held the administration responsible for carrying out council decisions. Gresson (1976) described an arena type of school board in his study. In the arena type of board there was inter-board conflict with issues debated publicly. Decisions were reached by non-unanimous vote and board members often expressed their dissatisfaction with the actions of the board.

Gresson (1976) studied an elite school council board and described it as having little conflict with smooth performance of its duties. When community pressure was brought to bear on the board or superintendent, there was complete solidarity and protection of each individual. The elite-arena model was based on councilar behavior.

Another predominant theme of behavior for governing bodies was the trustee/delegate model (Elau and Prewitt 1973). It was similar to the elite-arena model. At one end of the continuum, the delegate behavior was characterized by the belief that the interests of the community were best served by a close translation into legislation of the expressed desires of the community. At the other end of the continuum, the trustee behavior was characterized by actions which ignored the desires of the community and allowed the trustee to use independent judgment in legislative actions. Delegates were responsive to the desires and wishes of the community while trustees acted in a manner consistent with their own values.

Olsen (1980) developed another model based on a continuum similar to that proposed in the trustee/delegate model. However, in Olsen's model, the term delegate was used to describe the board member

who was responsive to a constituency and the term mandate was used to describe those who exhibited an elitist behavior. Olsen provided the following continuum of behaviors for school board members:

Delegate A school board member should not use his own independent judgment as a criteria [sic] for making school board decisions, but rather the opinion of the people he represents.

Delegate-Mandate The role of the school board member is to have a clear notion of the community wishes and expectations concerning educational matters. It is the responsibility of the school board members to act as the pulse of the community; that is, to make decisions based on their understanding of what the community values and wants in education.

Mandate-Delegate A school board member should make decisions based on what he thinks is best for the community, even if it is not what they want.

Mandate School board members are, on the whole, better informed and more qualified concerning educational issues because of interest and experience than is the general public; hence they should be speaking to the public rather than listening to them. Once a school board member is elected, he must be completely free to act in accordance with his own best judgment.
(p. 4)

Olsen (1980) applied his model in a study of 110 school board members in Rutland County, Vermont, in 1979 using a Q-sort technique with a set of 60 to 100 cards. The results of his study indicated that school board members responding to the study had no preference for either end of the mandate/delegate continuum. A majority of the school board members surveyed indicated a preference for the mandate/delegate category. The mandate/delegate category indicated that although the school board members chose a middle position, they tended to prefer the mandate end of the continuum. Those responding chose statements which indicated a desire to remain independent in their attitudes, yet not wishing to remove themselves from their constituencies. In other words, respondents indicated a desire to know what their constituents were thinking and were willing to listen to while adamantly retaining their right to remain uncommitted and independent.

Regardless of the theory or model presented, theories and models of representation reflected two extremes of behavior--elitism or democratic idealism. The predominance of elitism in representative thought was early established by men such as Burke and Hamilton. Dye and Zeigler (1975) maintained that "elites, not masses, govern America" (p. 1). They claimed that a handful of men shaped the life of democracy, just as in a totalitarian society. The central proposition of elitism was that all societies consisted of two classes--the few who governed and the many who were the governed.

Elitism implied that public policy did not reflect the demands of the people as much as it reflected the interests and values of elites. Changes and innovations in public policy were a result of redefinitions by elites of their own values. The general conservatism of elites--that is, their interest in preserving the system--meant that changes in public policy were incremental rather than radical. Public policies were frequently modified but seldom replaced (Dye and Zeigler 1975).

Also, elitism assumed that the masses were largely passive and ill informed. The passivity of the masses was manipulated by the elites more frequently than the elites' values were influenced by the masses. Democratic institutions, as well as elections and parties, were important only for their symbolic value. They did not actually tie the masses to the political system by giving them a role to play on election day and a political party with which they could identify (Dye and Zeigler 1975).

Theories of representation ranged on a continuum from elitism as expressed by Burke to the democratic ideal as expressed by Pitkin.

Similarly, models developed to determine the manner in which board members carried out their representative role had been developed on a continuum of elitist and democratic behaviors. The present study was intended to determine if school boards were perceived as having elitist or democratic behaviors similar to the theories and models discussed earlier. In order to understand the school boards as representative of the community, it was necessary to review social systems theory and research related to school boards as social subsystems.

The School Board As A Social System

Parsons (1951) and his colleagues developed a basic theory of human action that comprised a social systems theory. Getzels and Guba (1957) and others developed Parsons' theory further by developing a functional model of administration as a social process. This social system was based on the notion of two or more people interacting to achieve common goals. It included both normative and personalistic dimensions which were conceptually independent but phenomenologically interactive. The normative dimension was characterized by the values within the culture and roles within the organization. The other dimension, the personal, was described by the values of the individual and the need-dispositions of the individual. The interaction of the two dimensions within the social system produced the observed behavior (Getzels and Guba 1957).

Administration may be examined from three stances in the social systems theory proposed by Getzels and Guba (1957). Administration could be viewed as a hierarchy--superordinate-subordinate relationships within the social system. This was known as the structural view. The functional view focused on the locus in the hierarchy of relationships

where there was an allocation and integration of roles in order to achieve the goals of the social system. The operational view focused on the administrative process as taking place in environments characterized by person-to-person relationships. Hence, any relationship within the administrative structure was enacted in two dynamic and separate personal situations, one embedded in the other. The relationship was perceived and organized by each role participant in terms of personal needs and goals, skills, and experiences. The two situations were related to the extent that the individuals' perceptions were mutual (Getzels and Guba 1957).

The question then was to what degree did the participants agree or disagree in the expectations they held for their respective roles in the social system? In the present investigation, the focus of which was the role of the school board as representative of the public, to what extent do agreement and disagreement exist in the expectations held for the school board role as representative between board members and community members, and between board members and legislators?

In applying social systems theory to school organizations, Parsons (1958) developed a taxonomy of functions consisting of the technical system level, the managerial system level, and the institutional system level (i.e., the community). He proposed that the school board was an interstitial body between the managerial system level and the community system level.

Parsons (1958) described the hierarchical structure of the school system in terms of responsibility or function. The technical system level in a school organization was where the actual processes

of teaching occurred. The higher-order decisions that must be made in an educational organization had two elements--the resources necessary to perform the technical functions of the school district, and the relations of the technical system to the community as a whole. This level of higher-order decisions was termed the managerial system level. As the technical system was controlled by the managerial system, the managerial system was controlled by the institutional system.

Parsons (1958) discussed the points of articulation between the systems levels as follows:

The essential focus of the qualitative break in line authority . . . is the managerial responsibility assumed by the executive and the managerial organization which he, in many cases, heads. This . . . is not a mere "delegation" where the executive is commissioned to carry out the "details" while his superiors decide all the "policies." This is because it is not possible to perform the functions of focusing legitimation and community support and at the same time act as the active management of it. . . . The "board," or whatever structural form it takes, is a mediating structure between the affairs of the organization at the managerial level and its public. (pp. 47-48)

In the mediating role, the school board may have been seen as neither wholly within nor wholly outside the organization. It could have been viewed as an interstitial body with the responsibility for mediating between the public at large and the managerial and technical systems of the organization. The board may have functioned within an extra-organizational framework when board members reflected the attitudes and values of the community in securing financial support and in allocating expenditures. The board functioned in an intra-organizational setting when reflecting the attitudes, values, and needs of the organized profession of educators (Parsons 1958).

In order to understand the role of the school board in the community, it was necessary to understand the power structure of communities. As a social-cultural system, the board was also a subsystem of the larger systems, the school district and the community (Witmer 1976). The school board as a subsystem of the total power structure of the community could only exercise authority over education to the extent that it could maintain its legitimacy within the community (Nunnery and Kimbrough 1971). If a school board wanted to retain its power in the community structure, it must have made decisions and functioned in ways consistent with and acceptable to the people it served.

The school district was composed of other subsystems including factional-interest groups, ethnic groups, various groups within the school, and other local governmental bodies. The number and size of the other subsystems differed from school district to school district. Hence, some school districts had fewer subsystems and would have been characterized as a more homogenous population. Other districts might have had a very diverse community and a heterogenous population. Thus, any set of school districts would have existed on a homogenous-heterogenous continuum (Witmer 1976).

The maintenance of community power by school boards, then, was complicated by the degree to which the community was homogenous. It was assumed that the more homogenous the community, the more representative and powerful the board would be (Witmer 1976).

The hypothesis of "control of community power by the upper socioeconomic classes"--Burke's elitism--has been researched in several studies of school boards. A study of Middletown (Lynd and

Lynd 1929) viewed the population as being either owners or laborers. The owners had the control of power and, as a result, they set the standards of lifestyle for Middletown, including the educational program. The researchers found that a type of social illiteracy was maintained in the schools in that self-criticism and self-appraisal were stifled under the name of local unity. Other studies by Warner (1949), Hollingshead (1949), and Kahl (1967) researched community power structures and evidenced the upper-class control of decisions relative to community institutions, including the school district.

Witmer (1976) compared the sociocultural composition of school boards to the sociocultural composition of communities. In testing this relationship, he used census data to determine the percentage of people with white-collar occupations in each school district. The chi-square test results ($X^2 = 22.5$) indicated there was a significant difference between the sociocultural composition of the board and the sociocultural composition of the community. Unfortunately, Witmer's sociocultural measure--white-collar occupations--did not cover the full range of sociocultural differences that existed in a community.

The notion of the school board as a subculture was significant as it impacted the larger sociocultural system. As the board made educational decisions, it affected the larger culture. Beals, Spindler, and Spindler (1967) described a cultural system applicable to school boards when they stated:

Any group, no matter how specialized, no matter how undistinguished its characteristic behaviors, no matter how dependent it is upon other cultural systems, is a true cultural system if it possesses the decision-making capacity.
(p. 3)

The decision-making capacity of the school board was acknowledged as its policymaking role.

The board as a subsystem of the larger system--the community--served as an interstitial body between the institution, the school, and the community at large. At the same time, the board made policy decisions which impacted the culture of the community at large. The board could retain its power as long as the policy it made did not conflict in any extreme measure with the general culture of the community.

School Board Members As Representatives

The ideology of local school governance had remained stable since the early history of the colonies; but there was little evidence that the early leaders of New England towns possessed gifted political insights or democratic sensitivities that motivated them to establish school committees or eventually school districts (Nystrand and Cunningham 1973). School boards and school districts were a response to a growing need thrust upon local town councils who established special committees to meet the educational demands for public education in growing communities.

Although school systems have functioned within the total power structure of the community since New England's first school committees, they have only been able to exercise authority over education to the extent that they could legitimize their decisions (Wirt 1970). Thus, a board must have made decisions and functioned in ways that were acceptable to the people it served.

"Reflections of the public will" was considered an activity appropriately associated with the delegate side of the trustee/delegate

dichotomy discussed earlier. Because school board members were elected by the people of the local school district, it was the assumption on the part of the public that school board members were the public's representatives and that school boards functioned to effect "community will" in educational matters (Goldhammer 1964).

The concept of representation as a reflection of the public will was evidenced by many others in education. Legal Counsel for the Pennsylvania School Boards Association, Fearen (1975) stated: "It is a basic tenant of the democratic process that the public are represented by their elected officials who have the duty to ascertain and reflect their will" (p. 8). Gross (1958), Stapley (1957), and Tuttle (1958) indicated that it was important for school boards to reflect the community will. These statements of reflection of community will appeared to be based on the assumption that there was a unified community with an undifferentiated will.

Unfortunately, there was little empirical evidence to establish that the ideology of carrying out the community will had been actualized. The concept remained an ideology, that is, something to be hoped for rather than an ideal that had been achieved.

Lutz (1977), in his "dissatisfaction theory" of local governance, suggested:

1. There was a culture of school boards that dictated that the school boards operated in elite fashion.
2. Given the diversity of the public will which many school boards served, or the likelihood that the public changed over a period of time, it was unlikely that any single decision would be satisfactory to everyone or that any single point of view about public education

would be satisfying over long periods of time.

3. Included in the culture of school boards was the superintendent. Neither the board nor the superintendent saw themselves, nor were they viewed by the public as independent in the processes of policymaking and implementation.

4. Like the public, the board and the superintendent viewed themselves as one impregnable decision-making body; a new school board member elected because of public dissatisfaction would normally have carried a mandate to get rid of the superintendent.

Thus, Lutz concurred with the concept proposed by Wirt (1970) that boards must function in ways that were acceptable to the people; but Lutz carried it further with his dissatisfaction theory. When the board was unresponsive to the community, public dissatisfaction was expressed at the ballot box. Board members would not be re-elected to office and newly elected board members would make the effort to get rid of the present superintendent.

Zeigler (1976) stated that no public institution met the ideal of democracy but, by specifying criteria of a democratic process, these institutions could be assessed. He suggested that the ideal board, according to the criteria of democracy, exhibited the following characteristics:

- (1) Competition for board positions is vigorous, campaigns between competing candidates are phrased in terms of basic differences in educational philosophy.
- (2) Successful candidates seek to implement their ideology by controlling the educational policies of the district.
- (3) Board members are "responsive" to their constituents, and attentive to group demands. They "do what the people want."
- (4) The superintendent is accountable to the people through the board. He does not make policy, but rather implements the policy of the board. He is a manager.

(5) Thus, a chain of indirect accountability is maintained: the superintendent to the board; the board to the community. (p. 6)

Zeigler (1976) contrasted this democratic ideal to the professional model which was directed at serving the clients (students) rather than the public at large. The criteria of the professional model were as follows:

(1) Since professional services may not be subject to non-professional judgment, competitions for board positions should not be decisive. Rather, candidates should seek such positions on the assumption that educational philosophy is best negotiated without public interest.

(2) Successful candidates should not seek to impose their will upon the district. The clients of the school, students, did not participate in the election.

(3) Therefore, board members need not be responsive to the larger community or its component groups. They should not necessarily do what "the people" want.

(4) Rather, the board should defer to the superintendent, who has the requisite training and expertise to make sound decisions. The role of the board is largely that of selecting a competent superintendent.

(5) Effective boards are those which provide sufficient autonomy for a superintendent to provide appropriate professional services to the clientele of the educational system. (p. 7)

In discussing lay participation and board response, Zeigler (1976) suggested that the notion of "doing what people want," a key to democratic effectiveness, was difficult for board members to achieve. In his nine-month study of eleven school boards, Zeigler found that community members rarely spoke in board meetings; and when they informally communicated with board members, they did so "as individuals with personal problems or suggestions, rather than proposers of board policy" (p. 7). He found no institutionalized mechanisms for determining what the community wanted.

Zeigler (1976) further indicated that the board members in his study were "disinclined to believe that they view their role as one of instructed delegate" (p. 8). Rather, board members saw themselves

as trustees. They felt they best served the community by "acting in accordance with their own judgment" (p. 8). He further discovered that the public disagreed with that point of view. He pointed out that board members' judgments are "most often out of harmony with the views of the public" (p. 8).

In explaining the reasons for school board failure to be responsive to the public, Zeigler (1976) stated: "Boards do not do what the people want because (1) they do not believe they should; (2) they do not know what the people want; and, (3) even if they did, they would probably not change their views" (p. 8). All of this suggested that the boards in Zeigler's study tended to approximate the professional model rather than the democratic ideal.

Blanchard (1974) concurred with Zeigler's findings by stating that the vast majority of school board members believed that they, as school board members, had no obligation to behave based on the wishes of the community. He found that 87 percent of the school board members in his Kentucky survey said they voted as they felt best, even when it went against the public's wishes.

However, Olsen (1980) concluded that although board members preferred to remain uncommitted, this was not necessarily an indication that they were unresponsive. There was not necessarily a connection between independence and non-responsiveness. In fact, board members chose to reject choices that indicated a desire to be non-responsive.

Bers (1980) conducted a survey of board members attending the National School Boards Convention in 1979. The results of the survey indicated that 75 percent of those interviewed saw themselves as trustees rather than delegates. That is, they felt they should vote

their own conscience rather than transmit the will of the people. Despite this view, the board members felt that they were doing a good job of representing.

Formally, the legal codes of the fifty states might set down the minimum requirements--being a qualified voter, a district resident--but clearly these only screened out from the enormous number those who did not qualify to vote. Practically, eligibility was screened by income level, age, occupation, educational level, and sex (Wirt and Kirst 1972).

Representation, in the sense of having representation of like characteristics, was studied in 1928 by Rice. In his study entitled The Representativeness of Elected Representatives, Rice attempted to correlate characteristics of state legislators with those of their constituents, hoping to show that these measures would prove "the extent to which they represent their constituency" (p. 189). De Grazia (1951) restated Rice's definition of representativeness in a modified form: "Voters often demand that their representative possess some large measure of identity of characteristics with the group qualities, so that representation may be regarded as a consensus of characteristics" (p. 5).

Pitkin (1967) assumed that people's characteristics were a guide to actions they would take, and the electorate was concerned with the characteristics of the representative for just that reason. The term "descriptive representation" highlighted the concept that a person stood for others by being sufficiently like them in characteristics viewed as important.

Studies of board member characteristics have been conducted since the early part of the twentieth century. Although the characteristics under scrutiny have varied, income level, age, occupation, educational level, and sex dominated the literature. The following studies focused on some of these traits.

A nationwide comparison of school board member incomes in 1977 indicated that school board members' incomes were distributed from 26.1 percent below \$20,000; to 32.8 percent between \$20,000 and \$29,999; to 18.7 percent between \$30,000 and \$39,999; and, 22.4 percent earned salaries greater than \$40,000 (Underwood, McCluskey, and Umberger 1978). Unfortunately, no comparisons were made with constituents' incomes at the time.

In a study of randomly selected school boards in Kentucky and Virginia, it was found that school boards were not representative of the people according to income and other variables (Powell 1975). In both states, board members' incomes over \$15,000 were significantly more frequent than in the general population.

Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer (1983) reported that board membership tended to be assumed by people with relatively high incomes. Forty-nine percent of 4,200 board members surveyed reported family incomes of more than \$40,000, and 18.4 percent of the total reported incomes of more than \$60,000.

Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer (1983) also reported that board members were better educated than the general public; 63.3 percent reported having completed four or more years of college. The 1983 report differed significantly from those reported by Counts (1927) in the first major study of school boards. Counts found that 50 percent

of the board members surveyed in 1927 had attended college. However, a comparison of Counts's data and data from Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer was not appropriate because Counts's research reported people who had attended college, not those who had necessarily completed a baccalaureate degree.

A study by Albert (1959) reported that 72 percent of the board members had attended college. Like Counts's study, the data measured those who "attended" not necessarily those who completed a baccalaureate degree. A survey of 24,041 board members (White 1962) indicated that 48.3 percent were college graduates. In a survey of board members of twenty-seven New York school districts, Perkins et al. (1967) found that 53 percent of the board members had a baccalaureate degree. Similarly, Powell (1975) found that board members in his survey of Kentucky and Virginia school districts had significantly more years of education than the citizens of those states.

With such high percentages of college attendance and college graduation among school board members, it was not surprising that researchers found that most board members were in professional and managerial occupations. Counts (1927) determined that 55 percent of the board members surveyed were in technical, professional, or managerial positions. Struble's (1922) study of 169 city school boards reported that 60 percent were of similar backgrounds of the technical, professional, and managerial occupations in Nearing's (1917) study and Counts's (1927) study.

Hines's (1951) research on Eugene, Oregon, school boards from 1891 to 1944 reported that the board never represented the working class or farm groups, but always represented the business or professional

community. Powell's (1975) study of Kentucky and Virginia school boards reported that school board members were not representative of the people; rather, they demonstrated an overrepresentation of white-collar workers and farmers.

In a study of selected school districts in Pennsylvania, Witmer (1976) found that the social composition of school boards differed significantly from the social composition of school districts. Using the chi-square test to compare the data about community and board members based on white-collar occupation classifications and non white-collar classifications, he found the difference significant ($X^2 = 3.84$). Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer (1983) reported that 66.6 percent of the 4,200 board members responding to a national survey were in professional or managerial occupations. Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer's 66.6 percent figure showed an increase of 5.6 percent over Nearing's (1917) findings-- a small increase for the sixty-seven intervening years of massive economic and social change.

Females have been underrepresented throughout the recorded history of school boards. From 15 percent female membership on school boards in Counts's 1927 study to 24 percent female membership in 1971 (National School Boards Association 1972) and 25.9 percent in 1978 by Underwood, McCluskey, and Umberger, females remained a minority. Findings in 1982 (Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer 1983) revealed that only 28.3 percent of board members in the nation were female--an increase of 13.3 percent in sixty-five years.

Age was also a variable in Counts's (1927) study. He reported that 48.3 was the median age of board members in 1927. Tiedt (1962) found the majority of board members were between 42.5 and 53.4 years

of age, while Perkins et al. (1967), in a study of New York boards, characterized board members as "in their mid to late forties" (p. 29).

Powell (1975) found ages ranging between 30 and 59 in his study of Kentucky and Virginia school boards. Underwood, Fortune, and Meyer (1983) indicated that board members, on the whole, were middle-aged. The largest category was ages 41 years old to 50 years old, accounting for 38.7 percent of the 4,200 board members surveyed.

The review of research of school board biographical traits over the past sixty-seven years suggested that there were no dramatic changes in school board traits including age, sex, occupation, and education. The only dramatic increase occurred in incomes, but that was due to inflation and a rapidly changing economy. The differences between the incomes of board members and community members evidenced a higher income for board members, on the average, when compared to the community. All of the research in which comparisons were made of school board members and the general public indicated a significant difference between the two populations.

Summary

The review of the literature discussed the theory of representation, the school board as a social system, and school board members as representatives. Twentieth-century research and theory were based on concepts similar to theory proposed by Burke, Hobbes, Jay, Hamilton, and Adams from the seventeenth century and eighteenth century. Theory generally maintained one of two extremes--elitism or democratic idealism. Various studies of school boards' representative behaviors were cited.

The theory of school boards as social subsystems was based on the work of Parsons (1951). Selected studies of school boards as social subsystems were reviewed. These studies indicated that the school board was an interstitial body between the managerial and technical systems level of the community (educators and students) and the community.

In summary, a review of research about school boards as representatives was completed. Extensive research on the biographical characteristics of school boards suggested that there were significant discrepancies between school board members and community members in terms of selected characteristics.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the representativeness of school boards in North Dakota as perceived by school board members, community members, and legislators. The present chapter includes a review of the research procedures and methodology used in testing the hypotheses.

Data obtained from selected school board members, community members, and state legislators were used for testing the hypotheses. The study was designed so that the perceptions of general representation, representation in policy development, and representation at the state legislative level could be compared among the three groups. Comparisons of the perceptions of the groups were also made to determine the effect of biographical factors on the perceptions of school board members, community members, and state legislators. The biographical factors used in the study were sex, age group, occupation, income level, and size of school district enrollment.

Factors to Be Studied

The two categories of factors studied were representation and biographical. These factors are described in greater detail. Data about these factors were gathered on a questionnaire (see Appendix).

Representation Factors

General representation. General representation was a single-item factor. General representation was considered to be the responsiveness of the school board members to the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of the community in general actions of the board. The general actions of the board were defined as allocative decisions or decisions related to the integration of the organization (Parsons 1956). These general actions included student disciplinary actions, hiring of personnel, budgeting, expenditures, and actions of the board which did not directly reflect the development and enforcement of stated policies of the district or activities related to lobbying and for communications at the state legislative level.

Representation in policy development. Representation in policy development was a single-item factor. Representation in policy development was considered to be the responsiveness of the school board to the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of the community in establishing board policy. Policy was defined as a "statement of intent to act in a particular manner when confronted with a given situation or to achieve a given result at some future point in time" (Knezevich 1975, p. 321).

Representation at the state legislative level. Representation at the state legislative level was a single-item factor. Representation at the state legislative level was considered to be the responsiveness of the school board members to the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of the community when the board or board members were participating in the state legislative process. Participation in the state legislative process included lobbying actions by individual board members, school board associations, coalitions, or by board communications with state

legislators with the intent of influencing legislative action on behalf of public schools.

Biographical Factors

Sex. Sex was a single-item factor. Participants were identified by gender.

Age. Age was a single-item factor. Ages of respondents at the time of the survey were categorized into three groups. The first group ranged from eighteen to thirty-nine years. The second group ranged from forty to fifty years, and the third group ranged from fifty-one to ninety years.

Occupation. Occupation was a single-item factor. The occupation of the respondent was reported and categorized into twelve occupational categories which included technical, official, manager, semiskilled worker, salesman, farm or ranch owner or manager, workman or laborer, farm worker, professional, skilled worker or foreman, housewife, or unemployed.

Income level. Income level was a single-item factor. The annual family income of the respondent was categorized into one of seven income levels. The levels included \$6,999 or less; \$7,000 to \$11,999; \$12,000 to \$15,999; \$16,000 to \$19,999; \$20,000 to \$24,999; \$25,000 to \$37,999; and \$38,000 or more.

Education level. Education level was a single-item factor. The total number of years of formal education completed by the respondents was categorized into one of seven categories. The categories were (1) eight years or less, (2) nine to twelve years, (3) twelve years, (4) thirteen to fifteen years, (5) sixteen years, (6) seventeen to eighteen years, or (7) nineteen or more years.

The Attitude Scale

Respondents' perceptions of the board members' responsiveness were identified in part two of the questionnaire. This part of the questionnaire focused on general representation, representation in policy actions or decisions, and representation at the state level.

Part two of the questionnaire was constructed by accumulating thirty-nine clearly favorable or clearly unfavorable statements about the three areas of representation. Thirteen statements were specifically developed for each of the three areas of representation: general, policy, and legislative. The statements were written using the following criteria developed by Edwards (1957):

1. Avoid statements that refer to the past rather than to the present.
2. Avoid statements that are factual or capable of being interpreted as factual.
3. Avoid statements that may be interpreted in more than one way.
4. Avoid statements that are irrelevant to the psychological object under consideration.
5. Avoid statements that are likely to be endorsed by almost everyone or by almost no one.
6. Select statements that are believed to cover the entire range of the affective scale of interest.
7. Keep the language of the statements simple, clear and direct.
8. Statements should be short, rarely exceeding 20 words.
9. Each statement should contain only one complete thought.
10. Statements containing universals such as all, always, none, and never often introduce ambiguity and should be avoided.
11. Words such as only, just, merely, and others of a similar nature should be used with care and moderation in writing statements.
12. Whenever possible, statements should be in the form of simple sentences rather than in the form of compound or complex sentences.
13. Avoid the use of words that may not be understood by those who are to be given the completed scale.
14. Avoid the use of double negatives. (pp. 13-14)

A Likert-type method was used to construct a scale for each of the statements developed. In How to Measure Attitudes, Henerson,

Morris, and Fitz-Gibbon (1978) described an agreement scale such as the Likert-type scale. The agreement scale achieved a wide range of scores by having respondents report the intensity of attitude to each statement on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Both negative and positive statements were included in the questionnaire to strengthen the results of the item analysis for reliability.

Nunnally (1959) further described the Likert-type scale as follows:

The Likert method . . . starts with the collection of a large number of positive and negative statements about an object, institution, or class of persons. . . . [T]he scale is derived by item-analysis techniques. The collection of items is administered to a group of subjects. Each item is rated on a five-point continuum ranging from "strongly approve" to "strongly disapprove." . . . [E]ach item is correlated with total score, which shows the extent to which the item measures the same general underlying attitude as the total set of items. Items which have low correlations with total score are either unreliable or measure some extraneous attitude factor. Only those items which have high correlations with total score are retained for the attitude scale. (p. 305)

The decision to use a Likert-type scale was based on the following statement by Nunnally:

The Likert scaling procedure helps ensure that the final scale concerns only one general attitude and that individuals can be located with at least moderate precision at different points on the scale. . . .

The Likert method more directly determines whether or not only one attitude is involved in the original collection of items, and the scale which is derived measures the most general attitudinal factor which is present. The use of a five-point scale for each item provides more information than the simple dichotomy of "agree" or "disagree." (pp. 305-306)

The thirty-nine items on representation for the three parts of the questionnaire were presented to a panel of three judges comprised of three professors in educational administration at the University of North Dakota. The three panel members independently rated the

positive and negative direction of each statement. The panel of judges was also requested to offer suggestions which assisted in the revision of the instrument. The same panel of judges examined content validity. The process of determining content validity provided assurance that the statements were representative of the concepts to be measured in the questionnaire. Definitions of general representation, representation in policy, and representation at the state legislative level were provided for the panel. They were asked to associate one of the definitions with each statement. Responses of the panel members were compared for agreement. Only those statements on which all three panel members agreed were retained for the final questionnaire. Of the original thirty-nine statements, five were deleted for lack of agreement among the panel members.

Two items were deleted from the general representation scale, and three items were deleted from the representation in policy development scale. No items were deleted from the state-level representation scale. Thus, the general representation scale was comprised of eleven items; the representation in policy scale was comprised of ten items; and the representation at the state legislative level scale was comprised of thirteen items.

A pilot group of twenty graduate students in the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota was asked to respond to the thirty-four statements remaining in the pool. Students were provided with only the instructions and definitions in the questionnaire. No additional information was given in order to avoid biasing the student results.

The results of the pilot group were analyzed for reliability within the three categories: general representation, representation in policy actions or decisions, and representation at the state legislative level. Each participant's results were scored by assigning one to five points for "strongly agree," four points for "agree," three points for "undecided," two points for "disagree," and one point for "strongly disagree." The negative statements were scored by assigning five points for "strongly disagree," four points for "disagree," three points for "undecided," two points for "agree," and one point for "strongly agree." A score was computed by totaling points for each individual's response within each of the three categories.

All pilot results were recorded on National Computer Systems answer sheets and submitted to the University of North Dakota Computer Center for keypunch transmittal. The data were tested for reliability using the Statistical Package For The Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent 1975) on an IBM 370/158 computer at the University of North Dakota Computer Center. The item analysis was performed using coefficient alpha, a standard correlation technique designed to test for internal consistency to determine whether some items were contributing little or even affecting the scale in an inverse manner.

The purpose of the item analysis was stated by Henerson, Morris, and Fitz-Gibbon (1978):

In measurement texts, statistical techniques of item analysis are described for making comparisons between how respondents performed on individual items and how they scored on the instrument as a whole. The purpose for doing an item analysis is to select from a pool of items the ones that most effectively obtain the information you want, and to eliminate the less effective items from your instrument. (p. 87)

The results of the reliability analysis for the eleven items on the general representation scale indicated three items which did not discriminate well. The three items were deleted and a test on the remaining eight items produced $\alpha = .651$. The final general representation scale had eight items.

The reliability analysis of the ten items on the policy representation scale indicated that three items did not discriminate well. The three items were deleted and a test on the remaining seven items produced $\alpha = .840$. The final scale for policy representation had seven items.

The reliability analysis of the thirteen items on the representation at the state level scale indicated that four items did not discriminate well. The four items were deleted and a test on the remaining nine items produced $\alpha = .892$. The final scale for representation at the state level had nine items.

The final questionnaire (see Appendix) used in the study included three scales. There were eight statements on general representation, seven statements on policy representation, and nine statements on representation at the state legislative level. The statements were placed in part two of the survey in a random order. A total of twenty-four statements was used in the final instrument.

Research Sample

The research population included three different groups: community members, school board members, and state legislators. The samples were drawn from a sampling of school districts in the state of North Dakota.

School boards were selected by a stratified sampling of school districts in North Dakota based on enrollment. All high school districts (227) in the state were stratified by size from enrollment data reported in the North Dakota Educational Directory 1982-1983 (Department of Public Instruction 1982). Three levels of school district size were used for the strata: high school districts with enrollments of 100 and less, high school districts with enrollments from 101 to 500, and high school districts with enrollments of 501 and greater. Five school districts were selected from each of the three strata by a random number process.

The fifteen school districts in the sample had an enrollment of 20,115 with a range of 82 students to 8,437 students. The total number of students in the strata 100 and less enrollment was 453 with a mean enrollment of 90.6 and a range of 82 to 100. The total enrollment of students in the strata 101 to 500 enrollment was 1,196 with a mean enrollment of 239.2 and a range of 185 to 369. The total enrollment of the five districts with enrollments of 501 and greater was 18,466 with a mean enrollment of 3,693.2 and a range of 645 to 8,437.

The study was limited to high school districts because of the small number of graded elementary districts (47) and the number of rural one-room districts (14). The 15 districts were to be representative of the 227 high school districts in the state. This provided a 6.67 percent sample of high school districts in North Dakota.

Within each school district, ten community members were randomly selected. The community members were selected from the telephone directory for the community using a random number strategy.

A total community sample of 150 was drawn using the random selection process--ten from each of the fifteen sample high school districts.

All school board members from each of the fifteen sample school districts were included in the sample. School board size in North Dakota school districts varied from five to nine members. The total number of board members identified for the study was eighty-five.

The North Dakota House of Representatives and Senate members from each school district were included in the study. To identify legislators who resided in each school district identified in the school district sample, a map of legislative districts in North Dakota was overlaid on a map of school districts. Legislative districts were identified and senators' and representatives' names for the identified legislative districts were obtained from the Bureau of Governmental Affairs at the University of North Dakota. The total number of representatives was 52 and the total number of senators was 26. The total potential legislative sample was 78.

Data Collection

It was the writer's goal to include community members, legislators, and school board members from the fifteen school districts identified for the study. All data were collected in the summer of 1983 through an introductory telephone call and mailing of the survey instrument.

The 150 community members identified from community telephone directories by a random number process were contacted by telephone. The name of the researcher was given and the purpose of the survey was explained. Of the original 150 names selected, 14 could not be reached by telephone because of a disconnection or no answer after three

attempts on three separate occasions. An additional 14 names were randomly selected from the appropriate community telephone directories. The 14 telephone contacts produced an additional 9 participants in the study. The final 5 community members were randomly selected from telephone directories and agreed to participate.

From the original 150 community members, 19 did not agree to participate in the study because they were too old (1), no longer had children in school (11), or had no interest in participating (7). Additional names were then randomly selected from appropriate community telephone directories and contacted. Fifteen of the 19 selected agreed to respond to the survey. An additional 4 names were randomly selected from the appropriate community telephone directories and agreed to respond to the survey.

Seventy-seven of the community participants responded within twenty days of the mailing of the survey. Forty-two of those who had not responded were contacted by telephone during the third week of the survey, and an additional twenty-nine responded prior to 1 August 1983. No additional responses were received after that date. The total number of community respondents was 106, a return of 71 percent.

Seventy-eight of the eighty-five school board members identified for the study were contacted by telephone and agreed to respond to the survey. School board members were given the name of the researcher and the purpose of the survey. Ten of the eighty-five school board members had no telephone listing or did not respond to the telephone calls on three separate occasions. However, surveys were mailed to all eighty-five with the hope that those not contacted by

telephone would be willing to participate.

Fifty school board members responded within twenty days following the mailing of the survey. Twenty-three of the board members who had not responded by that time were contacted by telephone and asked to respond within ten days following the call. An additional eight responses were received. No responses were received after 1 August 1983. The fifty-eight returns from school board members equaled a 68 percent response.

Fifty-five of the 78 legislators were contacted by telephone. Twenty-three were not available by telephone, either because they were out of town or there was no answer on the three separate occasions that they were telephoned. Surveys were mailed to all legislators, however, in the hope that they would participate in the study.

Forty-one of the 78 legislators responded to the initial mailing of the survey within twenty days of the mailing. Seventeen of the remaining 37 were contacted twenty days following the mailing of the survey and asked to respond within an additional ten days. Eleven responses were received following the telephone calls, providing a total legislator sample of 52--a 65 percent response rate from legislators. No surveys were received after 1 August 1983.

The data obtained from the questionnaire were tabulated and recorded on IBM coding sheets and keypunched for the purpose of utilizing a computer in the mechanical tasks of statistical testing. The Statistical Package For The Social Sciences (Nie et al. 1975) was used in the development of the computer program. The IBM 370/158 computer at the University of North Dakota Computer Center was used to process the data.

Statistical Procedures

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test statistically the hypotheses proposed in the study. The analysis of variance procedure was designed so that a hypothesis of no difference among means of various groups could be tested. According to Ferguson (1976) and Downie and Heath (1970), analysis of variance, in its simplest form, was used to test the significance of the difference between the means of a number of different populations.

Analysis of variance must have a dependent variable that is measured on at least an interval scale and independent variables that can be all nonmetric or combinations of nonmetric and metric variables (Nie et al. 1975). The general representation variable, the policy representation variable, and the state legislative variable were dependent variables. Group was a categorical independent variable. Three categories were represented by the group--school board members, community members, and legislators. Other independent variables in the study were age, sex, education level, occupation, income level, and size of school district enrollment.

The classical approach was used because the number of cases falling in the group was unequal. The classical approach partitioned the effects of the independent variables into separate main effects. That is, the variation of the dependent variables accounted for by each independent variable was credited to the appropriate independent variable. This was particularly important where two independent variables may have had a significant effect on the dependent variable, but only one variable is truly effecting the variance of the dependent variable (Nie et al. 1975).

Assumptions underlying the analysis of variance were:

1. The observations are random and independent samples from the populations.
2. Measurement of the dependent variable is at least on an interval scale.
3. The populations from which the samples are selected are normally distributed.
4. The variance of populations are equal. (Hinkle 1979, pp. 260-61)

The consequences of violating the assumptions of the analysis of variance according to Hinkle (1979) were:

Generally, failure to meet these assumptions makes the probability statement imprecise. That is, instead of operating at the designated level of significance, the actual Type I error rate may be greater or less than, say .05, depending on how the assumptions were violated. (p. 262)

Glass (cited in Hinkle 1979) clarified the problems of violation of the assumptions in the article "Consequences of Failure to Meet the Assumptions Underlying the Use of Analysis of Variance and Covariance." Briefly, some of Glass's findings were:

1. When the populations sampled are not normal, the effect of the Type I error rate is minimal.
2. When measurement of the dependent variable is dichotomous or on an ordinal scale, the effect on the probability statement is not serious.
3. If the sample variances are different enough for us to conclude that the population variances are probably unequal, there may be a serious problem. With unequal sample sizes, if the larger variance is associated with the larger sample, the F-test will be too liberal (if the alpha level is .05). If the sample sizes are unequal, the effect of heterogeneity of variance on the Type I error is minimal. (p. 262)

The effects of violating the assumptions varied somewhat with the specific assumption violated. If the statistical procedure was little affected by having an assumption violated, the procedure was said to be robust.

Interactions for two-way analysis of variance data should be interpreted with caution when the degrees of freedom in the two-way interaction are not the product of the degrees of freedom between the independent variables. When these are not equal it signals that there were empty cells in the grouped data which may adversely affect the reliability of the results of the two-way interaction. However, it should be noted that none of the two-way interactions were significant ($<.05$) in any case.

An alpha level of .05 or less was used as the level of significance for failing to reject the null hypothesis. In other words, the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when it was in fact true was .05 or less. The results of the analysis are reported in chapter 4.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter is presented in four parts: a description of the groups which were studied, analysis of the data on general representation, analysis of the data on representation in policy development and policy decisions, and analysis of the data on representation at the state legislative level. The analysis of the results of this study are presented according to the testable hypotheses stated in the null form. Tables summarizing the data relevant to specific hypotheses are included in the discussion.

Descriptions of the Groups

The study surveyed 217 (69%) individuals--107 community members (49.3% of the total sample), 58 school board members (26.8% of the total sample), and 52 legislators (23.9% of the total sample). Composition of the sample is illustrated in table 1.

The community sample of 107 included 36 respondents from small high school districts, 37 from moderate-sized high school districts, and 34 from large high school districts. The 58 respondents in the school board sample included 19 from small high school districts, 21 from moderate-sized high school districts, and 18 from large high school districts. Of the 52 legislators responding, 9 were from small high

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS BY GROUP, DISTRICT SIZE,
 SELECTED SAMPLE SIZE, SURVEY SAMPLE RESPONSE (N),
 PERCENT OF SURVEY SAMPLE RESPONSE, AND
 PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSE

Groups District Size	Selected Sample Size	Survey Sample Response (N)	Percent of Survey Sample Response	Percent of Total Response
Community Members Small-sized Districts	50	36	72	16.6
Community Members Medium-sized Districts	50	37	74	17.0
Community Members Large-sized Districts	50	34	68	15.7
School Board Members Small-sized Districts	25	19	76	8.8
School Board Members Medium-sized Districts	29	21	72	9.7
School Board Members Large-sized Districts	31	18	58	8.3
Legislators Small-sized Districts	15	9	60	4.1
Legislators Medium-sized Districts	18	12	67	5.5
Legislators Large-sized Districts	45	31	69	14.3
Totals	313	217		100.0

Overall percent of responses = 69%

school districts, 12 were from moderate-sized high school districts, and 31 were from large high school districts.

A total of 64 respondents were from high school districts with enrollments of 100 or less. Of these, 19 were school board members, 36 were community members, and 9 were legislators. Of the respondents, 70 were from high school districts with enrollments from 101 to 500. Of these, 21 were school board members, 37 were community members, and 12 were legislators. Individuals totaling 83 responded from large school districts. Of these, 18 were school board members, 34 were community members, and 31 were legislators.

The data about the gender of participants in the study are presented in table 2.

TABLE 2
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF THOSE PARTICIPATING
IN THE STUDY BY SEX

Sex	Number	Percent
Males	128	59.8
Females	86	40.2
Totals	214	100.0

There was a predominance of males participating in the survey. They comprised nearly 60 percent of the sample. Three of the participants did not report their gender.

The data about the age of respondents participating in the study are reported in table 3.

TABLE 3
 NUMBER, PERCENT, AND MEAN AGE OF THOSE PARTICIPATING
 IN THE STUDY BY AGE

Age Ranges	Number	Percent
18-39	74	34.6
40-50	55	25.7
51-90	85	39.7
Totals	214	100.0

$$\bar{X} = 45.5$$

The mean age of participants was 45.5. The range of ages was from 18 to 90. The ages of participants were distributed over a wide and rather flat continuum. Three participants did not report their age.

The data about education levels are presented in table 4. Thus, 91.2 percent of the respondents had a high school education or more. Having a four-year college education were 36.4 percent, and an additional 15.2 percent had more than four years of post-secondary schooling.

The data about the occupations of respondents participating in the study are presented in table 5. The occupation most frequently identified by respondents was the farm or ranch owner or manager (34.1%). No farm workers were reported in the sample.

The data about the income levels of respondents participating in the study are presented in table 6. Sixty-five respondents did not report their income level.

TABLE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF THOSE PARTICIPATING IN THE
STUDY BY EDUCATION LEVELS

Education Levels	Number	Percent
Eight years or less	13	6.0
Nine years to eleven years	6	2.8
Twelve years	65	30.0
Thirteen years to fifteen years	54	24.9
Sixteen years	46	21.2
Seventeen to eighteen years	22	10.1
Nineteen or more years	11	5.1
Totals	217	100.0

TABLE 5
 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF THOSE PARTICIPATING
 IN THE STUDY BY OCCUPATIONS

Occupations	Number	Percent
Technical	1	0.5
Official	3	1.4
Manager, Proprietor, or Owner	20	9.2
Semiskilled Worker	16	7.4
Salesman	4	1.8
Farm or Ranch Owner or Manager	74	34.1
Workman or Laborer	1	0.5
Farm Worker	0	0.0
Professional	32	14.7
Skilled Worker or Foreman	2	0.9
Housewife	39	18.0
Retired/Unemployed	19	8.8
Not Reporting	6	2.8
Totals	217	100.0

TABLE 6
 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF THOSE PARTICIPATING
 IN THE STUDY BY INCOME LEVELS

Income Levels	Number	Percent
\$6,999 or less	5	2.3
\$7,000 to \$11,999	6	2.8
\$12,000 to \$15,999	22	10.1
\$16,000 to \$19,999	9	4.1
\$20,000 to \$24,999	21	9.7
\$25,000 to \$37,999	46	21.2
\$38,000 or more	43	19.8
Not reporting	62	30.0
Totals	217	100.0

The 217 responses included information from the respondents on general representation, policy representation, representation at the state legislative level, age, sex, occupation, education level, and income level. All of these data were used in the analyses of the perceptions of the three groups--school board members, community members, and legislators.

Analysis of the Data

The hypotheses were tested using analysis of variance. The three dependent variables--general representation, policy representation, and representation at the state legislative level--were tested with the independent variables--groups, size of school district enrollment, age, sex, education level, occupation, and income level. The results of the

analysis are reported for each of the dependent variables on the following pages.

General Representation

Null hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 7, table 8, and table 9. An examination of the data presented in table 7 indicated that there was a significant difference among school board members' and the other groups' perceptions at the .05 level when comparing those groups' perceptions in general representation. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 7

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Groups	2	12.2399	6.1200	17.829	<.001
Residual	214	73.4558	0.3433		
Totals	216	85.6957			

TABLE 8

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY
MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	58	2.0043
Community Members	107	2.5701
Legislators	52	2.4423
Total	217	2.3882

TABLE 9

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISON OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Groups	School Board	Community	Legislators
School Board		*	*
Community	*		
Legislator	*		

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

An a posteriori comparison--the Scheffé test--of all possible pairs of group means indicated that there was a significant difference among the perceptions of school board members and the other two groups in the study. The differences were significant at the .05 level.

Null hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared by size of school district enrollment.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 10, table 11, and table 12. An examination of the data presented in table 10 revealed that there was a significant statistical difference on the basis of school district at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 10

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION
AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS
WHEN COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Groups	8	16.1931	2.0241	5.671	<.001
Residual	207	73.8903	0.3570		
Totals	215	90.0835			

TABLE 11

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Groups	N	N	\bar{X}
Small School Board		19	2.1842
Medium School Board		21	2.0238
Large School Board		18	1.7917
Small Community		36	2.7257
Medium Community		37	2.4865
Large Community		33	2.4583
Small Community Legislators		9	2.2778
Medium Community Legislators		12	2.7396
Large Community Legislators		31	2.3750

TABLE 12

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISON OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Small School Board (1)									
Medium School Board (2)									
Large School Board (3)									
Small Community (4)		*	*						
Medium Community (5)			*						
Large Community (6)									
Small Community Legislators (7)			*						
Medium Community Legislators (8)									
Large Community Legislators (9)									

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

The Scheffé test revealed that school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments differed significantly from community members from school districts with small-sized enrollments, community members from school districts with medium-sized enrollments, and legislators from school districts with small-sized enrollments. There were also significant differences among the perceptions of school board members from school districts with medium-sized enrollments and community members from school districts with small-sized enrollments.

According to the Scheffé test, board members from the three sizes of school districts did not differ one from another. Similarly, community members and legislators did not differ within their respective groups. Differences appeared only among groups.

Null hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across sex of respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 13 and table 14.

TABLE 13

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	3	13.185	4.395	13.004	<.001
Group	2	9.722	4.861	14.384	<.001
Sex	1	0.381	0.381	1.129	0.290
Two-way Interaction	2	1.777	0.889	2.629	0.075
Residual	208	70.294	0.338		
Totals	213	85.256	0.400		

TABLE 14

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	Male	Female
School Board Members	2.00 (N = 48)	1.92 (N = 9)
Community Members	2.41 (N = 39)	2.67 (N = 66)
Legislators	2.49 (N = 41)	2.27 (N = 11)

An examination of the data presented in table 13 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects ($F = 13.004$; $df 3, 213$; $p < .001$). The F test of the variable groups had an $F = 14.384$ ($df 2, 213$) and was significant at the .001 level. However, the variable sex had an $F = 1.129$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Null hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across the age of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 15 and table 16. An examination of the data presented in table 15 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and age ($F = 8.628$; $df 4, 211$; $p < .001$). The F value

TABLE 15

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	4	11.779	2.945	8.628	<.001
Group	2	11.667	5.834	17.093	<.001
Age	2	0.167	0.081	0.237	0.790
Two-way Interaction	4	0.877	0.219	0.643	0.633
Residual	203	69.279	0.341		
Totals	211	81.935	0.388		

TABLE 16

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	2.00
Community Members	106	2.56
Legislators	49	2.41

of the variable groups had an $F = 17.093$; df 2, 211; $p < .001$. However, the variable age had an $F = 0.237$, with df 2, 211, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Null hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across income levels of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 17 and table 18.

TABLE 17

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS INCOME LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	9	10.438	1.160	3.397	0.001
Groups	2	7.381	3.691	10.808	<.001
Income Level	7	2.939	0.420	1.229	0.291
Two-way Interaction	9	3.226	0.358	1.050	0.404
Residual	134	45.757	0.341		
Totals	152	59.422	0.391		

TABLE 18

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS INCOME LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	39	2.03
Community Members	77	2.55
Legislators	37	2.52

An examination of the data presented in table 17 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and income ($F = 3.397$; $df 9, 152$; $p = .001$). The F value of the variable groups had an $F = 10.808$; $df 2, 152$, $p < .001$. However, the variable income had an $F = 1.229$; $df 7, 152$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Null hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across occupations of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 19 and table 20. An examination of the data presented in table 19 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent

TABLE 19

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	12	14.517	1.210	3.555	<.001
Groups	2	9.769	4.885	14.355	<.001
Occupation	10	2.837	0.284	0.834	0.597
Two-way Interaction	11	3.020	0.275	0.807	0.633
Residual	187	63.630	0.340		
Totals	210	81.167	0.387		

TABLE 20

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	2.00
Community Members	105	2.56
Legislators	49	2.42

variables groups and occupation ($F = 3.555$; $df\ 12,210$; $p < .001$). The F value of the variable groups had an $F = 14.355$; $df\ 2, 210$; $p < .001$. However, the variable occupation had an $F = 0.834$; $df\ 10, 210$; $p = .001$, which was not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Null hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in general representation as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across the education levels of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 21 and table 22.

TABLE 21

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS EDUCATION LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	8	14.759	1.845	5.430	<.001
Groups	2	11.857	5.928	17.449	<.001
Education	6	2.519	0.420	1.236	0.289
Two-way Interaction	11	4.003	0.364	1.071	0.387
Residual	197	66.933	0.340		
Totals	216	85.695	0.397		

TABLE 22

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS EDUCATION LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	58	2.11
Community Members	107	2.54
Legislators	52	2.40

An examination of the data presented in table 21 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and education ($F = 5430$; $df 8, 216$; $p < .001$). The F value of the variables groups had an $F = 11.857$; $df 2, 216$; $p < .001$. However, the F value of the variable education was $F = 1.236$, with $df 6, 216$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Policy Representation

Null hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 22, table 23, and table 24. An examination of the data presented in table 22 indicated that there was a significant difference among school board members', community members', and

TABLE 23

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Groups	2	7.1207	3.5603	10.671	<.001
Residual	214	71.3998	0.3336		
Totals	216	78.5204			

TABLE 24

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	58	2.1059
Community Members	107	2.5407
Legislators	52	2.4038
Total	217	2.3917

TABLE 25

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISON OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Groups	School Board	Community	Legislators
School Board			
Community	*		
Legislator	*		

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

legislators' perceptions in representation in the development of district policy. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An a posteriori comparison of all possible pairs of group means indicated that there was a significant difference among perceptions of school board members and the other two groups in the study. The Scheffé test showed significant differences among the groups at the .05 level.

Null hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared by school district size.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 26, table 27, and table 28. An examination of the data presented in table 26 indicated that there was a significant

TABLE 26

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Source of Variation	df	MS	SS	F	p
Groups	8	12.9103	1.6138	4.825	<.001
Residual	207	69.2395	0.3345		
Totals	215	82.1498			

TABLE 27

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND
LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED BY SIZE OF
SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Groups	N	\bar{X}
Small School Board	19	1.8330
Medium School Board	21	2.1292
Large School Board	18	2.2903
Small Community	36	2.3175
Medium Community	37	2.3383
Large Community	33	2.3680
Small Community Legislators	9	2.5598
Medium Community Legislators	12	2.6667
Large Community Legislators	31	2.7619

TABLE 28

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISON OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Small School Board (1)									
Medium School Board (2)									
Large School Board (3)									
Small Community (4)			*						
Medium Community (5)			*						
Large Community (6)									
Small Community Legislators (7)			*						
Medium Community Legislators (8)									
Large Community Legislators (9)									

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

statistical difference on the basis of school district size at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An a posteriori contrast test--the Scheffé--indicated that the group which differed significantly from other groups in the analysis was school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments. These school board members differed significantly from community members in school districts with medium-sized and small-sized enrollments. School board members from school districts with

large-sized enrollments also differed significantly from legislators from school districts with small-sized enrollments.

Null hypothesis 10. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across sex of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 29 and table 30. An examination of the data presented in table 29 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects ($F = 8.994$; $df\ 3, 213$; $p < .001$). The F value of the groups variable had an $F = 7.631$; $df\ 2, 213$; $p = .001$.

TABLE 29

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	3	8.791	2.930	8.994	<.001
Groups	2	4.972	2.486	7.631	.001
Sex	1	0.946	0.946	2.905	0.090
Two-way Interaction	2	1.133	0.567	1.739	0.178
Residual	208	67.771	0.326		
Totals	213	77.696	0.365		

TABLE 30

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS,
AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS
SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	2.09
Community Members	107	2.55
Legislators	52	2.40

However, the variable sex had an $F = 2.905$ which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Null hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across age of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 31 and table 32. An examination of the data presented in table 31 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and age ($F = 5.238$; df 4, 211; $p < .001$). The F value of the groups variable had an $F = 10.448$; df 2, 211; $p < .001$. However, the variable age had an $F = 0.350$; df 2, 211, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 31

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	4	6.871	1.718	5.238	<.001
Groups	2	6.853	3.427	10.448	<.001
Age	2	0.229	0.115	0.350	0.705
Two-way Interaction	4	1.313	0.328	1.001	0.408
Residual	203	66.573	0.328		
Totals	211	74.758	0.354		

TABLE 32

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	2.11
Community Members	106	2.53
Legislators	49	2.37

Null hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across income levels of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 33 and table 34. An examination of the data presented in table 33 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and income ($F = 2.742$; $df\ 9, 152$; $p = 0.006$). The F value of the variable groups had an $F = 7.693$; $df\ 2, 152$, $p = 0.001$. However, the variable income had an $F = 0.976$; $df\ 7, 152$; $p = 0.452$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 33

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED ACROSS INCOME LEVEL
OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	9	7.441	0.827	2.742	0.006
Groups	2	4.640	2.320	7.693	0.001
Income	7	2.060	0.294	0.976	0.452
Two-way Interaction	9	4.734	0.526	1.744	0.085
Residual	134	40.409	0.302		
Totals	152	52.585	0.346		

TABLE 34

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS INCOME LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	39	2.12
Community Members	77	2.58
Legislators	37	2.46

Null hypothesis 13. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across occupations of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 35 and table 36. An examination of the data presented in table 35 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and occupation ($F = 2.618$; $df\ 12, 210$; $p = 0.003$). The F value of the groups variable had an $F = 10.372$; $df\ 2, 210$; $p < .001$. However, the variable occupation had an $F = 1.081$; $df\ 10, 210$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 35

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	12	10.465	0.872	2.618	.003
Groups	2	6.910	3.455	10.372	<.001
Occupations	10	3.600	0.360	1.081	0.379
Two-way Interaction	11	2.347	0.213	0.641	0.792
Residual	187	62.289	0.333		
Totals	210	75.102	0.358		

TABLE 36

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	2.11
Community Members	105	2.54
Legislators	49	2.40

Null hypothesis 14. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community in the development of local school district policy as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across the education levels of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 37 and table 38. An examination of the data in table 37 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and education level ($F = 4.882$; df 8, 216; $p < .001$). The F value of the variable groups had an $F = 10.487$; df 2, 216; $p < .001$, and the F value of the variable education level had an $F = 2.217$; df 6, 216; $p = .015$. Both variables in the results were significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 37

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED ACROSS EDUCATION LEVELS
OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	8	12.221	1.528	4.882	<.001
Groups	2	6.564	3.282	10.487	<.001
Education Level	6	5.101	0.850	2.717	0.015
Two-way Interaction	11	4.651	0.423	1.351	0.199
Residual	197	61.648	0.313		
Totals	216	78.520	0.364		

TABLE 38

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF POLICY REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS EDUCATION LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	58	2.11
Community Members	107	2.54
Legislators	52	2.40

Representation at the State
Legislative Level

Null hypothesis 15. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 39, table 40, and table 41.

TABLE 39

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Groups	2	9.0389	4.5194	14.696	<.001
Residual	214	65.8096	0.3075		
Totals	216	74.8485			

TABLE 40

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	58	1.9598
Community Members	107	2.3987
Legislators	52	2.4573
Total	217	2.2954

TABLE 41

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISON OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF REPRESENTATION AT THE STATE LEGISLATIVE LEVEL AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS

Groups	School Board	Community	Legislators
School Board			
Community	*		
Legislator	*		

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

An examination of the data presented in table 39 indicated that there was a significant difference among school board members', community members', and legislators' perceptions at the .05 level when comparing those groups' perceptions in representation at the state legislative level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An a posteriori comparison of all possible pairs of group means indicated that there was a significant difference among the perceptions of school board members and the other two groups in the study. The Scheffé test showed significant differences at the .05 level among the groups.

Null hypothesis 16. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared by size of school district enrollment.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 42, table 43, and table 44.

TABLE 42

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Groups	8	13.277	1.659	5.274	<.001
Residual	207	65.134	0.315		
Totals	215	78.411			

TABLE 43

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS
WHEN COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Groups	N	\bar{X}
Small School Boards	19	1.586
Medium School Boards	21	2.122
Large School Boards	18	2.134
Small Community	36	2.293
Medium Community	37	2.397
Large Community	34	2.401
Small Community Legislators	9	2.469
Medium Community Legislators	12	2.500
Large Community Legislators	31	2.592

TABLE 44

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISON OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Small School Board (1)									
Medium School Board (2)									
Large School Board (3)									
Small Community (4)			*						
Medium Community (5)			*						
Large Community (6)			*						
Small Community Legislators (7)			*						
Medium Community Legislators (8)			*						
Large Community Legislators (9)			*						

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

An examination of the data presented in table 42 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference on the basis of size of school district enrollment at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An a posteriori contrast test--the Scheffé--indicated that school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments differed significantly from community members from school districts with large-sized, medium-sized, and small-sized school district enrollments and

from legislators from school districts with large-sized, medium-sized, and small-sized enrollments.

Null hypothesis 17. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across sex of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 45 and table 46. An examination of the data presented in table 45 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects ($F = 10.371$; $df\ 3, 213$; $p < .001$). The F value of the groups variable had an $F = 13.426$; $df\ 2, 213$; $p < .001$. However, the variable sex had an $F = 0.522$; $df\ 1, 213$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 45

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	3	9.479	3.160	10.371	<.001
Groups	2	8.181	4.090	13.426	<.001
Sex	1	0.159	0.159	0.522	0.471
Two-way Interaction	2	1.503	0.751	2.466	0.087
Residual	208	63.367	0.305		
Totals	213	74.349			

TABLE 46

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	1.95
Community Members	105	2.40
Legislators	52	2.46

Null hypothesis 18. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across age of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 47 and table 48. An examination of the data presented in table 47 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and age ($F = 7.419$; $df 4, 211$; $p < .001$). The F value of the groups variable had an $F = 14.609$; $df 2, 211$; $p < .001$. However, the variable age had an $F = 0.381$; $df 2, 211$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 47

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	p
Main Effects	4	8.931	2.233	7.419	<.001
Groups	2	8.794	4.397	14.609	<.001
Age	2	0.229	0.115	0.381	0.684
Two-way Interaction	4	2.190	0.547	1.819	0.127
Residual	203	61.096	0.301		
Totals	211	72.216	0.342		

TABLE 48

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	1.95
Community Members	106	2.40
Legislators	49	2.43

Null hypothesis 19. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across income level of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 49 and table 50. An examination of the data presented in table 49 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and income ($F = 5.019$; df 9, 152; $p < .001$). The F value of the groups variable had an $F = 15.404$; df 2, 152; $p < .001$. However, the variable income level had an $F = 1.758$; df 7, 152, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 49

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE
REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN
COMPARED ACROSS INCOME LEVELS
OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	MS	SS	F	p
Main Effects	9	11.775	1.308	5.019	<.001
Groups	2	8.031	4.015	15.404	<.001
Income Level	7	3.208	0.458	1.758	0.101
Two-way Interaction	9	3.569	0.397	1.521	0.146
Residual	134	34.930	0.261		
Totals	152	50.274	0.331		

TABLE 50

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS INCOME LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	39	1.89
Community Members	77	2.42
Legislators	37	2.44

Null hypothesis 20. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and legislators when compared across occupations of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 51 and table 52. An examination of the data presented in table 52 indicated that there was a significant statistical difference for the main effects on the basis of the two independent variables groups and occupation ($F = 3.460$; $df\ 12, 210$; $p < .001$). The F value of the variable groups had an $F = 14.810$; $df\ 2, 210$; $p < .001$. However, the variable occupation had an $F = 1.452$; $df\ 10, 210$, which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE 51

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	MS	SS	F	p
Main Effects	12	12.430	1.036	3.460	<.001
Groups	2	8.871	4.435	14.810	<.001
Occupation	10	4.348	0.435	1.452	0.161
Two-way Interaction	11	2.384	0.217	0.724	0.715
Residual	187	56.002	0.299		
Totals	210	70.822	0.377		

TABLE 52

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	57	1.96
Community Members	105	2.39
Legislators	49	2.42

Null hypothesis 21. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the local school boards in North Dakota as representative of the expressed desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators when compared across education levels of the respondents.

The results of the statistical treatment of the hypothesis are presented in table 53 and table 54.

TABLE 53

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS WHEN COMPARED ACROSS EDUCATION LEVELS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Source of Variation	df	MS	SS	F	p
Main Effects	8	12.867	1.608	5.196	<.001
Groups	2	9.503	4.752	15.352	<.001
Education Level	6	3.828	0.638	2.062	0.059
Two-way Interaction	11	1.008	0.092	0.296	0.986
Residual	197	60.973	0.310		
Totals	216	74.848	0.347		

TABLE 54

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF STATE REPRESENTATION AMONG SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND LEGISLATORS
WHEN COMPARED ACROSS EDUCATION LEVELS
OF THE RESPONDENTS

Groups	N	\bar{X}
School Board Members	58	1.96
Community Members	107	2.40
Legislators	52	2.46

A summary of the results of the tests of the hypotheses in this study is presented in chapter 5. Conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the data and recommendations are made for development of policy, procedures, and further study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The American school board has remained a highly visible unit of democracy in action. The presence of school boards in communities throughout the nation has provided the American public with an opportunity to observe the ideals of democracy at work. Thus, the role of school board members as representatives has remained under the close scrutiny of the community. Understanding the representative role of school boards was the fundamental concern addressed in this study.

Representation has long been a fundamental premise upon which the democratic form of government existed. Representation for the purpose of this study has been defined as the responsiveness of the elected to the expressed desires, opinions, and wants of the electorate. This definition closely approximated the idealism that prevailed in representative theory. The school boards' actions in carrying out the general activities of the district, developing policy at the local level, and representing the school district in the legislative arena were viewed as the three major arenas of the boards' representative role.

Information about the perceptions of the representative role of school boards in general activities of the board, in representation in policy development, and in representation at the state legislative

level was considered in relation to the groups identified, that is, school board members, community members, and state legislators. Other factors considered in relation to the perceptions of these groups included the size of the school district enrollment, the respondent's age, sex, occupation, education level, and occupation. Hypotheses were developed for testing the differences among the perceptions of the representative role of the school board by these groups and compared across biographical factors.

A review of the literature was conducted prior to and during the formulation and development of the problem to be studied. The literature related to representation was extensive. The literature which might be considered related research to school board representation was limited.

The historical background of representation, as discussed in the literature, was one which reached back to ancient Greece. The first English writing about representation appeared in Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan (Molesworth 1839-1845). Hobbes's theory of formal representation was based on the concept of the artificial person who represented the actions and works of the represented. Another concept of representation was set forth by Edmund Burke in 1790 (Hoffman and Levack 1949). Burke held that a natural aristocracy should represent the interests of the populace. This natural aristocracy was formed from the elite who were above those circumstances which limited the common man's ability to serve the greater interests of the people. The literature on representation which followed the early writings of Hobbes and Burke maintained the basic conflict set forth by these writers--representation by the elite as opposed to representation by

the artificial person who truly represented the words and actions of others.

Research on school boards, as representative of the community, perpetuated the two divergent concepts of representation. The studies of Ziegler (1976), Witmer (1976), and Olsen (1980) were representative of the continuing investigation of the role of board members. In all of these studies, the role of the school board member as a representative was studied on a continuum between the two definitions of representation. At one end of the continuum, board members perceived themselves as a trustee of the electorate who voted their own conscience based on what they believed was in the best interest of the populace regardless of the desires and opinions of the populace. At the other end of the continuum, board members voted or acted according to the desires and opinions of the populace. But, none of these studies of school boards investigated the perceptions of the representativeness of school boards as perceived by board members, community members, or legislators.

It was necessary to develop an attitude scale for use in measuring the perceptions of the identified groups. A Likert-type scale was developed, administered, and revised before final administration. The final scale contained twenty-four items in three subscales designed to measure the groups' perceptions of the school board as representative of the desires and opinions of the community in general representation, policy representation, and representation at the state legislative level. Eight of the items measured perceptions of general representation, seven items measured perceptions of policy representation, and nine items measured perceptions of representation at the

state legislative level. The reliability coefficients of the scales were $\alpha = .651$ (general representation), $\alpha = .840$ (policy representation), and $\alpha = .892$ (representation at the state legislative level). Biographical factors were gathered from all respondents to compare differences across groups.

Fifteen school districts were selected from the state of North Dakota on a stratified random sample basis. Eighty-five school board members from the selected school districts were identified for the survey. Ten community members from each school district were selected from telephone directories using a random number process. A total of 150 community members was selected. State senators and representatives who were elected by the electorate of the selected school districts were also identified for the survey. A total of 78 legislators was identified. All participants in the study were contacted by telephone, the purpose of the study was explained, and they were asked to participate. When community members were not willing or able to participate, replacement community members were randomly selected. Fifty-eight school board members, 107 community members, and 52 legislators responded to the survey. The total number of respondents was 217, representing 69 percent of the identified participants.

The responses of the three groups were tested for significant differences using the analysis of variance (ANOVA). Computations were done at the University of North Dakota Computer Center. The hypotheses based upon the research questions were written in the null form. The .05 level of significance or less was considered sufficient to reject a hypothesis of no difference.

There were significant differences in the three groups' perceptions of the board in general representation activities. The analysis of variance resulted with $\alpha < .001$ and the null hypothesis was rejected. The Scheffé test showed that there were significant differences between the school board members' perceptions and the perceptions of the other groups--community members and state legislators. School board members believed themselves to be more representative than did community members and legislators.

There was also a significant difference at the .05 level when perceptions of the school boards' general representation activities were compared by size of school district enrollment. The Scheffé test showed that those groups which differed significantly from other groups in the analysis were (1) school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments, and state legislators and community members from school districts with small-sized enrollments; (2) school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments, and legislators from school districts with small-sized enrollments; and (3) school board members from school districts with medium-sized enrollments, and community members from school districts with small-sized enrollments. When the three groups' perceptions of general representation were compared across age, sex, education level, occupation, and income level, no significant differences were found.

The three groups'--school board members, community members, and state legislators--perceptions of school boards as representative of the desires and opinions of the community in policy development were significantly different. The analysis of variance resulted with $\alpha < .001$ and the null hypothesis was rejected. The Scheffé test

showed that there were significant differences between the perceptions of the school board members and the other two groups--the community members and state legislators. The Scheffé test results were significant at the .05 level. School board members believed themselves to be more representative of the community in policy development than community members or legislators.

Significant differences were found at the .05 level when the three groups' perceptions of the board as representative of the community in policy development were compared across the size of school district enrollment. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The Scheffé test indicated that the perceptions of school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments differed significantly from community members from school districts with medium-sized and small-sized enrollments. School board members from large-sized districts also differed significantly from legislators from school districts with small-sized enrollments. Age, sex, education level, and occupation did not significantly affect the groups' perceptions of the school board as representative of the community in policy development.

The perceptions of the school board as representative of the desires and opinions of the community at the state legislative level were significantly different among school board members, community members, and legislators. The analysis of variance resulted with $\alpha < .001$ and the null hypothesis was rejected. The Scheffé test showed that there were significant differences between the perceptions of school board members and the other two groups--community members and state legislators--at the .05 level. School board members believed

themselves to be more representative of the community at the state legislative level than did community members and legislators.

Significant differences were found at the .05 level of significance when the three groups' perceptions of the school board as representative of the community at the state legislative level were compared across the size of school district enrollment. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The Scheffé test indicated that the perceptions of school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments differed significantly (1) from community members from school districts with large-sized, medium-sized, and small-sized school district enrollments; and (2) from legislators from school districts with small-sized, medium-sized, and large-sized enrollments. No significant differences were found when perceptions of the school board as representative of the community at the state legislative level were compared across age, sex, education level, income level, and occupation.

Conclusions

The conclusions are based on the statistical treatment of the data gathered for the study. The conclusions apply only to the sample of the population which was considered in the study. They are reported in the same sequence as presented in chapter 4.

1. An interpretation of the statistical evidence indicated that, among the participants in the study, there was a significant difference among school board members and both community members and legislators in the area of general representation. School board members believed themselves to be more representative than did either legislators or community members. These differences may have occurred

because school board members were more aware of the activity and actions of the board because of their participation on the board. . Another alternative may be that community members and state legislators had limited experience and/or communications with the school board and therefore had formed perceptions based on inadequate information. Finally, it is possible that the community members and legislators were correct: School boards did not represent the desires and opinions of the community in general representation activities.

2. An interpretation of the statistical evidence indicated that when the groups' perceptions of the board in general representation activities were compared across the size of school district enrollment, there were significant differences. School board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments believed the school board was more representative than legislators and community members from school districts with small-sized enrollments. Similarly, school board members from large school districts perceived the school board to be more representative than did community members from school districts with medium-sized enrollments. Interpretation of the statistical evidence further indicated that school board members from school districts with medium-sized enrollments perceived the board as more representative than did community members from small-sized districts. These differences may have occurred because school boards in school districts with large-sized and medium-sized enrollments were more aware of the actions and activity of the board as it related to general representation because of their participation on the board. As a unit, the school board may have been more responsive to community input as it was presented to the board; but the community members and legislators

from school districts with small-sized enrollments may not have been aware of the boards' responsiveness. On the other hand, the school board members' perceptions may have been biased because of a limited knowledge of what the community desires and opinions were. Perhaps the boards responded well to limited information from the community, but they did not know what the greater community desires and opinions were. It is possible that community members from small-sized and medium-sized school districts and legislators from small communities were correct: School boards did not represent the desires and opinions of the community effectively.

3. Although there were significant differences in the groups' perceptions of the school boards' general representation activities, no significant effects were indicated when the groups' perceptions were compared across sex, age, income level, occupation, and education level. This suggested that perceptions of the boards' actions were not biased by biographical factors of the groups.

4. An interpretation of the statistical evidence indicated that, among the participants in the study, there was a significant difference between school board members and both community members and legislators in perceptions of representation in the development of district policy. School board members believed themselves to be more representative than did either community members or legislators. These differences may have occurred because school board members were more aware of the policy developed by the board and the relationship between community opinions and desires and the policy. Another possibility was that the community members and state legislators had limited experience and/or knowledge of the policy developed by the

board and therefore had formed perceptions based on inadequate information. Finally, it is possible that the community members and legislators were correct: School boards did not represent the desires and opinions of the community in the development of district policy.

5. Interpretation of the statistical evidence further indicated that when the groups' perceptions of the board as representative of the community when developing district policy were compared across the size of school district enrollment, there were significant differences. School board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments believed school boards were more representative in the development of district policy than community members and legislators from school districts with small-sized enrollments. Also, school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments believed school boards were more representative in the development of district policy than community members from school districts with medium-sized enrollments. These differences may have occurred because school boards in large districts had more communications with their communities, while school boards in medium-sized and small-sized communities may not have had effective communications with their communities. For example, small-sized and medium-sized districts probably received less media coverage or did not have a local newspaper or access to radio and television coverage. Another option was that school boards were responsive to the expressed desires and opinions of the community, but community members from small-sized and medium-sized districts as well as legislators from small-sized districts were not aware of the boards' actions in the development of district policy and how it achieved representation of the communities' expressed

desires and opinions. On the other hand, school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments may have been responsive to limited input from the community but they were not aware of the expressed desires and opinions of the greater community. It is possible that community members from small-sized and medium-sized school districts as well as legislators from small-sized school districts were correct: School boards were not as responsive to the community in the development of district policy as school board members believed themselves to be.

6. Although there were significant differences in the groups' perceptions of the school boards' representation of the community in the development of district policy, no significant effects were indicated when the groups' perceptions were compared across sex, age, income level, and occupation. However, significant differences were detected when groups' perceptions of school boards in the development of district policy were compared across education level. The mean of the school board member group suggested that the school board members believed themselves to be more representative in policy development than did community members and legislators, and the school board had significantly more years of education than the other two groups--community members and legislators.

7. An interpretation of the statistical evidence indicated that, among the participants in the study, there was a significant difference between school board members and both community members and legislators in their perceptions of representation at the state legislative level. School board members believed themselves to be more representative than did community members and legislators. These

differences may have occurred because school board members were more aware of the boards' activities at the state legislative level than community members and legislators. Although community members may have lacked experience and knowledge of board activity at the state legislative level, legislators surely did not. It would be expected that legislators were well informed at the state legislative level, and their perceptions suggested that the boards' performance in terms of representation at the state legislative level was not representative of the community. On the other hand, it is possible that legislators did not know the expressed desires and opinions of the community as they related to school board participation in the state legislative arena. School boards may have been effective in representing the community's desires and opinions, and legislators did not know what the community's desires and opinions were in relation to education matters. Another option is that the school boards may have represented those members of the community who communicated their desires and opinions to the school board without informing the community at large of their actions. It is also possible that community members and legislators were correct: Boards may have been less responsive to the community than school board members believed themselves to be.

8. Significant differences were indicated among the perceptions of participants in the study when comparisons were made across the size of school district enrollment. School board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments believed the school board was more representative than community members and legislators from school districts with small-sized, medium-sized, and large-sized enrollments. These differences may have occurred because school board

members from districts with large-sized enrollments were better informed of the boards' activities at the state legislative level. It is possible that board members from large-sized school districts were more active at the state legislative level than were board members from medium-sized and small-sized districts and did represent the community in their actions. On the other hand, community members and legislators may have been correct: School boards were not as representative as school board members from school districts with large-sized enrollments believed themselves to be.

9. There were no significant differences indicated among the participants in the study when perceptions of school board participation at the state legislative level were compared across biographical factors. This suggested that there was no bias on the perceptions of board members, community members, and legislators due to biographical factors including sex, age, income level, occupation, and education level.

In conclusion, the findings of the study addressed the research question which asked, "Are school boards responsive to the expressed desires and opinions of the community as perceived by school board members, community members, and state legislators?" The study did not provide a definitive answer to the question. Rather, the study indicated that there were significant differences among the three groups' perceptions of school boards in general representation, representation in policy development, and representation at the state legislative level. Additionally, biographical factors did not significantly affect those perceptions--with the exception of education level--in the area of policy development and the size of school district

enrollment across all three categories of representation. While no conclusive answers were obtained, school board members, and other persons involved in education, can use the data for making decisions about the role of the boards as representative of the community.

Limitations

Statistical procedures and treatments impose some limitations on any research design. These are identified with the statistic and its use. Other limitations which may have affected the results of this study follow:

1. There was a general question concerning the stability of perceptions. If the perception measure was not relatively stable, the results of this investigation could not be generalized to the sample population.

2. An effort was made to obtain a stratified random sample and thus randomize the possibility of error; however, the technique of selecting names from a telephone directory using a random number list has not met completely the requirements of random sampling. It is likely that very few community members were not included in the sample because they had an unlisted number or did not have a telephone at the time of the study. Other potential participants likely had unlisted phone numbers.

3. The interrelationships of variables limited to some degree the interpretability of the results.

Discussion

The results of the analysis of the survey data were not conclusive about the representative behaviors of school boards included

in the study, but in the opinion of this writer, there are implications that can be derived from the analysis which suggest that school boards fall short of achieving the democratic model proposed by Samuel Adams (Schultz 1973), Tuttle (1958), and Pitkin (1967). Whether school boards were in fact truly representative is not as important to school administrators; school board members; and national, state, and local policy developers as is the evidence that indicated that the school boards were not perceived to be representative of the expressed wishes and desires of the community. In the opinion of the writer it is incumbent upon school boards to take action to change that perception and hence improve the vital link between the school, the community, and the state.

The results of the present study indicated that school board members, community members, and state legislators did not concur in their perceptions of school board behavior. The predominant results evidenced that school board members believed themselves to be more representative than did community members and state legislators. In the view of the writer the school boards included in the present study behaved in a manner consistent with the elitist behavior of board members in Olsen's (1980) study. A majority of respondents in his study indicated a preference for mandate behavior described as actions in accordance with the board members' judgment rather than actions consistent with the views of their constituencies.

The elitist behavior of school boards as perceived by community members and legislators in the present study was also consistent with the work of Lutz (1975). He suggested that the norms, values, beliefs, and expectations for school boards were supported by the notion that education was too important to be political and that in response to these

expectations school boards became trustees for the public and not representative of it. Yet, Bailey (1962) claimed that education was a very political entity. School boards can no longer ignore the political activities occurring at the local and state level. The writer believed it important that school boards re-examine the justification for a trustee type of attitude and behavior towards representation.

If school boards determine that the representative role of the board should be consistent with the elitist model of representation, then school curriculum and materials should be reassessed to assure that students learn that the acceptable "ideal" in the present representative form of government is based on the trustee/elitist model. In conjunction with this curriculum change, students must be trained for citizenship roles in a system in which their wishes and desires are only communicated successfully through the ballot box.

On the other hand, if school boards determine that the democratic ideal is the goal for local governance of schools, reforms are necessary to achieve that goal. School board members must assess their current representative behaviors and modify those behaviors which are not consistent with the democratic model. Board members, community members, and students must be trained to participate in the democratic process and monitor the actions of governing bodies such as the school board.

In order to effectively meet the training needs of school boards, school board members must first acknowledge the need to improve the representative function of the board. Findings of the present study and other research on school boards must be disseminated at the state and local level. Further research must be directed to determine

effective means of improving school/community relations, and models must be developed which will integrate the democratic idealism with the everyday operations of schools. It is a concern of this writer that the inconsistency between the democratic idealism taught in the public schools and the governance model practiced at the school board level undermines the effectiveness of curriculum which the school board approves through their policy actions and directs district staff to include in their instructional program. There must be a greater consistency between the idealism taught in the schools and the practices of the governing body of those same schools.

To achieve this consistency, a clarification of the role and responsibilities of school board members is necessary. School boards included in this study, in the state of North Dakota, and in the nation must consider the implications of representation as they function as the interstitial body between the school and community. Further analysis of the representative behavior of school boards and a redefinition of what that behavior should be are vital to the effective delivery of services to the community.

Recommendations

Recommendations suggested from this study which would be helpful for future research and actions in regard to school boards as representatives of the community are offered for consideration:

1. School boards and administrators should develop policy which clarifies the role of the school board as representatives of the community. School boards must determine what community input will be obtained and how the board will respond to community input. Regular channels for determining community desires and opinions should be

established. For example, community input could be achieved through broad community participation on school committees that make recommendations to the board about the general activities, policy, and state legislative actions by the board.

2. Accountability for general actions, development of district policy, and activity at the state legislative level should be provided through district policy and procedures. Communication channels that report board activity to the community should be established. These communications should include, but not be limited to, media such as newspapers, radio, and television. A regular newsletter reporting the board's activities or a regular column in the newspaper reported by the secretary to the board could help to create a more informed community.

3. School board training should include a study of representative theories. A review of the opposing views of representation and the theories developed on school board behaviors should be reviewed so that school boards might be better informed in making decisions relative to representation of the community in general representation actions, representation in policy actions, and representation at the state legislative level.

4. Further study is recommended to determine why significant differences exist among the groups in the present study. Additional investigation of school board activities may provide specific direction for boards to consider in their representative role. A study similar to the present study should incorporate a survey of board attitudes about their representative role. The trustee/delegate extremes of representation should be studied in relationship to the varied

perceptions of school board members, community members, and legislators.

5. Additional study is recommended to determine what factors contributed to less positive perceptions from community members and legislators. The implications of this study should not be considered in isolation to other factors which might contribute to effective community representation by the board.

6. Training should be provided for school boards on how to effectively work with a community in carrying out their obligations as elected representatives. School board members should be informed of the means by which they can obtain community input and use that information in the school board decision-making process.

A Perspective

The following recommendations are an expression of the writer's views reflecting not only the data but also reflecting the insights developed by doing the study. In some cases the insights do not necessarily have an empirical base; but, nevertheless, they are presented for consideration.

1. School boards and state school board associations should work to improve the perceived effectiveness of the school board as representative of the community at the state legislative level and the community level. Too little is known about the activities of school boards and more awareness is needed in all levels from the state legislative arena to the community.

2. Community and student programs should be developed to provide a better-informed citizenry. The school board as a local model of democracy in education should be included in studies of American government for students during their public school years.

Community members should be provided information through the media and school brochures which describe board policies and procedures in general actions, policy developments, and activity at the state legislative level.

APPENDIX

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD REPRESENTATION

I am doing research as part of the doctoral program in educational administration at the University of North Dakota. The purpose of my study is to determine how school boards, as representatives of the community, are perceived by community members, school board members, and legislators.

The following information will be useful in making comparisons among different groups in the population. This information will be confidential and no names will be used in reporting any part of the study.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Michael L. Ward

Michael L. Ward

Please complete all of the questions below.

- (A) Male _____ Female _____
- (B) Age _____
- (C) Occupation _____
- (D) Annual family income _____
- (E) Number of years of education completed _____
- (F) How many school board members are there on the local school board in your community? _____
- (G) How many school board members can you name? _____
(Indicate a number only.)
- (H) Do you communicate with the school board members in a:
- _____ business context?
- _____ social context?
- _____ church context?
- _____ other? (Please state) _____
- (I) How frequently do you estimate you communicate with board members about school matters?
- _____ monthly or more frequently
- _____ 3 or 4 times a year
- _____ once or twice a year
- _____ less than once a year
- _____ not at all

For each statement mark an 'X' in the column that describes your feelings	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. The school board is representative of the community.					
2. Many actions of the school board go against what I believe are in the best interest of the community.					
3. When hiring a new superintendent, the school board's actions are in accordance with the expressed desires of the community.					
4. The school board does not represent my point of view about how schools should operate.					
5. The school board handles student disciplinary cases in a manner consistent with the wishes of the community.					
6. The school board is made up of people who are aware of what the community wants for its schools.					
7. The school board renews the superintendent's contract regardless of the expressed opinions of the community.					
8. When faced with a difficult decision, the school board makes decisions commensurate with the wishes of the community.					

For each statement mark an 'X' in the column that describes your feelings	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
9. The school board develops policy without any input from the community.					
10. If the school board were to develop policy on graduation requirements, it would consider the expressed desires, opinions and wants of the community.					
11. School board policy in the school district reflects the general desires and wants of the community.					
12. When developing policy about student discipline, the school board considers the expressed desires, opinions and wants of the community.					
13. The school board always considers the opinions of the community when planning a policy on student participation in extracurricular activities.					
14. The policy of the school district reflects the law of the state and the standards expressed by the community.					
15. The school district's attendance policy reflects the concerns and desires of the community as to what school standards should exist.					
16. The school board represents the community's expressed opinions when testifying before the Senate Education Committee in Bismarck.					

For each statement mark an 'X' in the column that describes your feelings	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
17. The school board appears before the state legislature to communicate the community's desires for its schools.					
18. The school board uses tax dollars to go to Bismarck to lobby support for schools that the community wants.					
19. When the school board writes statements of support for potential legislative action, they are representing the expressed desires of the community.					
20. When the school board communicates with state legislators about school needs, the board is representing the expressed desires of the community.					
21. Activity at the state legislative level by the school board has no relationship to the expressed concerns and desires of the community.					
22. If the school board were to present testimony before a legislative hearing, I believe they would express the concerns and interests of our community.					
23. The school board does not represent the expressed desires and wants of the community when participating in lobbying activities in Bismarck.					
24. The school board represents the community's opinions and desires when appearing at state legislative meetings.					

SELECTED REFERENCES

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Adams, John. Works. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1852-1865.
- Albert, Frank L., Jr. "Selected Characteristics of School Board Members toward Certain Criticism of Public Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1959.
- Andrews, Charles M. Famous Utopias. New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1901.
- Bailey, Frederick G. "Decisions by Consensus in Councils and Committees." In Political Systems and the Distribution of Power, pp. 1-20. Edited by Michael Banton. London: The University Press, 1971.
- Bailey, Stephen. Schoolmen In Politics. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962.
- Beals, Allan R.; Spindler, George; and Spindler, Louise. Culture and Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Beard, Charles A., and Lewis, John D. "Representative Government in Evolution." American Political Science Review 26 (April 1932): 223-40.
- Beloff, Max, ed. The Federalist Papers. Oxford, England: Blackwell, 1948.
- Bers, Trudy. School-Community Communication: School Board Members and Their Constituents. National School Boards Association Research Report 1980-1. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 193 760, 1981.
- Blanchard, Paul D. "Most School Board Members Are Their Own Men (And Women)-Not Conduits of the Public Will." The American School Board Journal 161 (May 1974): 47-48.
- Callahan, Raymond E. "The American Board of Education, 1789-1960." In Understanding School Boards, pp. 19-46. Edited by Peter J. Cistone. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Company, 1975.
- Cistone, Peter J. Understanding School Boards. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Company, 1975.
- Counts, George S. The Social Composition of Boards of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927. (Supplementary Educational Monograph No. 33)

- De Grazia, Alfred. Public and Republic: Political Representation in America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1951.
- Department of Public Instruction. North Dakota Educational Directory 1982-1983. Bismarck: Department of Public Instruction, 1982.
- Downie, Norville M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.
- Dye, Thomas R., and Zeigler, L. Harmon. The Irony of Democracy. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1975.
- Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Elau, Heinz. "Changing Views of Representation." In Contemporary Political Science: Toward Empirical Theory, pp. 53-85. Edited by Ithiel De Sola Pool. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Elau, Heinz, and Prewitt, Kenneth. Labyrinths of Democracy Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1973.
- Fearen, William, esq. "The Power to Govern Public Schools--Where Is Its Source?" PSBA Bulletin 39 (March-April 1975): 5-9.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.
- Ford, Henry J. Representative Government. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1924.
- Frederich, Carl J. "Representation and Constitutional Reform." Western Political Quarterly 1 (June 1948): 124-30.
- Getzels, Jacob W., and Guba, Egon G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review 55 (Winter 1957): 423-49.
- Goldhammer, Keith. The School Board. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
- Gresson, Aaron D. "External-Internal Mandates and Elite-Arena Behavior in Local School Boards." Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.
- Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Harris, George. The True Theory of Representation in a State. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1857.
- Henerson, Marlene E.; Morris, Lynn Lyons; and Fitz-Gibbon, Carol Taylor. How to Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.

- Hermes, Ferdinand Aloys. The Representative Republic. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956.
- Hines, Charles. "A Study of School Board Administrative Relationships: The Development of the Eugene, Oregon Superintendency 1891-1944." The American School Board Journal 122 (February 1951): 19-21.
- Hinkle, Dennis E. Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979.
- Hoffman, Ross J. S., and Levack, Paul, eds. Burke's Politics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949.
- Hollingshead, August B. Elmstown's New York. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.
- Kahl, James A. The American Class Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Kerr, Norman. "The School Board As An Agency of Legitimation." Sociology of Education 38 (Fall 1984): 34-59.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1975.
- Lutz, Frank W. "Local School Boards As Sociocultural Systems." In Understanding School Boards, pp. 63-77. Edited by Peter J. Cistone. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Company, 1975.
- _____. Elite-Arena Council Behavior and School Boards. New York: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 136 391, 1977.
- Lutz, Frank W., and Iannacone, Lawrence. Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Lynd, Robert S., and Lynd, Helen Merrill. Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.
- Mayo, H. B. An Introduction to Democratic Theory. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Mitzel, Harold E., ed. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 5th ed. New York: Free Press, 1982.
- Molesworth, Sir William, ed. English Works. London: Longmans, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1839-1845.
- National School Boards Association. "Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Big City School Districts." Evanston, Illinois, November 1972.

- _____. The People Look at Their Schools. Research Bulletin 1975-1. Evanston, Ill.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 116 268, 1975.
- Nearing, Scott. "Who's Who in Our School Boards?" School and Society 5 (January 1917): 5.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. Statistical Package For The Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Nunnally, Jum C., Jr. Tests And Measurements: Assessment and Prediction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.
- Nunnery, Michael, and Kimbrough, Ralph B. Politics, Power, Polls, and School Elections. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Nystrand, Raphael O., and Cunningham, Luvern L. The Dynamics of Local School Control. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 084 887, 1973.
- Olsen, Peter. Constituent Responsiveness of School Board Members. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 195 028, 1980.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.
- _____. "Suggestions for A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations: I." Administrative Science Quarterly 1 (June 1956): 63-65.
- _____. "Some Ingredients of A General Theory of Organization." In Administrative Theory in Education, pp. 40-72. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
- Perkins, James, et al. School Boards And School Board Membership: Recommendations and Report of a Survey. Albany, New York: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 011 693, 1967.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.
- Powell, William T. "An Assessment of the Representation of Elected and Appointed School Board Members in Selected School Districts in Virginia and Kentucky." Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.
- Ravitch, Diane. The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973. A History of the Public Schools as Battlefield of Social Change. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.

- Reeves, Charles Everard. School Boards--Their Functions, and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.
- Rice, Stuart. Quantitative Methods in Politics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1928.
- Rosenthal, Alan, and Fuhrman, Susan. Legislative Educational Leadership in the States. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of Educational Leadership, 1981.
- Schultz, Stanley K. The Culture Factory: Boston Public Schools, 1789-1860. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Stapley, Maurice E. School Board Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1957.
- Struble, George S. "A Study of School Board Personnel." The American School Board Journal 65 (October 1922): 48-49, 137-38.
- Swabey, Marie C. Theory of the Democratic State. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Tiedt, Sidney W. "Oregon School Board Members in the Willamette Valley." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin 6 (1962): 1-17.
- Truman, David B. "Disillusion and Regeneration: The Quest for Discipline." American Political Science Review 59 (December 1965): 865-73.
- Tuttle, Edward Mowbray. School Board Leadership in America. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958.
- Underwood, Kenneth E.; Fortune, Jim C.; and Meyer, James A. "Readout: All About Who You Are." The American School Board Journal 170 (January 1983): 23-25.
- Underwood, Kenneth E.; McCluskey, Lawrence; and Umberger, George R. "A Profile of the School Board Member." The American School Board Journal 165 (October 1978): 23-24.
- Wakefield, Howard E. "Rural School Boards." In The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 8, pp. 70-73. Edited by L. C. Deighton. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Warner, W. Lloyd. Democracy in Jonesville. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- White, Alpheus L. Local School Boards: Organization and Practices. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Wirt, Frederick M. "Theory and Research Need in the Study of American Educational Politics." The Journal of Educational Administration 3 (May 1970): 53-87.

- Wirt, Frederick M., and Kirst, Michael W. The Political Web of American Schools. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.
- Witmer, Daniel C. "School Board Council Type-Community Diversity and Public Attitudes about Schools." Ed.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.
- Zeigler, L. Harmon. What Makes School Boards Effective. Eugene, Ore.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 183 746, 1976.
- Zeigler, L. Harmon; Jennings, M. Kent; and Peak, G. Wayne. Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1974.