1

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Division

Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

59921

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Peter Gordon Boswell

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

July 5, 1940

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

England

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

P.O. Box 8583, Station "A"
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 3P2

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Representational Role Style Perceptions of Municipal Councillors
in Newfoundland and Labrador

University — Université

Carleton University

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Ph.D.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1983

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Dr. H. B. Mayo

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

December 16, 1982

Signature

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE PERCEPTIONS OF
MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

BY

PETER G. BOSWELL

ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND

AUGUST 1982

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis

REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE PERCEPTIONS OF
MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

submitted by Peter G. Boswell, B.A., M.A.,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Thesis Supervisor

Chairman, Department
of Political Science

Carleton University

January 3, 1983

Peter G. Boswell
Abstract of Dissertation

The views held by elected representatives concerning the degree to which the opinions of their constituents should be taken into consideration when voting, have been the subject of considerable research and debate. Generally, such views are referred to as representational role styles and they have traditionally been categorized into three groups: delegate -- a representative who would vote in accordance with what he perceived to be his constituents' wishes, regardless of whether he personally agreed with them or not; trustee -- a representative who would view himself as a free agent acting on the basis of his own judgement and perception of what would be best for the community, regardless of his constituents' views; and politico -- a representative who cannot clearly be categorized as either a delegate or trustee and who may adopt different role styles depending on the particular issue or on his perception of the salience of the issue to his constituents.

Virtually all research on representational role style perceptions has been conducted at the federal and provincial or state levels. Very few such studies have been undertaken at the municipal level of government, and none in Canada.

The purposes of this dissertation are threefold. First, to add to the existing knowledge of representational role style perceptions by conducting a case study of their incidence among municipal councillors in the Province of Newfoundland. Second, to compare the relationships between the representational role styles and background variables of municipal councillors in Newfoundland with those found in previous studies elsewhere. Third, to examine the adequacy of the traditional categorizations of representational role styles, and to assess the usefulness of this form of research at the municipal level of government.

The data for this study were gathered by a combination of personal interviews and mailed questionnaires from 322 municipal councillors throughout the Province of Newfoundland. Representational role styles were measured by three direct questions and a series of indirect attitude statements,

The representational role styles, as measured by an index constructed from the direct questions, together with their relationships to background variables, were found to be generally comparable with the results of other similar studies. However, the representational role styles as measured by the attitude statements were found to be significantly different from those measured by the direct questions. This, together with variations observed stemming from the use of different questions, was deemed sufficient to cast the traditional categorization of representational role styles into doubt. A factor analysis of the attitude statements further indicated that not only were the traditional categorizations inadequate, but that representational role styles are only part of a more complex cluster of attitudes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II GENERAL METHODOLOGY	5
III THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE PERCEPTION	42
IV THE REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE PERCEPTIONS OF NEWFOUNDLAND COUNCILLORS	78
V THE UTILITY OF REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE ANALYSIS IN THE STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT	117
VI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	161
Appendix	
A MUNICIPALITIES SELECTED FOR PHASE ONE INTERVIEWS	167
B INTERVIEW SCHEDULES	169
C LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS	171
D LETTER FROM DEPUTY-MINISTER	172
E LETTER TO COUNCILLORS NOT INTERVIEWED	173
F LETTER TO PHASE TWO COUNCILS	174
G LETTER TO PHASE TWO COUNCILLORS	175
H MASTER REGISTER	176
I QUESTIONNAIRE	187
J DIFFERENCE OF MEANS TEST BETWEEN PERSONAL INTERVIEW AND MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLES	201
K SUMMARY OF RESULTS	224
L RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONS OF ATTSCALE INDEX AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES	284
BIBLIOGRAPHY	286

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many municipal councillors in the Province of Newfoundland who gave so willingly of their time by agreeing to interviews or by completing a long questionnaire. Without their cooperation this thesis could never have been undertaken. I would also like to thank the Minister, Deputy-Minister and other officials from the Department of Municipal Affairs for their interest and cooperation in this study. My colleagues in the Department of Political Science at Memorial University have been most generous with their time for advice, comments and constructive criticisms. Mark Graesser, Michael Wallack, Hugh Whalen and Bill McGrath are due special thanks, as is my secretary, Hilda Wakeham, for effectively shielding me from interruptions during the last stages of writing and for taking over many of the day-to-day chores of running the department.

The Institute of Social and Economic Research at Memorial University was most generous in providing for the extensive travel throughout the island and for the costs of all supplies connected with the study. Special thanks are due to Mrs. Shirley Fraize, Administrative Assistant of the Institute, for her assistance in so many ways during the field work and for arranging the typing of the chapter-by-chapter drafts.

The financial assistance of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation is gratefully acknowledged, both for funding during my pre-dissertation years at Carleton University and for assisting with the costs of typing and copying this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Henry Mayo, my thesis supervisor, for his infinite patience and wisdom in shepherding this thesis through to its finish. His comments on each chapter were always incisive and thorough, and have certainly resulted in a better thesis than would otherwise have been the case. I would also like to thank the other two members of my thesis supervision board, Dr. D. C. Rowat and Professor M. S. Whittington, for their encouragement and particularly for their most helpful comments on the thesis proposal.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Whether we believe that municipal government is the "cradle of democracy" or simply a representative provider of services,¹ one of its major functions is to provide the mechanism for the representation of citizens at the local level. How well local government performs this task is important to its continued well-being. Since the representation function occurs through elected or appointed councillors,² it is important to consider the attitude of these representatives toward those they represent and how these attitudes affect councillors' approaches toward the issues that come before council.

Most studies of representative role style perception have been conducted at the national or state level, and have employed a classification scheme of delegate, politico, and trustee. The few attempts to expand such studies to the municipal level have adopted the traditional classification scheme and have limited their scope to major urban areas. No such study has yet been undertaken at the municipal level in Canada.

It is the purpose of this thesis to examine the attitudes and representative role style perceptions of municipal councillors in the province of Newfoundland. At the level of primary and original research,

¹See the debate in section one of Feldman and Goldrick Politics and Government of Urban Canada (3rd edition), (Toronto: Methuen, 1976)

²Since Newfoundland's system of local government includes 32 Local Improvement Districts, whose members are appointed by the provincial government, the traditional usage of "elected" and "appointed" officials cannot properly be used. Consequently, the distinction will be between "councillors" and "administrative officials."

this thesis will contribute to the available knowledge of local government in one Canadian province; it will also contribute to the overall discipline of political science by an analysis of the concept of representative role styles, particularly the applicability of the commonly-accepted categories of delegate, politico and trustee to the local level of politics.

Two factors make the province of Newfoundland a particularly good environment in which to explore these ideas and test hypotheses: the age distribution of municipalities, and the varied local government structures.

With the exception of the capital city of St. John's, which was incorporated as a town in 1888 and as a city in 1921, local government in the province is relatively new. However, nearly 20 municipalities have been incorporated for 25 years or more and a significant number of others are approaching this age. On the other hand, a substantial number of municipalities have been incorporated for less than five years. It may be hypothesized that the older municipalities would be more institutionalized in the sense of being accepted by the community as a normal part of life and government, whereas the newer ones may not yet have attained the same degree of public acceptance. It may be further hypothesized that the degree of institutionalization will influence councillors' attitudes. Specifically, councillors in relatively new municipalities might be expected to show greater concern for their fellow-citizens' opinions by exhibiting attitudes closer to the category of delegate than trustee.

The uniqueness of Newfoundland in this aspect is that the longer history of local government in other provinces precludes a test of the relationship between councillor attitudes and institutionalization. The relatively recent introduction of regional government in some provinces may allow a certain amount of work to be done in this area, but in these cases, only the second-tier units are new, not the concept of local government itself.

The second factor that makes Newfoundland a particularly good choice for this type of research is the varied structure of its

municipalities. There are five basic types of local government in the Province: cities (2), towns (118), rural districts (14), local government communities (129), and local improvement districts (32).³

There are two important distinctions among these structures that may well have a significant effect on the attitude and role perceptions of councillors. First, each local improvement district is governed by a provincially appointed Board of Trustees: it may be hypothesized that these councillors will have a different attitude toward their representative role than councillors who must stand for re-election. This point is of particular significance, since the provincial government intends to appoint five members of the proposed 15 member regional council for the St. John's area,⁴ which could easily serve as a model for other regional governments in the province.

Second, councillors are elected in the other four types of municipalities, but for different terms: four years in the cities, towns and rural districts, and two years in the local government communities. It might be expected that a shorter term of office would result in a higher degree of politico or delegate role perception. The almost even split between four year (134) and two year (129) terms should provide a good opportunity to test this hypothesis.

The data for this study were derived from a series of personal interviews with 92 councillors and mailed questionnaire returns from

³ Subsequent to the commencement of research for this study, the structure of local government in the province was changed. Under the provisions of the Municipalities Act (1980), rural districts and local improvement districts were converted into towns, although not all yet have elected councils. Since the research for this study was conducted under the older system, the then-existing structures will be referred to throughout, although any pertinent changes will be noted.

⁴ See Bill 101 for details, although the government's action in this respect closely follows the recommendation of the Henley Commission. For a more complete analysis of regional government proposals see Peter G. Boswell, "Legislative Reform in Newfoundland: The Case of Local Government," paper delivered to the Annual Meeting of the A. P. P. S. A., October 21, 1977.

a further 230. The study was conducted throughout the province of Newfoundland and Labrador during the period from summer 1977 to fall 1978. Complete details of this data base are presented in Chapter Two along with a description of the general methodology and research design, questionnaire construction, data collection procedure, and method of data analysis.

Chapter Three will review and analyze the general literature on representative role perception particularly as applied to the Canadian parliament and provincial legislatures. The findings of this study will be presented and discussed in Chapter Four. Certain hypotheses relating to the socio-economic background, municipal experience, municipal structure and age, electoral competitiveness, and personal characteristics will be tested. The results will be analyzed in Chapter Five and will be discussed in the broader context of whether the traditional categories of representational role perception, as developed for use at the senior levels of government, are useful for the study of local government in Newfoundland.

CHAPTER TWO

GENERAL METHODOLOGY

Research for the study of legislator attitudes and role analysis may be carried out by either mailed questionnaires or personal interviews.¹ Each approach has advantages and drawbacks, although traditional assertions about the adequacy and desirability of each method have recently been questioned. The ensuing debate will be considered here only insofar as it is directly relevant.

It has generally been accepted as a truism that the best method of obtaining accurate information in survey research is by personal interview.² The attributes most often cited in favour of this approach are those of reliability, higher completion rate,

¹The personal interview technique was employed by Arthur B. Gunlicks, "Representative Role Perceptions Among Local Councillors in Western Germany," Journal of Politics, 31 (1969); pp. 443-464, and J. H. Kuklinski and R. C. Elling, "Representational Role, Constituency Opinion, and Legislative Roll-Call Behavior," American Journal of Political Science, February 1977, pp. 135-147. The mailed questionnaire approach has been used much less frequently but some examples are cited in D. A. Caputo and Richard L. Cole, "City Officials and Mailed Questionnaires: An Investigation of the Response Bias Assumption," Political Methodology, 4, 3 (1977), pp. 271-287.

²See for example, Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioural Research (2nd. ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), pp. 412-13.

flexibility and ability to correct question misunderstanding.³

The two disadvantages most commonly noted are those of cost and interviewer bias.⁴ Selltitz, Wrightsman and Cook, however, mention two further potential difficulties with the personal interview method: the lack of anonymity, and the incidence of illiteracy even in highly-developed countries.⁵

Relatively low cost is the most obvious advantage of the mail questionnaire method, but other advantages, such as wider coverage, anonymity, and less pressure on the respondent are frequently mentioned.⁶ The major disadvantage of the mail questionnaire approach is the relatively low return rate often experienced. Few methodologists go so far as Kerlinger who asserts that mail questionnaires may be "worse than useless" and should not be used if a "better method" is available;⁷ however, concern over

³Such attributes are mentioned by many authors of articles and texts on research methodology. See for example: Claire Selltitz, Lawrence S. Wrightsman, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (3rd. ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), pp. 296-298; A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966), pp. 30-35; Barbara Neigh Smith, et al., Political Research Methods: Foundations and Techniques, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976, p. 160.

⁴Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design; Smith, Political Research Methods.

⁵Selltitz, Wrightman, and Cook, Research Methods, pp. 295-97.

⁶Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design; Selltitz, Wrightman, and Cook, Research Methods; pp.294-298; Smith, Political Research Methods.

⁷Kerlinger, Foundations, p.414. See also Mildred Parten, Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures, (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1966), pp. 383-402.

the generally low return rate is often expressed.⁸ Other disadvantages of mail questionnaires often cited include: inflexibility, biased samples, and difficulty of obtaining in-depth data.⁹

Regardless of available time and money, it might be argued that the soundest approach to survey research would be through a series of personal interviews. This method would yield a relatively high completion rate, be flexible enough to provide any opportunity for in-depth probing and the pursuit of new or additional lines of inquiry as warranted, and allow any misunderstandings about questions to be cleared up as the interviewer progresses. However, interviewer bias may creep in--not only in terms of the wording of questions and the way in which they are asked, but also through seemingly innocuous factors such as "appearance, dress, and accent."¹⁰ It might also be argued that those being interviewed may not be entirely candid or forthcoming during the interview either because of reluctance to express strong, controversial or unconventional views in a face-to-face interview, or because guarantees of anonymity may not be readily accepted.

On the other hand, it could be argued that a mail questionnaire might be the soundest approach. Guarantees of anonymity may be more convincing when the researcher and respondent never actually meet; more thoughtful and comprehensive answers may result when the respondent does not feel pressured to come up with a quick answer or when he can complete the questionnaire at his leisure; and interviewer bias is eliminated. It might even be

⁸ Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design; Selltitz, Wrightsman and Cook, Research Methods, pp. 296-98; Parten, Surveys; Smith, Political Research Methods, 160-64

⁹ Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design; Selltitz, Wrightsman, and Cook, Research Methods; Smith, Political Research Methods.

¹⁰ Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design, p.31.

argued that the lower rate of return common with mail questionnaires could be offset by increasing the initial coverage of the survey, a procedure more realistic in terms of time and money with a mail questionnaire than with the personal interview format.

Arguments can be made for either approach and expert evidence produced to support the method adopted. Each approach has inherent weaknesses which must be weighed in the context of the proposed research: the theoretically optimum approach may not be feasible in the particular circumstances. Factors of time, funding, culture, accessibility and socio-economic strata of potential respondents, nature of research, and even climate are examples of specific variables that may influence the choice of a particular research method in addition to theoretical considerations. And recent research has indicated that even the seemingly intractable problem of low return rates with mail questionnaires may not be as critical as commonly believed.¹¹

In order to obtain the most extensive and reliable data possible, both personal interviews and mail questionnaires were used in this study. By combining the two approaches, the benefits of each method could be realized while the drawbacks might be limited. In addition, by keeping the data from each method in separate sub-files, it may be possible to make some contribution to the methodological debate by comparing the results of the two groups. The personal interviews (Phase One) were conducted during summer 1977 and fall 1978; the mail questionnaires were administered in fall 1977 and spring 1978.

¹¹David A. Caputo and Richard L. Cole, "City Officials and Mailed Questionnaires: An Investigation of the Response Bias Assumption," Political Methodology, IV, 3 (1977), pp. 271-87.

Personal Interviews (Phase One)

In 1973, a study of citizen attitudes toward local government in the province of Newfoundland was conducted by the York University Survey Research Centre under the direction of Professor M. W. Graesser of the Department of Political Science at Memorial University. The study was conducted for the Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador and formed part of that Commission's report.¹² In order to provide a scientifically accurate cross-sample of the population, the province was divided into 19 randomly selected sample areas following a stratified two-stage probability sample process.¹³

Since the communities in the nineteen areas designated in the 1973 study may be assumed to be representative of the province as a whole, it was decided to adopt these areas as bases for the personal interviews. However, some initial modifications were necessary. First, in the 1973 study every community, whether incorporated or not, had an equal chance of being included in the survey; since the present study covers only incorporated communities (those having a municipal government) the unincorporated ones had to be discarded.

Second, as can be seen in Figure 1, about one-half of the sample areas each contained more than one community, consequently those remaining after the unincorporated ones were deleted had to be limited even further in order to avoid overrepresentation of certain areas. This was necessary since the actual number of municipalities within any area was of little consequence for the 1973 study, since those being interviewed were members of the general population; for the present study, however, since only the municipal councillors were to be

¹² Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador (Whalen Report), St. John's: Queen's Printer, 1974, Chapter 4 and passim.

¹³ See M. W. Graesser, "Attitudes Toward Local Government in Newfoundland; Summary Report" (Prepared for the Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador, St. John's, 1973) pp. 1-9.

interviewed, the number of municipalities in any area was a significant factor. The second modification, then, was to select for interviewing no more than two municipalities from any one area. In some areas, only one incorporated municipality had been included in the 1973 study, thus no adjustment was required; in the other areas the municipalities to be included were randomly selected from among the available number of any particular type of municipality in the area concerned.

The third modification was to provide for a reasonably equal distribution of each type of municipality. The 1973 study had made only a limited attempt to control for type of municipality, since other factors such as population and date of incorporation had been included in the calculations for community and area selection. The overall aim of the third modification was to select for personal interview approximately ten percent of the provincial total of each type of municipality, with the exception of the city category where the inclusion of both cities resulted in a one hundred percent inclusion rate.

The fourth modification was the inclusion of the cities of Corner Brook and St. John's which had been excluded from the 1973 study.¹⁴ Although both cities operate under the authority of their

¹⁴ The rationale for the exclusion of the two cities was primarily the expectation that "the size and maturity of the two city municipal systems would yield public attitude patterns similar to those prevailing in other jurisdictions where urban local governments have long been established and are broadly supported." Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador (St. John's: Queens's Printer, 1974) p.93. In addition, the St. John's metropolitan area had been under study for a number of years and a Commission of Enquiry had been appointed in 1974 to "review and obtain public reaction to the St. John's Urban Region Study, the most recent in the series: Commission of Enquiry, St. John's Urban Region Study (St. John's, 1976) 3rd and Final Report, pp. iv-xii. Labrador was also excluded from the 1973 study since the Royal Commission of Labrador was then examining all aspects of public affairs in that area of the province, including local government. Labrador was also excluded from Phase One of the present study since the limited number of municipalities in the area did not justify the time or expense of interviews.

own acts, and, particularly in the case of St. John's, may be considered to be somewhat unique in their structure and traditions of local government, it was felt that no study of local government in Newfoundland would be complete without their inclusion. In addition, their presence in the study provides an opportunity to examine whether there is any significant difference between the attitudes of councillors from the larger urban areas as compared to those from smaller municipalities. Table 2-1 provides a summary of the final selection of municipalities for Phase One interviews classified as to type; Figure 2-1 shows the geographical location of the sample areas; and Appendix A lists the individual municipalities by sample area.

Following the compilation of the list of municipalities in which interviews were to be conducted, four geographical groupings were formed and approximate dates scheduled for interviews in each municipality.¹⁵ Letters were then sent to the clerk, secretary, or manager of each selected municipality explaining the purpose of the study, the approximate date which I planned to be in their area, and requesting their assistance by advising council members of the study and of my desire to interview them.¹⁶ A covering letter from the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing was also sent to each council.¹⁷

Two questionnaires were composed--one for administrative employees and one for councillors. The questionnaire construction is discussed below, but it may be noted here that they were designed as interviewing guides and contained both closed and open-ended questions. In addition, they were designed to gather more information than required for the thesis itself, since there are many aspects of local government in Newfoundland about which very little is known. The original intent of using separate questionnaires for the administrators and councillors was twofold: first, to measure and compare the perceptions of each group on their individual roles in policy-making; second, to provide a means of assessing the knowledge of councillors about their own community's finances and operations. Elaboration of these points and some comments on some difficulties with this approach are contained in the section on the questionnaire construction.

¹⁵ See Appendix B.

¹⁶ See Appendix C.

¹⁷ See Appendix D.

FIGURE 2-1

MAP OF SAMPLE AREAS FOR 1973 STUDY OF CITIZEN ATTITUDES

*Not included in 1973 study.

Table 2-1

DISTRIBUTION BY TYPE OF MUNICIPALITIES

FOR PHASE ONE INTERVIEWS

TYPE	1973 SURVEY	PRESENT STUDY	1973 TOTAL in PROVINCE	1977 TOTAL in PROVINCE	1973 SURVEY PERCENTAGE	PRESENT STUDY PERCENTAGE
Cities	-	2	2	2	-	100.0
Towns	10	12	93	118	10.8	10.2
Rural Districts	1	2	8	14	12.5	14.3
Local Improvement District	4	4	49	32	8.2	12.5
Local Government Communities	30	13	119	129	25.2	10.1
	45	33	271	295		

SOURCES: 1973 data obtained from the Report of the Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador (Queen's Printer: St. John's, 1974) pp. 2, 95. 1977 data obtained from the Municipal Directory (Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 1977).

The following procedure was used to conduct the interviews. The municipal clerk or manager was contacted on my arrival in the community and interviewed as soon as convenient. A list of the councillors' names was obtained during the interview along with information as to where they could be located. Each available councillor was then interviewed, although in a number of cases it was necessary to call back two or three times. Call backs were, of course, only possible during the time I was in the area, and it was not possible to contact all members of council in each municipality. A number of councillors were on vacation and some worked out of town returning home only on weekends. Others worked in industries such as the fishery and were away for unpredictable periods of time. Two options were available to deal with these absent councillors: either an attempt could be made to have them complete the questionnaire on their own and mail it back, or they could simply be excluded from study. The first option would potentially vitiate one of the aims of using both the interview and mail questionnaire methods of gathering data--that of being able to compare the results. The second option would result in the loss of valuable information, and reduce the possibility of verifying the reliability of the 1973 study sample areas.

The procedure adopted was to leave a questionnaire, letter of explanation, and a pre-stamped envelope at either the home of the absent councillors or with the clerk or manager.¹⁸ These questionnaires were coded to distinguish them from those completed during personal interviews but for most purposes were included in and processed with the general file; although, in testing the reliability of the phase one sample areas they were included with the phase one returns.

Mailed Questionnaires (Phase Two)

The response obtained from the phase one personal interviews could be considered representative of the province as a whole, insofar as the sample areas adapted from the 1973 survey were themselves representative. However, in order to remove any sampling error which may be contained in

¹⁸ A copy of the letter forms Appendix E.

the personal interview data, it was decided to supplement them with a complete study of all municipalities in the province. An added feature of this procedure is that the statistical accuracy of the sampling areas can be checked by comparing the results of both phases.

Using the provincial government's Municipal Directory¹⁹--which lists the type; mailing address; head of council; and clerk, secretary, or manager of each municipality--the same questionnaire forms as used for the personal interviews were mailed out in October 1977, together with letters of explanation and business-reply return envelopes, to every active municipality not covered in phase one.²⁰

One problem that arose during the preparation for phase two was that of determining the number of questionnaires to be mailed to each municipality. Neither the Department of Municipal Affairs nor the Federation of Municipalities maintain records of individual councillors, nor is any calculation of the number of councillors in the province available. With the exception of the two cities, where the number of councillors is set under their respective acts, it is difficult to even estimate the number of councillors since the governing acts provide for a relatively wide range of council members. Towns and Rural Districts may have between "not less than five nor more than ten" members of council;²¹ Local Improvement Districts may have "not less than three and not more than seven" members;²² and Local Government Community councils may be composed of "not fewer than three and not more than five."²³ As Table 2-2

¹⁹Province of Newfoundland, Municipal Directory (Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 1977).

²⁰The letters to the administrative officials and councillors comprise appendices F and G.

²¹Province of Newfoundland, The Local Government Act, 1972, Section 9 (3).

²²Ibid., Section 58 (3).

²³Province of Newfoundland, The Community Councils Act, 1972, Section 5 (5).

indicates, these provisions allow for a total range of councillors of between 1159 and 2205.

Two problems were raised by the relatively large range between allowable upper and lower limits of council membership: first, that of how many questionnaires should be sent to each municipality; second, that of accurately calculating the return rate of the questionnaires. The first problem was handled by basing an estimate on the pattern that emerged from the information gathered in the pre-test and phase one. Towns and Rural Districts tended to have between five and seven members of council, whereas Local Improvement Districts and Local Government Communities each averaged five members. Accordingly, seven questionnaires were sent to each Town and Rural District council and five were sent to each Local Improvement District and Local Government Community. Table 2-3 shows the total number of questionnaires mailed in phase two.

The question of accurately calculating the questionnaire return rate was dealt with by including a question asking the number of council members. A master register was composed which listed each municipality by type, code number, area, and estimated number of councillors. This list was used to record questionnaire returns as they were received, and any adjustments required to bring the estimated number of councillors in line with the actual number as indicated by the returns were made accordingly. For those municipalities from which no replies were received, the original estimate was allowed to stand. The Master Register comprises Appendix H.

In order to ascertain the geographical distribution of the questionnaire returns, it seemed desirable to divide the province into regions. However, no generally accepted standard of division was readily apparent: census tracts were too small as were provincial electoral districts; the federal electoral constituencies were not truly representative of regional divisions; the Department of Municipal Affairs divides the province into only three administrative regions--Eastern, Central, and Western--somewhat too large for the required analysis; other provincial departments have their separate systems of

TABLE 2-2

POTENTIAL RANGE OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS IN NEWFOUNDLAND
UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF PRESENT GOVERNING ACTS

TYPE OF MUNICIPALITY	NUMBER	LOWER LIMIT	LOWEST POTENTIAL NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	UPPER LIMIT	HIGHEST POTENTIAL NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS
City	2	16	16	16	16
Town	118	5	590	10	1180
Rural District	14	5	70	10	140
Local Government Community	129	3	387	5	645
Local Improvement District	32	3	96	7	224
	295		1159		2205

SOURCES: Province of Newfoundland, Department of Municipal Affairs; Municipal Directory (1977); City of St. John's Act, s. 18 (1); City of Corner Brook Act, section 5; The Local Government Act, s. 9 (3) and s. 58 (3); and The Community Councils Act, s. 5 (5).

TABLE 2-3QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED IN PHASE TWO

TYPE OF MUNICIPALITY	NUMBER	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	QUESTION- NAIRES MAILED
Town	106	7	742
Rural District	12	7	84
Local Government Community	116	5	580
Local Improvement District	28	5	140
	262		1546

NOTE: Based on the original calculation of 295 active municipalities less the initial 33 from phase one.

defining regions according to their individual needs and requirements. The Whalen Commission developed a classification of seven regions with twenty-seven sub-regions as a basis for its arguments in favour of regional government. These regions included both incorporated municipalities and unincorporated communities, and the structure was based on the dual criteria of service and efficiency and representation and access.²⁴

All of the foregoing regional classification systems were taken into consideration in drawing up the regional boundaries for this study, however none of them individually fitted the precise criteria desired. The main goal was to divide the province into a sufficient number of regions to enable a means of checking that the questionnaire returns represented a fairly accurate cross-section of the entire province. A secondary consideration was the potential use of regions as an independent variable in subsequent analysis. The criteria used in selecting the region boundaries included geography (Avalon and Burin Peninsulas); existence of consultative municipal groupings (Burin and Great Humber Joint Councils, local economic development associations); self-defining newspapers and tourist brochures (Humber Log, Bonne Bay, Avalon); the desire to avoid splitting the 1973 sample areas; and subjective assessments of cultural differentiations (based on discussions with colleagues and my own observations during phase one travel).

The six regions selected are shown in outline form on the map in Fig 2-2. It is recognized that as Hugh Whalen pointed out "the determination of regions and theory of their basic nature is anything but an exact science,"²⁵ and that another researcher using the same information may come up with somewhat different boundaries; however, for the defined purpose it is believed that the regional demarcations will adequately suffice.

²⁴ Whalen Report, pp. 480-85.

²⁵ Whalen Report, p. 480.

FIGURE 2-2

MAP SHOWING REGIONAL BOUNDARIES FOR THIS STUDY

General Questionnaire Design

Questionnaires can take many forms, and the choice of format, length, question design and sequence, or the use of precoded versus open-ended questions must be guided by the aims of the study, the information sought, the method of administration, and the potential respondents to which it will be directed. Every facet of questionnaire design must be carefully planned, although at each step arguments can be made for and against the inclusion of certain items, the wording of questions, the use of various techniques such as "funnels" or "filters", and generally every aspect of questionnaire construction.

A review of the recent literature on questionnaire design and attitude measurement disclosed that no one "standard" design existed.¹ An analysis of the questionnaires used in other studies of the attitudes and beliefs of the legislators indicated that none was adequately suited to the purposes of this study.² However, some conventional background questions were included and certain questions pertaining to role perceptions were adapted from other studies.

Two questionnaires were used in the research: one for councillors, the other for administrative officials. Initially, there were two reasons for this. First, given the resources committed to this study in terms of both time and funds, it was desirable to gain as much information as possible about the structure and operation of municipalities in the province. On the assumption that administrative officials, such as clerks, town managers, and community council secre-

¹ Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design; pp. 24-80; Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook, Research Methods, pp. 291-330.

² Allan Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), pp. 153-161; Wahlke et. al., The Legislative System (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), pp. 435-504; Heinz Eulau and Kenneth Prewitt, Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973), pp. 617-89; Kenneth Newtown, Second City Politics: Democratic Processes and Decision-Making in Birmingham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), pp. 245-55.

taries, would be a valuable source of information by virtue of their positions and length of service, it was decided to interview these personnel along with the councillors in phase one. Further, since no record was available listing the names of individual councillors, it was necessary to work through the relevant officials in order to have the questionnaires distributed for phase two of the study. Again, the opportunity for the procurement of information presented itself, along with the additional hope that the administrative personnel would take a greater interest in distributing the questionnaires if they too were involved in the study.

Second, by comparing the information provided by administrative officials concerning a municipality's background, structure, and finances, to the answers given to identical questions by the municipality's councillors, it was hoped to be able to measure councillors knowledge of their municipality's operation. The level of knowledge could then have been used as an independent variable in the analysis of representational role perception. No problems with this approach were found in the pilot study,¹ but during phase one it became evident that many councillors, rather than admit they did not know the amount of the budget or the date the municipality was incorporated, would ask the clerk or the manager for the answer.² The validity of this approach having been obviously undermined, it was decided to drop the proposed comparison of administrative and councillor responses and the use of knowledge as an independent variable.

¹For details of the pilot study see below, pp. 23-24.

²Further evidence of this practice was found in the questionnaire returns from phase two where in a number of cases the answers to some of the questions dealing with financial matters were completed in different handwriting to the rest of the questionnaire. In certain cases, where the clerk or manager had returned a questionnaire along with more than one councillor, it was possible to obviously identify the handwriting in all the answers to the financial background questions as that of the administrative official. It should be noted that no such practice was evident in any other section of the questionnaires, although the returns were carefully scrutinized.

- Since only the first reason for the use of the administrative personnel questionnaires remained valid--that of gathering information not of direct relevance to this thesis, it was decided to analyze them separately at a later date.¹ Consequently, the term 'questionnaire' and all subsequent discussion of its construction, administration, and analysis will refer only to the form which pertains to the councillors.

Pilot Study and Pretest

The first version of the questionnaire was developed in spring 1977, and students in my third-year local government class administered it as part of their course work. Each student was required to interview the councillors in one assigned municipality and to write a report on some aspect of their findings. Since the work was scheduled over the mid-term break, a number of students decided to interview the councillors in their own communities outside the St. John's area, thus insuring a fairly dispersed pretest of the questionnaire. The students' interest was primarily that of gaining information about the operation of a specific municipal council and of the attitudes of only a few councillors. My own concern was much broader, and at the end of term an analysis was made of the questionnaire returns as a whole. The findings were reported in a paper presented to the 1977 annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association.²

In administering the pilot study questionnaires, the students had been instructed to carefully note any strong or unusual reactions to particular questions, and any evidence of misunderstanding or confusion concerning the meaning of questions. The student reports, together with suggestions received from the discussant and members of the audience at the CPSA session, were major influences in the

¹The returns from the administrative officials' questionnaires, however, have been coded and the data are stored on discs in SPSS format as subfiles 3 and 4 (API,AM) of the computer file for this project.

²Peter G. Boswell, "Attitudes and Role Perceptions of Local Government Officials in Newfoundland: A Pilot Study," paper delivered to the 1977 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Fredericton, N.B.

subsequent questionnaire revisions.¹ Other changes were suggested, although not always heeded, by colleagues in the department of political science at Memorial University;² and Mr. Peter Withers, Deputy Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs, suggested a number of additional wording changes to make the questionnaire more understandable for all councillors.

The various changes made as a consequence of the pilot study results undoubtedly produced a much improved survey instrument. Perhaps the most important revision was the increased emphasis on the measurement of representative role perception. In the pilot study, only one question had been used to measure this variable, and it was felt that by itself this one question may not be a valid indicator of role perception. Consequently, the revised questionnaire contained a funnelled series of questions directly pertaining to representative role perception. In addition, a series of attitudinal measurement questions was included in order to provide a more substantial base for measuring the central focus of the thesis.

The Final Questionnaire

While the questions dealing with the role perception are further dealt with in Chapter four, it may be helpful to briefly state here the rationale for the rest of the questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire itself forms Appendix I. In order to avoid any suggestion that might be contained in the body of the questionnaire concerning the role or duties of a councillor, and in order to gain further insight

¹Particular thanks are due to Barry Kay, who as discussant at the session made a number of very constructive observations particularly concerning statistical procedures, and to Missy Powell who was then engaged in research with the Robarts Commission in Metro Toronto and who provided many helpful suggestions as well as providing me with a copy of the Commission's questionnaire for municipal councillors and her analysis of the results.

²Mark Graesser, in particular, provided continued encouragement for the study from the beginning and his advice at all stages of the project has been invaluable.

into the respondent's own conception of what being a councillor entailed, two open-ended questions were asked on the instruction page of the questionnaire. The first question asked the respondent to briefly describe what he did as a councillor, and particularly what he considered the most important duties of the job. The second question asked which aspects of being a councillor the respondent particularly liked or disliked. The responses to these questions were not coded, although the case identification number was recorded on each completed sheet and the responses were considered in subsequent analysis.

Section A of the questionnaire was designed to obtain background information about the municipality, and included such items as the type, age, population, number of council members and method of selection, number of employees, frequency of council and committee meetings, and financial information. Section B was designed to gain information about the background of the respondent, and included questions dealing with age, sex, education, municipal experience and details of election, personal and family interest in politics, political aspirations, occupation, club membership, and political affiliation. The questions in these two sections had a dual purpose: first, to provide the data for some of the independent variables which might be expected to explain some of the variance in the dependent variable of representational role perception; second, to provide previously unknown information about municipal councils and councillors in the province.¹

Section C was designed to probe the relations between council, councillors, and the community, and contains questions concerning perceptions of citizens' interest, knowledge, and awareness of council activities, and the respondent's contact both with fellow-councillors and the community. Questions 45 and 45A concerning the selection of the mayor or chairman were included since Newfoundland's municipal legislation allows most municipalities the choice of having the mayor

¹For a summary of the data on councillors see, Peter G. Boswell, "Municipal Councillors in Newfoundland and Labrador," Newfoundland Quarterly, 76, -1 (spring 1980).

directly elected or chosen by council from among their number.¹ Questions 46 and 46A dealing with difficulties in tax collection sought to pinpoint the reasons councillors felt such problems existed.

Questions 51 - 54 were the key questions pertaining to representative role perception. Question 59 was designed to ascertain the respondent's perception of democracy for the dual purposes of providing further information concerning role perceptions, and as an elucidation of the responses to the following question. Question 60 was included in order to determine councillors' views of why local government is necessary.

Section D was aimed at determining the respondent's perception of the most important community issues or problems, how they are brought to the attention of council, the role played by various personnel in their resolution, and the activity of organized community groups.

Although some use is made here of the data in this section, the primary reason for its inclusion was to gain background information about council decision-making processes. Section E explores the relationship between the community and the province, and the attitude of councillors toward some reforms that have been proposed for local government in the province. Here again, the primary function of the section is not directed toward the central focus of the thesis, but as a means of gathering otherwise unavailable information. Section F contains 18 statements, most of which are judged to provide attitude measures of representational role perception. The rest were planned to compare the attitudes of councillors with the attitudes of the general public as measured by the 1973 study.² The last question simply seeks to determine whether the respondent's views about council powers and abilities have changed with incumbency.

Most of the questions were developed specifically for this questionnaire. However, as noted above, some of the questions were adopted or adapted from other questionnaires. In such cases, the

¹ See below, p. 205.

² M. Graesser, 1973 Attitude Survey.

sources are provided at the time the question is first discussed. In all cases, other than for standard background questions, the rationale for the inclusion of each question will be provided at the time of its first analysis.

Data Collection

As indicated in Appendix B, the personal interviews in phase one were conducted in late summer 1977, with the exception of the city of St. John's where the interviews were conducted in fall 1978. Table 2-4 shows the interview completion rate for phase one broken down by type of municipality and region. Some variation is evident in the completion rates between regions, particularly regions 3 and 4. The extremely low response rate from region 3 may be related to the fact that the interviews in that region were assigned to my research assistant. Since she had interviewed all 7 members of her native Grand Falls council in the pilot study, and since she was a resident of the general area, no difficulties were anticipated. However, despite a number of call-back attempts, the results were somewhat disappointing. Whether this was due to a reported male chauvinist attitude toward a female researcher, or simply due to bad luck cannot be verified.¹ At the other extreme is region 4, where personal and fortuitous situational circumstances combined to provide a higher than average completion rate.²

¹This should not be interpreted as any criticism of Ms. Goulding, who was a very competent and hard-working research assistant.

²The fact that a son of one of the councillors had been one of my better students in the previous semester, and that I knew the brother of another councillor facilitated the interviewing in one municipality. In the other case, a chance stop at a service station provided an introduction to a friend of the council chairman who undertook to "round up" the council members. Interviews were then arranged that same evening with councillors whom I had been attempting to locate for two days.

TABLE 2-4.

INTERVIEW COMPLETIONS
PHASE ONE

REGION	TYPE AND NUMBER OF MUNICIPALITIES	NUMBER REPLIED	%	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER REPLIED	%
1	City	1	100	9	7	77.7
	Town	2	100	12	4	33.3
	RD	-	-	-	-	-
	LGC	2	100	10	6	60.0
	LID	-	-	-	-	-
		5	100	31	17	54.8
2	City	-	-	-	-	-
	Town	2	100	14	8	57.1
	RD	2	100	13	7	53.8
	LGC	4	100	18	11	61.1
	LID	2	100	14	10	71.4
		10	100	59	36	61.0
3	City	-	-	-	-	-
	Town	2	100	14	3	21.4
	RD	-	-	-	-	-
	LGC	-	-	-	-	-
	LID	-	-	-	-	-
		2	100	14	3	21.4
4	City	-	-	-	-	-
	Town	1	100	6	4	66.6
	RD	-	-	-	-	-
	LGC	1	100	5	4	80.0
	LID	-	-	-	-	-
		2	100	11	8	72.7
5	City	-	-	-	-	-
	Town	1	100	7	3	42.8
	RD	-	-	-	-	-
	LGC	1	100	5	4	80.0
	LID	-	-	-	-	-
		2	100	12	7	58.3
6	City	1	100	7	6	85.7
	Town	2	50	14	6	42.8
	RD	-	-	-	-	-
	LGC	3	100	15	6	40.0
	LID	2	100	10	3	30.0
		8	87.5	46	21	45.6

Table 2-4 -Continued

SUMMARY

TYPE AND NUMBER OF MUNICIPALITIES	NUMBER		%	NUMBER OF		%
	REPLIED			COUNCILLORS	REPLIED	
City	2	2	100	16	13	81.3
Town	10	9	90	67	28	41.8
RD	2	2	100	13	7	53.8
LGC	11	11	100	53	31	58.5
LID	4	4	100	24	13	54.2
	29	28	96.6	173	92	53.2

NOTE: RD = Rural District
 LGC = Local Government Community
 LID = Local Improvement District

The summary of Table 2-4 indicates very little difference in completion rates between rural districts, local government communities, or local improvement districts. The higher level of responses from the cities can be explained by the greater ease of contacting the councillors; whereas the lower rate of completions for towns is at present unexplained. Overall, the completion rate of 53.3 percent is satisfactory, considering that in most cases call-backs were not possible if some councillors happened to be on vacation or working for extended periods of time away from home. In addition, no substitution of respondents was possible, and reliance on third parties was essential for initial contact and any follow-up. As noted above,¹ a copy of the questionnaire and a covering letter were left for absent councillors. However, no further attempt was made to elicit replies since such responses would not add to the number of personal interview cases.

Table 2-5 shows the questionnaire return rate from phase two broken down by type of municipality and region. While some variation is evident, there are no extreme differences in return rates from either regions or types. The overall return rate of 14.8 percent is rather low, but is the result of two waves of questionnaires. The first wave of questionnaires was sent out in October 1977. Follow-up letters were sent in December, but by early spring 1978 only 168 returns had been received. In an effort to increase this number, a second mailing of questionnaires was sent in May 1978 to all councils from whom no replies had been received. In order to overcome the possibility that because of oversight or non-coöperation on the part of administrative personnel the original questionnaires never actually reached the councillors, the second wave was sent directly to the mayor or chairman of council. A second follow-up letter was sent to the administrative personnel of those councils from whom one or more replies had been received, asking them to remind their councillors of the survey and advising that additional questionnaires were available on request.

¹See above, p. 14.

TABLE 2-5

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS
PHASE TWO

REGION	TYPE AND NUMBER OF MUNICIPALITIES	NUMBER REPLIED	%	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER REPLIED	%	
1	City	-		-			
	Town	39	21	53.8	265	38	14.3
	RD	6	2	33.3	41	6	14.6
	LGC	20	3	15.0	100	3	3.0
	LID	9	2	22.2	47	3	6.4
		74	28	37.8	453	50	11.0
2	City	-		-			
	Town	17	9	52.9	113	21	18.6
	RD	2	2	100.0	14	5	35.7
	LGC	11	3	27.3	54	7	13.0
	LID	2	1	50.0	10	2	20.0
		32	15	46.9	191	35	18.3
3	City	-		-			
	Town	26	17	65.4	182	30	16.5
	RD	2	-	0.0	14	-	0.0
	LGC	34	16	47.0	169	28	16.6
	LID	9	4	44.4	48	10	20.8
		71	37	52.1	413	68	16.5
4	City	-		-			
	Town	9	7	77.8	63	13	20.6
	RD	1	1	100.0	7	1	14.3
	LGC	13	5	38.5	65	9	13.8
	LID	-		-			
		23	13	56.5	135	23	17.0
5	City	-		-			
	Town	9	7	77.8	60	14	23.3
	RD	-		-			
	LGC	30	13	43.3	150	19	12.7
	LID	5	2	40.0	25	3	12.0
		44	22	50.0	235	36	15.3
6	City	-		-			
	Town	8	2	25.0	56	2	3.6
	RD	1	1	100.0	6	2	33.3
	LGC	10	6	60.0	54	10	18.5
	LID	3	2	66.7	15	4	26.7
		22	11	50.0	131	18	13.7

Table 2-5 -Continued

SUMMARY						
TYPE AND NUMBER OF MUNICIPALITIES	NUMBER REPLIED	%	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER REPLIED	%	
City	-		-			
Town	108	63	58.3	739	118	15.9
RD	12	6	50.0	82	14	17.1
LGC	118	46	39.0	592	76	12.8
LID	28	11	39.3	145	22	15.2
	266	126	47.4	1558	230	14.8

The results of this second wave were an additional 62 responses. Table 2-6 illustrates this increase along with the distribution of responses from each wave. Although the total 36.9 percent increase was gratifying, it was decided that any further probable increase would not justify the necessary expense. Consequently, no further effort was made to increase the phase two response rate. Table 2-7 provides the combined interview completions and questionnaire returns from both phases.

TABLE 2-6

INCREASE IN PHASE TWO QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS
FROM FIRST WAVE TO SECOND WAVE

REGION	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER OF REPLIES		TOTAL	PERCENTAGE INCREASE
		FIRST WAVE	SECOND WAVE		
1	453	40	11	51	27.5
2	191	33	3	36	9.1
3	413	42	23	65	54.7
4	135	20	3	23	15.0
5	235	22	13	35	59.1
6	131	11	9	20	81.8
		168	62	230	36.9

Table 2-7

INTERVIEW COMPLETIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS
PHASES ONE AND TWO

REGION	TYPE AND NUMBER OF MUNICIPALITIES	NUMBER REPLIED	%	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER REPLIED	%	
1	City	1	100.0	9	7	77.7	
	Town	41	23	56.1	277	42	15.2
	RD	6	2	33.3	41	6	14.6
	LGC	22	5	22.7	110	9	8.2
	LID	9	2	22.2	47	3	6.4
		79	33	41.8	484	67	13.8
2	City	-	-	-	-	-	
	Town	19	11	57.9	127	29	22.8
	RD	4	4	100.0	27	12	44.4
	LGC	15	7	46.7	72	18	25.0
	LID	4	3	75.0	24	12	50.0
		42	25	59.5	250	71	28.4
3	City	-	-	-	-	-	
	Town	28	19	67.8	196	33	16.8
	RD	2	-	0.0	14	-	0.0
	LGC	34	16	47.1	169	28	16.6
	LID	9	4	44.4	48	10	20.8
		73	39	53.4	427	71	16.6
4	City	-	-	-	-	-	
	Town	10	8	80.0	69	17	24.6
	RD	1	1	100.0	7	1	14.3
	LGC	14	6	42.9	70	13	18.6
	LID	-	-	-	-	-	-
		25	15	60.0	146	31	21.2
5	City	-	-	-	-	-	
	Town	10	8	80.0	67	17	25.4
	RD	-	-	-	-	-	-
	LGC	31	14	45.2	155	23	14.8
	LID	5	2	40.0	25	3	12.0
		46	24	52.2	247	43	17.4
6	City	1	1	100.0	7	6	85.7
	Town	10	3	30.0	70	8	11.4
	RD	1	1	100.0	6	2	33.3
	LGC	13	9	69.2	69	16	23.2
	LID	5	4	80.0	25	7	28.0
		30	18	60.0	177	39	22.0

Table 2-7 -Continued

<u>SUMMARY</u>						
TYPE AND NUMBER OF MUNICIPALITIES		NUMBER REPLIED	%	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER REPLIED	%
City	2	2	100.0	16	13	81.3
Town	118	72	61.0	806	146	18.1
RD	14	8	57.1	95	21	22.1
LGC	129	57	44.2	645	107	16.6
LID	32	15	46.9	169	35	20.7
	295	154	52.2	1731	322	18.6

Coding and Data Preparation

As interviews were completed and questionnaires returned, the responses were coded by either myself or one of my two research assistants.¹ In order to save time and reduce the possibility of coder error, as many questions as possible were precoded. For the open-ended questions, standard coding categories were used where possible; for the balance, I drew up a coding format which was then applied by the research assistants. In order to ensure consistent perceptions of coding categories and responses, a standard inter-coder reliability test was undertaken between each research assistant and myself.² As a further precaution all coding was checked by myself prior to keypunching.

After the coding had been completed the data were keypunched, verified, and listed, then checked once again for any coding or keypunching errors. An SPSS file was then created for the data with four subfiles: API, containing the data from the personal interviews with administrative personnel; AM, consisting of the data from the mail questionnaires completed by administrators; CPI, comprising phase one personal interview data from councillors; and CM, composed of data from councillors who completed the phase two mail questionnaires. Only the latter two sub-files, CPI and CM, are used in this study.

Data Reliability

There is no universally-accepted standard for questionnaire completion and return rates. A review of the literature on survey research methodology indicates a variety of views on the question of

¹Ms. Kendra Goulding, April 1977 to September 1977; and Mr. Paul McDonald, October 1977 to September 1978.

²In each case, 9 questionnaires were selected at random and 10 questions (numbers 23, 24, 29, 36, 46, 48, 59, 63, 80, 81) were separately coded by the research assistant and myself. The results were then compared with the following results: in Ms. Goulding's case there was an inter-coder reliability rate of 97.2% and in Mr. McDonald's case the rate was 96.8%.

what may be considered "acceptable" rates of return and data bases.¹ Since the adequacy and reliability of the data are of crucial importance to the confidence which can be placed in the outcome of the study, this section will examine the data to be used in this study in order to determine its reliability as a base on which to conduct further analysis.

There are two distinct, but inter-related, facets of data reliability: size of data base and sample representivity. For the purposes of this study, the optimum data base would obviously have been the entire population of 1,731 councillors. However, as indicated in the summary on Table 2-7, only 322 responses were received, an overall percentage of 18.6. Broken down by personal interview completions and mailed questionnaire responses, 92 out of 173 (53.2%) councillors were interviewed, and 230 out of 1,558 (14.8%) councillors responded to the mail questionnaires.

The first question, then, concerns the overall sufficiency of the number of cases. In comparison with other studies of a similar nature, the absolute number of cases is quite congruent. Kenneth Newton's study of councillors in Birmingham, England, consisted of 66 cases; the Urban Governors series of studies in California had a data base of 365 cases; and Gunlicks study of local councillors in West Germany was based on a total of 92 interviews.² The range of cases in

¹See Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioural Research, pp. 127-9; Selltitz, Wrightsman, and Cook, Research Methods, pp. 105-112 and 512-40; Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, 3rd ed., (New York: David McKay Co., 1977), pp. 73-83; Smith, et. al., Political Research Methods, pp. 155-65.

²Kenneth Newton, Second City Politics: Democratic Processes and Decision-Making in Birmingham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); Heinz Eulau and Kenneth Prewitt, Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1973); Arthur B. Gunlicks, "Representative Role Perceptions Among Local Councillors in Western Germany," Journal of Politics 31 (1969), pp. 443-64.

studies of role perceptions at senior levels of government tends to fall within similar parameters.¹ The total of 322 cases is also more than adequate for the statistical analysis to which the data will be subjected.

The second question, that of the degree to which the 322 respondents can be considered representative of the entire population of 1,731, presents a greater challenge. If variables such as age, sex, length of municipal service, education, or primary employment categories were known for all councillors, then it would be a simple matter to compare the respondents with the entire population of councillors. Unfortunately, neither the Department of Municipal Affairs nor the Federation of Municipalities have any biographical data on the province's councillors.² Further, no other study of councillors in the province has been undertaken that could serve as a base for comparison.³ Nor would census data be of any use, since it cannot be assumed that municipal councillors are significantly more representative of the general population than are members of parliament or provincial assemblies.⁴

This difficulty was anticipated and, in fact, provided for in the original research design. As discussed above,⁵ the areas in Phase One derived from a stratified two-stage probability sample process, and were accepted by the Whalen Commission and York University's Institute for Behavioural Research as being statistically representative of the province as a whole. The modifications made to these sample areas for this study were designed to introduce a control for type of muni-

¹ For example, Harold D. Clark's recent publication, "The Ideological Self-Perceptions of Provincial Legislators," Canadian Journal of Political Science 11 (September 1978), pp. 617-33, used a data base of 252; Robert D. Putman had a data base of 176 for The Beliefs of Politicians: Ideology, Conflict, and Democracy in Britain and Italy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973); Allan Kornberg interviewed 165 Members of Parliament for his Canadian Legislative Behaviour: A Study of the 25th Parliament (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967).

² Discussions held prior to the start of the study in 1977 with Mr. P. G. Withers, Deputy Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs, indicated that no such biographical information existed in the Department's files. In fact, he expressed a great interest in finding out such information. Discussions in February 1979 with Mr. Art Brown, Director of Local Government Administration for the province, confirmed that no biographical or background information yet existed, beyond a rather incomplete list of names. Mr. W. B. Titford, Executive Director of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities, also advised that the Federation had no such information.

³Some aspects of councillors' backgrounds were presented in the report of the Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador; but these findings are not useful for this study since they were examples chosen from available data, and were not assumed to be statistically representative of the entire population of councillors.

⁴See R. Van Loon and M. S. Whittington, The Canadian Political System: Environment, Structure and Process, 2nd. ed., (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1976), pp. 329-31.

⁵See pp. 9ff.

icipality, and should not have affected the representativity of the sample areas as a whole. By comparing the variable means of returns, from phase one with those from phase two, it should be possible to estimate the reliability of the data insofar as the representative nature of the returns is concerned.¹

Details of the procedure used and the results are contained in Appendix J. In summary, when the means of each of the 121 variables contained in the two samples were compared 99 (81.8%) were shown to have no statistically significant difference and could therefore be assumed to have come from the same population. Arguments are presented to show that the statistically different means observed in a further 15 variables (12.4%) can be logically explained, and those of 4 variables surmised, leaving only 3 with no explanation for the difference of means. On the basis of the evidence presented, it seems reasonable to conclude that the two samples can be deemed to have come from the same population.

Further, since the personal interviews were conducted in randomly-chosen sample areas, it can be argued that the relatively low response rate encountered in the mail questionnaire sample has not affected the reliability of the data. Had there been a response bias, we would not have expected such a high level of congruence on the variable means between the two samples.

The difference of means test results may also be taken as further evidence that the sample areas which were used for the 1973 attitude survey were in fact representative of the entire province. This finding may be of significance for future research. For the purposes of the present study, however, the main advantage of the results is that both samples can now be pooled for further analysis, providing a sufficiently large data base for investigation.

¹This is very similar to the procedure used by Newton to compare the social, political and financial characteristics of Birmingham to those of a larger study of English and Welsh county boroughs. Kenneth Newton, Second City Politics, pp. 4-5..

It is of particular interest to note that the conclusion reached here closely parallels that of Caputo and Cole, who argued that very little response bias is evident in samples generated by mailed questionnaires.¹ Their study of four questionnaire surveys of chief administrative officials in American cities concluded that:

...officials replying to these four mailed surveys respond in a generally random and unbiased fashion... These findings, considered with other studies reporting similar results, increase our confidence in the randomness of responses to mailed questionnaires. This is especially true of questionnaire surveys of public officials...²

Their article, in which previous studies by others along the same lines are cited, casts doubt on the artificially high response rate which most methodology texts insist is necessary to avoid response bias in mail questionnaires. The results obtained in the present study would seem to lend support to the arguments that low response rates in a mailed questionnaire do not necessarily imply significant response bias.³

¹David A. Caputo and Richard L. Cole, "City Officials and Mailed Questionnaires: An Investigation of the Response Bias Assumption," Political Methodology, IV, 3 (1977), pp. 271-87.

²Ibid., p. 283.

³The pursuit of this argument is not central to the focus of this thesis, but it is intended to further develop and test the results which have been obtained. One potential method that might be used is to personally interview a random sample of councillors from among municipalities from which no replies were received to the mail questionnaire.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE PERCEPTION

The existing literature on representational role perception will be reviewed and analyzed in this chapter. First, the concepts of role and representational role style will be explored with a view to clarifying them for use in this study. Second, previous studies at the federal or national, provincial or state, and local levels of government will be summarized, and their findings compared. Finally, consideration will be given to the various questions used in the studies cited to determine representational role perceptions.

The term 'role' has many meanings ranging from the colloquial "taking a part" to the more precise usage of structural-functionalism. The concept has been widely used in the social sciences to examine and explain the behaviour of individuals in various situations and occupations--from parent to teacher, from president to voter.

A general definition of role is that of "the behaviour expected of the occupant of a given position or status."¹ A distinction is often made between role expectations and role performance.² Merton and others have expanded the general concept to encompass sets or networks

¹International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (1968), v. 13, "Role: Psychological Aspects," by Theodore R. Sarbin.

²Ralph Ruddock, Roles and Relationships (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 16.

of roles, and numerous studies of role interrelationships now exist.¹ Role analysis has been applied to many areas of life and terms such as 'role-sets', 'role-conflict', 'role-integration', and 'role-congruity' have become fairly common in social science literature.²

However, the aspect of role theory most pertinent to this study is that concerning its applicability to the legislative process. In this context, the definition of role provided by Wahlke is a useful starting point:

Role, for any individual legislator, refers to a coherent set of "norms" of behaviour which are thought by those involved in the interactions being viewed, to apply to all persons who occupy the position of legislator.³

Two aspects of this definition are of particular note. First, that the norms of behaviour are considered to be a coherent set--that is, they must make logical sense not only individually, but as a whole. This is similar to the concept of ideology where it is expected that particular beliefs or attitudes will form a closely-related set.⁴ It follows that if the concept of role, as it will be explored in this work, is to have any explanatory value for the attitudes of local councillors, then there must be an internal consistency in individual perceptions of roles. Second, the norms of behaviour are not those of the general public, but

¹Michael Banton, Roles: An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations (New York: Basic Books, 1965), pp. 21-29; also, John A. Jackson, "Role: Editorial Introduction," in Role, ed. J. A. Jackson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 1-9.

²A useful overview of recent developments in the field of role analysis is found in Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, eds., Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: Wiley, 1966).

³John C. Wahlke et al., The Legislative System: Explorations in Legislative Behaviour (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), p. 8.

⁴John Plamenatz, Ideology, Key Concepts in Political Science (London: Macmillan, 1971), p. 15.

those of the legislators themselves. This is not to suggest that the legislators are unaffected by the views of their constituents concerning their roles, for undoubtedly they are; rather, the implication is that the legislators' norms of behaviour are developed and conditioned primarily by their own expectations and experience of their positions as legislators.¹

A third aspect of Wahlke's definition is of less value; in fact, it runs counter to the focus of this inquiry. Whereas Wahlke considers the norms to be applicable universally, "to apply to all persons who occupy the position of legislator," the concern here is more of an individual one. Although we will seek to determine the individual councillor's general view of representational role as it applies to all councillors, the main focus will be on the variables which affect each councillor's individual perception of his own role.

Further, Wahlke seems to be overlooking the effects that structure, or the institutional framework, can have on the norms of behaviour. It could plausibly be argued that structural differences are one of the reasons for the wide range of representational role styles found in the literature. In fact, in seeking to explain some differences in the role style perceptions of Canadian legislators as compared to their American counterparts, Kornberg pursued this line of reasoning.²

¹The effect of experience on role perceptions will be considered below in chapter four.

²Allan Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour: A Study of the 25th Parliament (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), pp. 109-115.

A more useful general definition of the term role for the purposes of this study is:

Role, for any individual councillor, refers to a coherent set of attitudes and norms of behaviour which forms the basis for actions undertaken in pursuit of his activities as a councillor.

But this definition must be narrowed further, since only one aspect of role analysis--the councillor's perception of his role as representative--will be examined here. Thus, although the theoretical base derives from attempts to understand the legislative process, the present aim is not to explain the process of legislative policy-making at the municipal level, but to examine the representative role perceptions of the councillors.

Further, in an institutional setting in which virtually all the legislators (councillors) are elected or appointed "at large," only one branch of representational role style is pertinent. The distinction Edmund Burke drew between local and national interest, has engendered the study of areal focus as an integral part of the overall study of representational roles.¹ However, in the particular geographical, structural and systemic context of this study, the areal focus is of little use. The local/national dichotomy which forms an important part of studies at the senior levels of government is not appropriate for small municipalities, very few of which even have a ward system of election.²

¹ Edmund Burke, The Works of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke, F. W. Rafferty, vol. 2: "Speech to the Electors of Bristol" (London: Oxford University Press, 1906), pp. 163-5.

² Neither St. John's nor Corner Brook have a ward system, although a few of the towns and rural districts do. But even in these cases, the population and area are so small as to render the areal focus inapplicable.

However, Burke's contention that the representative cannot be bound by instructions, but must be guided by "...unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience...",¹ has not only provided the basis for much discussion of the role of the representative in democratic theory,² but has generated a number of studies concerned specifically with representational style. Many of these studies, though, have combined the areas and style foci; but as Wahlke points out, Burke's linkage of areal focus and representational style constituted a "special case" of relationship which has been considerably modified by subsequent developments in political life which tend to blur the distinction between the two concepts.³ In a similar vein, a recent reevaluation of Burke's concept of representation suggests the danger of misinterpreting Burke by applying his theory to contemporary politics without due regard for the political milieu of the period in which he wrote.⁴

Conniff's caution is well-advised, and may even be extended to apply to other systems and levels of government than that of which Burke wrote. But, on the other hand, it would be unwise to reject an approach which is proving useful in a conceptual understanding of how legislators behave, simply on the grounds that conditions have changed since the concept was first developed. Of course, the question may be

¹Burke, Works, p. 164.

²See particularly Hanna Pitkin, The Concept of Representation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), Chapter 8.

³Eulau, Legislative System, p. 272.

⁴James Conniff, "Burke, Bristol, and the Concept of Representation," Western Political Quarterly, 30 (September 1977): 340-341.

raised of just how useful the concept of representational role perception actually is. This will be explored later, both in terms of the approach generally, and specifically as applied to the municipal level.¹ At this point it will merely be noted that Eulau and his colleagues regarded the approach as an alternative or supplement to roll-call voting analysis in the study of legislators.² If the approach proves transferable to the municipal level, it may be particularly valuable in the study of legislators in the majority of smaller local governments where a tradition of roll-call voting has not evolved. In addition, Jewell noted that it is important to explore the sources of roles, since knowing why legislators differ in their role concepts can increase our explanations of the legislative process.³

Representative Role Style

Thusfar, representative roles have been discussed in fairly general terms, although a distinction has been drawn between areal focus and representative style. This latter concept is sometimes referred to as "role orientation," and has been defined by Jewell as being "a distinct pattern of norms making up a particular role."⁴ It has been common practice to group these norms into three clusters: trustee, delegate, and politico.

¹This question will be pursued in detail in chapter five.

²Eulau, Legislative System, p. 240.

³Malcolm E. Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants of Legislative Behaviour: The Utility of Role Analysis," in Allan Kornberg and Lloyd D. Musolf, eds., Legislatures in Developmental Perspective (Durham: Duke University Press, 1970), p. 461.

⁴Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," p. 463.

The trustee style refers to a legislator who, in deciding how to vote on any given issue, views himself in the Burkean tradition as a free agent acting on the basis of his own judgement and perception of what is best for the community, regardless of his constituents' views. The delegate style is assigned to a legislator who would vote in accordance with what he perceived to be his constituents' wishes, regardless of whether he personally agreed with them or not.

There is some variation, but little disagreement, in the literature on these definitions of trustee and delegate role style.¹ But not all legislators easily fit within these two ideal extremes. Consequently, a third cluster has been developed to encompass those who cannot be categorized as either a trustee or delegate. Generally referred to as the politico style, this third category applies to legislators, who for various reasons, fall between the trustee and delegate styles. Such legislators may adopt different styles depending on the particular issue involved or on their perception of the salience of the issue to their constituents. Eulau referred to the politicos as overlapping the trustee and delegate roles since some legislators may take both roles simultaneously or serially.² However, there is some disagreement among researchers about the validity of the politico category. Janda, for instance, argues that it should not be used since not only is its meaning unclear, but legislators who do not fit in either

¹ See for instance Wahlke et al., Legislative System, pp. 272-276; Kornberg, Legislative Behaviour, p. 106; and Charles G. Bell and Charles Price, "Prelegislative Sources of Representational Roles," Midwest Journal of Political Science 13 (May 1964); pp. 254-270.

² Eulau et al., Legislative System, p. 278.

the trustee or delegate role may really be indicating a complete absence of any role orientation.¹

Summary of Previous Findings

Studies of representative role perceptions have been conducted at the federal, provincial or state, and local levels of government. Although some work has been undertaken in other countries, the bulk of such research has been done in the United States and Canada. For the purpose of comparison, the findings will be summarized here by level of government analyzed, and will be presented in chronological order by date of publication.²

Federal or National Level

Despite the fact that representational role analysis was first developed in the United States, more studies have been undertaken at the federal level in Canada than at the national level in the United States. The pioneering work in Canada was that of Allan Kornberg who studied the members of the 25th Parliament.³ In order to ascertain the representative role style of his respondents, Kornberg asked one question: "What do you think your representational role entails?" The responses to this

¹ Mentioned in Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants" p. 488.

² All studies which could be traced through footnotes, references in other studies, manual and computer searches of the relevant indices have been included when their content was deemed applicable to this study. In some cases, where research touched only tangentially on representational style or where data were not provided in sufficient detail, the results were not included in this summary, although other references to such studies may be found elsewhere in this thesis.

³ Allan Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour: A Study of the 25th Parliament (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967).

question were coded and sorted into the three clusters of trustee, politico, and delegate-servant.¹ In their study of the MPs in the 28th Parliament, Kornberg and Mishler used twelve of the answers provided in response to the role style question in the 1967 study to construct a more sophisticated measurement of role styles.² Although the results of the two studies are not directly comparable, primarily because the later study provides no cumulative findings, it is interesting to note that the role style perceptions of MPs in the 28th Parliament differ remarkably from those in the 25th Parliament. As shown in Table 3-1 the 1967 study showed the most prevalent role style to be that of delegate-servant (49%). In the 1976 study, we find that "The great majority of MPs, regardless of party, preferred the Politico role . . ."³ Kornberg and Mishler neither note nor try to explain this difference.

As part of their study of the House of Commons for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Hoffman and Ward asked eight questions of their respondents in an effort to categorize their representative role styles.⁴ Overall they found a fairly even split among the three role types, although they divided the delegate style into "constituency" delegate and "party" delegate. Taken together, the delegate styles accounted for 30 percent, the trustee style for 33 percent, and the "mixed" (politico) style for 36 percent.⁵

¹Ibid., pp. 106-108.

²Allan Kornberg and William Mishler, Influence in Parliament: Canada (Durham: Duke University Press, 1976), p. 87.

³Kornberg and Mishler, Influence in Parliament, p. 101.

⁴David Hoffman and Norman Ward, Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the Canadian House of Commons. Documents of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, volume 3 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970).

⁵These percentages were calculated from Tables IV.2 and IV.3, Hoffman and Ward, *ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

While most studies of representational role styles seek to explain representative styles by reference to background variables, Jack Cramer focussed on post-incumbency socialization in his 1970 study of 103 Canadian members of Parliament.¹ Although he provided no details of either his question or coding criteria, he introduced a fourth category which he described as "mixed." It is not clear, however, just what this category means, beyond the sparse description of legislators who have "no trend."² Nor is it clear how those in the mixed category differ from the politicians "non-commitment."³ Cramer's overall findings, as shown in Table 3-1, differ significantly from the findings of other studies of Canadian M.P.'s, with a much lower percentage of delegates (4%) and a somewhat higher proportion of trustees (40%).⁴

Price, Clarke, and Krause were concerned with both pre- and post-incumbency role socialization in their 1974 study of 47 freshmen members of parliament.⁵ And while they did not seek to classify their respondents into the traditional representative role styles, they did note that "the emphasis on constituency in the data in this study are

¹ Jack S. Cramer, "Parliamentary Experience and Legislative Behaviour," in Foundations of Political Culture: Political Socialization in Canada, eds. Jon H. Pammett and Michael S. Whittington (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976), pp. 195-210.

² Ibid., p. 201.

³ Ibid., pp. 200-201.

⁴ Ibid., p. 201.

⁵ Richard G. Price, Harold D. Clarke, and Robert M. Krause, "The Socialization of Freshman Legislators: The Case of Canadian M.P.'s," in Foundations of Political Culture: Political Socialization in Canada, eds. Jon H. Pammett and Michael S. Whittington (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976), pp. 211-238.

congruent with Kornberg's earlier observation that the predominant representational role style among members of Parliament is that of delegate-servant."¹

Surprisingly, there have been very few published studies of representative role styles at the federal, or national, level in the United States. In one of two such studies, Roger Davidson conducted 116 personal interviews with members of the House of Representatives during 1963-64.² Only 87 responses were "usable" for determination of representational style, and of these, Davidson calculated that 28 percent were trustees, 23 percent were delegates, and 46 percent were politicians.³ It is not really clear how the respondents were categorized into the various role styles, since the criteria used for coding responses to the open-ended question apparently used for that purpose are not provided.

The only other published study specifically examining representational role style at the American national level, is that of Donald Gross.⁴ In reanalyzing some of the data collected by Miller and Stokes in 1958, Gross examines the relationship between representational styles

¹ Ibid., p. 215.

² Roger Davidson, The Role of the Congressman (New York: Pegasus, 1969).

³ No further information on coding criteria could be found in an earlier work stemming out of the same study, Roger H. Davidson, David M. Kovenock, and Michael K. O'Leary, Congress in Crisis: Politics and Congressional Reform (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966). The interview schedule was, however, included in both works.

⁴ Donald A. Gross, "Representative Styles and Legislative Behaviour," Western Political Quarterly, 31 (September 1978): 359-71.

TABLE 3-1
 REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES AT THE FEDERAL AND NATIONAL LEVEL
 A SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STUDIES
 (By percentage)

Study	Year	Country	Delegate	Politico	Trustee	Other	N
Kornberg	1967	Canada	49	36	15	—	165
Davidson	1969	USA	23	46	28	3 ^a	87
Hoffman & Ward	1970	Canada	30	36	33	—	115
Cramer	1976	Canada	4	39	40	17 ^b	97
Kornberg & Mishler	1976	Canada	c	c	c	c	189
Gross	1978	USA	20	44	36	—	109

a "undetermined"

b "mixed"

c details not provided by authors

SOURCES: Provided in text

and legislative behaviour. His criteria for role allocation are clearly set out; of the total (unweighted) 109 cases, 20 percent were judged to be delegates, 44 percent politicians, and 36 percent trustees.¹

State or Provincial Level

Studies of representational role styles at the provincial and state levels are much more numerous than those at the federal and national level, particularly in the United States. It is not clear whether this is the result of a more conducive research milieu, in terms of easier access to legislators or geographical proximity, or because the analytic concepts were first developed through use at the state level. Given the lack of comparative analysis, it would appear that the latter possibility is not likely. In fact, one of the most striking aspects of the literature is the absence in most of the research of any attempt to compare findings from one study with those of previous studies.²

The first published study of representational role styles was a 1959 article by Eulau, Wahlke, Buchanan and Ferguson.³ One of the few studies to employ a comparative approach, this forerunner of their more celebrated book, introduced the representative role style categories which were to serve as the model for much subsequent research. Personal

¹Ibid., p. 362.

²Some notable exceptions are: Malcolm E. Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants" and Frederick J. Fletcher and Arthur M. Goddard, "Government and Opposition: Structural Influences on Provincial Legislators," Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November 1978): 647-69.

³Heinz Eulau et al., "The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Representation of Edmund Burke," American Political Science Review 53 (September 1959): 742-56.

interviews were conducted with a total of 474 legislators in four American states. 295 respondents provided answers suitable for determining representative role styles. These styles were categorized on the basis of responses to one open-ended question which asked the respondent to describe the job of being a legislator.¹ The findings for the individual legislatures are listed in Table 3-2, but overall Eulau and his associates found that 63 percent of the respondents chose the trustee role style, 14 percent chose the delegate, and 23 percent were classified as politicians.²

The next study to examine the concept of legislative representation was that of Wilder Crane, who compared the votes of Wisconsin legislators on a daylight saving bill with the subsequent ratification vote by their constituents.³ Crane found an 85 percent agreement between the legislators and their constituents⁴; and as the result of follow-up interviews with 80 legislators, he concluded that there had been a conscious assumption by the legislators of what he termed a "delegate" role.⁵ It should be noted that Crane provided no categorical description of his "delegate" role, and was apparently unaware of the recently-published work by Eulau and his colleagues.

¹Ibid., p. 749.

²Ibid., p. 751.

³Wilder W. Crane, Jr., "Do Representatives Represent?" Journal of Politics 22 (May 1960): 295-99.

⁴Ibid., p. 296.

⁵Ibid., p. 298.

In 1962, Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan, and Ferguson published their pathbreaking study The Legislative System.¹ Their examination of legislators in the states of California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Tennessee became the standard work on representational role analysis and is referred to throughout this thesis. Their findings will not be noted here, however, since they were mentioned in the discussion of their 1959 paper.

Sorauf's study of state legislators and defeated candidates in Pennsylvania was primarily concerned with the role of political parties in the representation process, especially in recruitment and voting.² He did, however, ask the 106 legislators several questions pertaining to their representational role style. He found 31 percent classifiable as delegates, 33 percent as trustees, and 27 percent as politicians; one respondent could not be classified.³

Friedman and Stokes used the opportunity of a 1961 constitutional convention in the state of Michigan to compare the representational role perceptions of 100 appointed delegates to the convention with those of 91 state legislators.⁴ To determine representational role style, they used two open-ended questions,⁵ and concluded that the two sets of respondents were remarkably similar in their views on this dimension.

¹John C. Wahlke et al., The Legislative System (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962).

²Frank J. Sorauf, Party and Representation: Legislative Politics in Pennsylvania (New York: Atherton Press, 1963).

³Ibid., p. 124.

⁴Robert S. Friedman and Sybil L. Stokes, "The Role of Constitution-Maker as Representative," Midwest Journal of Political Science 9 (May 1965): 148-66.

⁵Ibid., p. 160.

Of the appointed convention delegates, 72 percent were classified as trustees, 2 percent as "unable to choose," and 20 percent as delegates. The representational styles of 6 percent could not be ascertained. For the legislators, 66 percent were classified as trustees, 4 percent as "unable to choose," 26 percent as delegates, and 2 percent as "not ascertained."¹ For the purposes of comparison, only the data for the legislators is listed on Table 3-2; although it should also be borne in mind that the situation studied by Friedman and Stokes was unique, and the questions were specifically oriented to the constitutional convention.

Robert Huckshorn interviewed 96 Idaho state legislators in his study of perceived influences on decision-making.² One of his variables was the attitude of legislators toward their constituents, and to measure this he asked his respondents four agree-disagree questions.³ Huckshorn's presentation of the data is somewhat confusing, since no attempt was made to build an index based on these questions, nor were conflicting double-responses excluded. This latter difficulty has rendered the data unusable for comparative purposes, although it is of interest to note that 52 percent of the respondents were classified as having a delegate representative role style (based on their agreement with one question), and 54 percent were classified as having a trustee (or "agent") style (based on their agreement with a second question).⁴

¹Ibid.

²Robert L. Huckshorn, "Decision-Making Stimuli in the State Legislative Process," Western Political Quarterly 18 (March 1965): 164-85.

³Ibid., p. 166.

⁴Ibid.

In his 1970 article summarizing previous representational role studies,¹ Jewell refers to an unpublished 1967 paper by Ronald Hedlund which examines legislative socialization and role orientations in the state of Iowa.² Unfortunately, it has not been possible to obtain a copy of this paper, however, the study's relationships between representational role style and background characteristics as reported by Jewell will be utilized in later analysis.³ The articles by Hedlund and Friesema which are discussed below apparently draw on the same data, as does a more recent book written by the three primary researchers in the project.⁴

A second work published in 1967 was that of Norman Meller, who reported the results of his studies in the American Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.⁵ In light of the Wahlke, Eulau studies, Meller re-analyzed data collected some years previously, and calculated that in the newly-formed Congress of Micronesia, 69 percent of the 32 members who responded fell into the trustee category, 25 percent into the politico category, and 6 percent into the delegate category.⁶ In the Truk District Legislature 46 percent of the 26 respondents were identified as trustees, 31 percent as politicos, 19 percent as delegates,

¹Malcolm E. Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," pp. 460-500.

²Ibid., p. 471.

³See Chapter Four.

⁴Samuel C. Patterson, Ronald D. Hedlund, and Robert G. Boynton, Representatives and Represented (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975).

⁵Norman Meller, "Representational Role Types: A Research Note," American Political Science Review 61 (March 1967): 474-77.

⁶Ibid., p. 475.

while 4 percent could not be determined.¹ Although not of direct relevance to this thesis, it is interesting to note that Meller also asked his respondents to assess their constituents' perception of what their representational role styles should be. Not surprisingly, he found that the legislators thought that their constituents would prefer them to act as delegates to a greater degree than they themselves felt they should.²

In order to test the hypothesis that "life experience prior to legislative service is related to the representational role played during such service," Bell and Price conducted interviews with 31 freshmen-elect California legislators prior to service in the Assembly and again after one year's service.³ Using three of the questions originally designed by Wahlke plus one of their own, they found that while there was not much overall change between pre-legislative and post-legislative role style perceptions, those who did change were more likely to shift toward the trustee role.⁴ Before entering the Assembly, 10 percent of the 31 respondents were classified as trustees, 65 percent as politicians, and 26 percent as delegates. This compares with 29 percent trustee, 55 percent politician, and 16 percent delegate, after one year of service.⁵

¹Ibid., p. 476.

²Ibid., pp. 475-76.

³Charles G. Bell and Charles M. Price, "Pre-Legislative Sources of Representational Roles," Midwest Journal of Political Science 13 (May 1969): 254-70.

⁴Ibid., p. 264.

⁵Ibid., p. 262.

The first study of representational role styles held by Canadian provincial legislators was D. E. Smith's series of interviews with 50 Saskatchewan MLA's.¹ In order to determine their role styles, Smith asked 10 open-ended questions, and classified the responses into 4 categories. He found 12 percent to be trustees, 14 percent constituency delegates, 46 percent party delegates, and 28 percent mixed.²

In their study of how accurately legislators perceive views held by their constituents, Hedlund and Friesema interviewed 177 Iowa state legislators and asked them to predict their own district's vote and the general state vote on four constitutional amendments.³ The accuracy of the legislators' predictions was crosstabulated with a number of independent variables, including representational role styles. To measure representational role style, Hedlund and Friesema used one open-ended question adapted from Eulau. They classified 25 percent of their respondents as delegates, 23 percent as politicians, and 52 percent as trustees. It is interesting to note that they found delegates were least able to predict constituency opinion, while trustees were best able to predict their constituents' views.⁴

¹D. E. Smith, "The Recruitment, Role Perceptions and Political Attitudes of Saskatchewan M.L.A.s," paper presented at the 42nd annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, University of Manitoba, June 1970.

²Ibid., p. 21.

³Donald D. Hedlund and H. Paul Friesema, "Representatives' Perceptions of Constituency Opinion," in Public Opinion and Public Policy, ed. Norman R. Luttwig (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1974), pp. 396-412. (Originally published in Journal of Politics, 34, 3 (August 1972), pp. 730-52.) Some further conclusions from the Hedlund and Friesema study were contained in H. Paul Friesema and Ronald D. Hedlund, "The Reality of Representational Roles," Public Opinion and Public Policy, pp. 413-17.

⁴Hedlund and Friesema, "Representatives' Perceptions," p. 405.

Bryan Jones' study of 94 Texas legislators was aimed at measuring responsiveness and testing the relationship between electoral competitiveness and representivity.¹ Representational role style was measured by combining the answers to two Guttman scaled questions, and he found 51 percent to be delegates, 29 percent politicians, and 20 percent trustees.²

Clarke, Price and Krause conducted a mail survey of all Canadian MLAs (except cabinet members) in order to test three hypotheses concerning constituency service.³ One of these hypotheses pertained to the relationship between representational role style and constituency service, and individual role styles were calculated from answers to two questions about the importance of constituents' opinions and personal judgement. The representational role styles of the 248 respondents were: 16 percent delegate-servants, 60 percent politico, and 24 percent trustees.⁴

In a 1977 article, Clarke and Price reported the results of their interviews with 47 "freshmen" MPs.⁵ The study does not directly

¹ Bryan D. Jones, "Competitiveness, Role Orientations, and Legislative Responsiveness," Journal of Politics 35 (November 1973): 924-47.

² Ibid., p. 940. Only 65 of the 94 legislators interviewed could be classified as to representational role style.

³ Harold D. Clarke, Richard G. Price, and Robert Krause, "Constituency Service Among Canadian Provincial Legislators: Basic Findings and a Test of Three Hypotheses," Canadian Journal of Political Science 8 (December 1975): 520-42.

⁴ Ibid., p. 534.

⁵ Harold D. Clarke and Richard G. Price, "A Note on the Pre-Nomination Role Socialization of Freshmen Members of Parliament," Canadian Journal of Political Science 10 (June 1977): 391-406.

relate to this thesis, since the purpose was to investigate the pre-nomination role socialization process, and does not refer directly to representational role styles. It is of interest, however, since it discusses political socialization and involvement prior to holding office--an aspect that will be examined later.¹

Hadley's 1977 article combines interviews with 99 Indiana State legislators with their roll-call voting records on a number of bills.² Representational role style was based on a scale created from the responses to three questions, but the distribution of role styles is not reported. The study is of importance, however, since it seeks to explore the actual affect of role orientations on legislative behaviour.

A similar attempt to link representational role orientations to actual legislative behaviour was reported by Kuklinski and Elling in 1977.³ In their study of 54 California legislators, they assessed role orientations on the basis of one open-ended question, performed a factor analysis of referenda and initiative issues, and studied all roll-call votes during 1973. Their overall findings will be discussed in Chapter Five, but noted here that they found 22 percent of California assemblymen could be classified as delegates, 33 percent as politicians, and 45 percent as trustees.⁴

¹See Chapter Four.

²David J. Hadley, "Legislative Role Orientations and Support for Party and Chief Executive in the Indiana House," Legislative Studies Quarterly 2 (August 1977): 309-35.

³James H. Kuklinski and Richard C. Elling, "Representational Role, Constituency Opinion, and Legislative Roll-Call Behaviour," American Journal of Political Science 21 (February 1977): 135-47.

⁴Ibid., p. 143.

Using data from the 1975 survey which he conducted with Price and Krause, Clarke subsequently focussed on the determinants of constituency service behaviour.¹ While no new data are introduced in his 1978 article, it is of particular interest for its use of multivariate analysis. This aspect will receive further discussion in Chapter Six.

Fletcher and Goddard set out to test the hypothesis that the roles and attitudes of members are affected by their status in the legislature.² Using data collected from interviews with members of the Ontario and British Columbia legislatures, they divided the respondents into three groups: ministers, government backbenchers, and opposition members. Representational role categories were based on an open-ended question about the respondent's perception of his job as an MLA, together with some further questions concerning how the member would vote in cases where he perceived a clash between his own views and those of his constituents, or between his party and his constituents. Of the respondents whose replies were coded, the following distributions of representational role styles were found: in British Columbia, 38 percent of the 45 MLAs were classified as trustees, 53 percent as delegates, and 9 percent as "mixed;" in Ontario, 59 percent of the 46 members were categorized as trustees, 32 percent as delegates, and 9 percent as "mixed."³

¹Harold D. Clarke, "Determinants of Provincial Constituency Service Behaviour: A Multivariate Analysis," Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November 1978): 601-28.

²Frederick J. Fletcher and Arthur M. Goddard, "Government and Opposition: Structural Influences on Provincial Legislators," Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November 1978): 647-669.

³Ibid., p. 652.

TABLE 3-2

REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES AT THE PROVINCIAL AND STATE LEVEL
A SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STUDIES
(In Percentages)

Study	Province/State	Delegate	Politico	Trustee	Other	N
Eulau et al.	1959/ (1962)	20	25	55	—	49
	California					
	New Jersey	17	22	61	—	54
	Ohio	15	29	56	—	114
	Tennessee	6	13	81	—	78
Sorauf	1963	39	27	33	— (a)	106
	Pennsylvania					
Friedman & Stokes	1965	26	4	66	2 (a)	91
	Michigan					
Meller	1967	6	25	69	— (a)	32
	Micronesia					
	Truk	19	31	46	4	26
Bell & Price	1969					
	California (b)	16	55	29	—	31
	(c)	26	65	10	—	31
Smith	1970	60	28	6	—	50
	Saskatchewan					
Hedlund & Friesema	1972	25	23	52	—	177
	Iowa					
Jones	1973	51	29	20	—	65
	Texas					
Clarke, Price, & Krause	1975	16	60	24	—	248
	Canada					
Kuklinski & Elling	1977	22	33	45	—	54
	California					
Fletcher & Goddard	1978	53	9	38	—	45
	British Columbia					
	Ontario	32	9	59	—	46

^a "not ascertained," "other"

^b before service

^c after one year

NOTES: 1. "Party" and "Constituency" delegates have been combined where initially reported separately.
2. Categories such as "mixed" have been included in the Politico column where clearly of this type.

SOURCES: Provided in text

McCrone and Kuklinski's 1979 study was aimed at testing the delegate theory of representation.¹ They measured three variables: constituency opinion, representatives' perception of constituency opinion, and representatives' roll-call behaviour. Two "conditioning" variables, representational role and constituency-cuing, were used in the analysis of 38 incumbent California state assemblymen who were seeking reelection. Representational role styles were calculated from replies to one open-ended question; 42 percent were found to be delegates, and 58 percent to be non-delegates.²

Local Level

It is perhaps surprising that there are so few studies of representational role styles at the local level, particularly in Canada. For it is at the municipal level of government that we find the closest proximity in modern politics to the "ideal" situation in which representative standards need not be sacrificed to party dictates. Indeed, a number of observers have suggested that the modern party operation in contemporary legislative settings, may in fact reduce representational role style analysis to little more than an academic game of categorization.

While the accuracy of this view may be questioned, Canadian municipal government does offer an opportunity to examine representational role styles free of party influence. Not all Canadian municipalities are run on non-partisan lines, but most are--a much higher percentage

¹ Donald J. McCrone and James H. Kuklinski, "The Delegate Theory of Representation," American Journal of Political Science 23 (May 1979): 278-300.

² Ibid., p. 287. Since the "non-delegate" category was not broken down further, the data from this study have not been included in Table 3-2.

than found in either the United States or in Western Europe. Yet no serious study of this kind has previously been undertaken at the municipal level in Canada.¹

The pioneering study of representational role orientations at the municipal level was conducted by Prewitt, Eulau, and Zisk in 1967.² As part of a larger study exploring the relationship between time of political socialization and role perceptions, 129 councillors from 23 California cities were interviewed. Representational role style was determined primarily by answers to one open-ended question concerning the councillor's view of his job. 62 percent of the councillors were classified as trustees, 29 percent as politicians, and 9 percent as delegates.³

¹In his essay on Fort William and Port Arthur, Alan Alexander discusses councillor roles and attitudes, but makes no systematic analysis. See Alan Alexander, "The Institutional and Role Perception of Local Aldermen" in Politics and Government of Urban Canada, 3rd ed., eds. Lionel D. Feldman and Michael D. Goldrick (Toronto: Methuen, 1976), pp. 186-199. Margaret Kipp, in her study of Ottawa-Carleton, makes some use of the traditional classifications, but role analysis does not form a major part of her paper. See Margaret Kipp, "The Relationship Between the Attitudes of Citizens and Councillors on Regional Reorganization" in Urban Politics in Ottawa-Carleton: Research Essays, ed. Donald C. Rowat (Ottawa: Department of Political Science, Carleton University, 1974), pp. 11-40. An entirely different form of role analysis than that discussed here, is found in the study of Metro Toronto by Harold Kaplan, Urban Political Systems (New York: Columbia, 1967). And despite the title, Trevor Price and Robert Krause "Representational Styles in Local Government: A Case Study of Hamilton-Wentworth," a paper given at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, May 31, 1979 at Saskatoon, does not actually deal with representational role styles at all.

²Kenneth Prewitt, Heinz Eulau, and Betty H. Zisk, "Political Socialization and Political Roles," Public Opinion Quarterly 30 (Winter 1966-1967): 569-82.

³*Ibid.*, p. 580 (calculated from Table 7).

In 1969 Arthur Gunlicks published the results of a study of 92 municipal councillors in Lower Saxony, Germany.¹ Interestingly, Gunlicks notes that although local elections in Lower Saxony are nearly always partisan, the local government regulations direct councillors to perform their duties "according to their own free convictions directed only to the common good."² In his study, Gunlicks sought not only to explore the representative role perceptions of the local councillors, but also to determine any such distinctions among the councillors with regard to their party affiliation. Rejecting the more common approach of seeking to determine how a representative should vote in a hypothetical situation, Gunlicks asked his respondents whether they decided occasionally to vote against their own convictions in favour of one of four interests: district, party, interest groups, and community as a whole. Gunlicks argues that the traditional free agent or delegate dichotomy is misleading, and refuses to categorize his respondents in this manner. Consequently, his study is of limited value in any attempt to compare the findings of previous research.

A second study which, while interesting provides no data suitable for comparative purposes, is that of Young Kim, who interviewed 150 assemblymen in two Japanese prefectures.³ Unfortunately, Kim does not provide any details of his data on representational role orientations;

¹ Arthur E. Gunlicks, "Representative Role Perceptions Among Local Councillors in Western Germany," Journal of Politics 31 (May 1969): 443-464.

² Ibid., p. 445.

³ Young C. Kim, "Role Orientations and Behaviour: The Case of Japanese Prefectural Assembly in Chiba and Kanagawa," Western Political Quarterly 22 (June 1969): 390-410.

he simply notes that "The possible dichotomy between the trustee role and the delegate role orientation does not appear salient to the assemblymen."¹ However, he does add that when presented with an explicit choice, "most of the respondents chose the trustee role orientation."²

Although the major contribution of Jewell's 1970 article may be his summary and analysis of the existing research on representational roles, he also provided some new data based on interviews with legislators in nine American metropolitan counties.³ He found that 51 percent could be classified as trustees, 32 percent as politicians, and 16 percent as delegates.⁴

As part of their "Urban Governors" series, Eulau and Prewitt reported interviews with 435 councillors from 87 California cities.⁵ Their unit of analysis, however, is not the individual councillor, but collective councils. Consequently, they refer only in passing to individual representational role style perceptions: 60 percent chose the trustee role, 22 percent the politician, and 18 percent the delegate.⁶ Unfortunately, the companion study analyzing individual-level data on

¹ Ibid., p. 396.

² Ibid.

³ Malcolm E. Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," pp. 460-500.

⁴ Ibid., p. 477: calculated from Table 2.

⁵ Heinz Eulau and Kenneth Prewitt, Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics, The Urban Governors Series (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973).

⁶ Ibid., p. 407.

TABLE 3-3
 REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL
 A SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STUDIES
 (In Percentages)

Study	Year	Place	Delegate	Politico	Trustee	Other	N
Prewitt et al.	1967	California	9	29	62	-	127
Jewell	1970	Metro Counties	16	32	51	-	133
Eulau & Prewitt	1973	California	18	22	60	-	435
Newton	1976	Birmingham	27	26	47	-	66

SOURCES: Provided in text

representation was never published, thus much valuable comparative data from this major study is unavailable.¹

One of the most comprehensive studies of local politics was published in 1976. Kenneth Newton's work on municipal politics in Birmingham, England discusses many aspects of the relationships between elected officials and the citizens they represent.² Using a question which outlines the dichotomous representational role styles, Newton classified his 66 councillor respondents as: 27 percent delegates, 26 percent politicians, and 47 percent trustees.³

As can be seen from Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3, there is a wide variation in representational role styles as measured by different researchers. One possible cause of these differences lies in the questions asked in order to determine role style. In the next section, the variety of questions and coding formats will be examined.

Questions and Coding

A wide variety of questions was asked in the studies cited in the efforts to categorize representational role styles. Not all of the

¹ Various references to the companion volume: Katherine Hinckley, The Fabric of Urban Representation (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, forthcoming) were noted. Since no trace of the work could be found, I finally contacted Dr. Hinckley by telephone at the University of Akron (Ohio). She advised that the book had never been written, and that it was unlikely the data would ever be published.

² Kenneth Newton, Second City Politics: Democratic Processes and Decision-Making in Birmingham (London: Oxford University Press, 1976). A number of parts of Newton's study were published prior to the release of Second City Politics, but since they all refer to the same data and add nothing to the analysis contained in the book, no specific reference will be made to them here. For information purposes, they are listed in the bibliography.

³ Ibid., p. 120.

QUESTION FORMAT USED TO DETERMINE REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES

1) Single Open-Ended:	Eulau Derivative	Dichotomy	Other
	Eulau (1959)	Newton (1976)	Gunlicks (1969)
	Prewitt, Eulau and Zisk (1967)	Kuklinski and Elling (1977)	
	Kornberg (1967)	McCrone and Kuklinski (1979)	
	Davidson (1969)		
	Hedlund and Friesema (1972)		
	Eulau and Prewitt (1973)		
	Fletcher and Goddard (1978)		
2) Multiple Open-Ended:		Number of Questions	
	Sorauf (1963)	3	
	Friedman and Stokes (1965)	2	
	Hoffman and Ward (1970)	8	
	Smith (1970)	10	
	Gross (1978)	3	
3) Multiple Closed-Choice:		Number of Questions	Format Range
	Huckshorn (1965)	4	Agree/Disagree
	Bell and Price (1969)	4	Agree/Disagree
	Jones (1973)	2	Agree/Disagree
	Clarke, Price and Krause (1975)	2	Important/Not Important
	Kornberg and Mishler (1976)	12	Agree/Disagree
	Hadley (1977)	3	Dichotomous Choice

SOURCES: Noted in text

researchers identified their questions, but for the majority that did provide details, their questions can be grouped into three general categories: a single open-ended question, multiple open-ended questions, and multiple closed-choice questions. Table 3-4 provides a listing of the studies according to a question format category, for those studies where details were provided.

Single Open-Ended

Two general forms of single open-ended questions can be identified. First, what may be termed the "Eulau derivative"--either a direct repetition or a slightly adapted format of Eulau's original question: "How would you describe the job of being a legislator--what are the most important things you should do here?"¹ Kornberg's question of "What do you think your representational role entails?" goes a little beyond Eulau's approach, but still fits within the overall genre of asking the respondent to describe his conception of what the job is about.²

The second type of single open-ended question presents the respondent with a dichotomy of representational theories and asks him to choose which is closest to his own views. Newton's question is typical:

- There are two theories of political representation. The first says the representative should be the voice of the people and should act as they want him to. The second says that the representative should exercise his own judgement and act according to his own conscience and his own assessment of the situation. Which do you agree with most?³

¹ Eulau et al., "Role of the Representative," p. 749. Eulau's second question "Are there any important differences between what you think this job is and the way your constituents see it?" has rarely been used in subsequent research.

² Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour, p. 106.

³ Newton, Second City Politics, pp. 118-119.

A unique variation of the single open-ended question format was adopted by Gunlicks who asked his respondents whether they had occasionally decided against their own convictions in the interests of their constituents, party, interest groups, or the community as a whole.¹

Multiple Questions

As an alternative to the single open-ended question, many researchers chose a series of either open-ended or closed-choice questions. As indicated in Table 3-4 these ranged in number from 2 to 12. Most of the open-ended questions seemed designed to elicit more specific information from the respondents than might be possible through the use of a single question, while still generally following the Eulau format. For example, Smith's first question was:

First, would you describe your job of being an M.L.A.? What are the most important things you should do as an M.L.A.?

He followed this up by asking about representation of local interests, mediation of conflicting interests, and acting as an ombudsman for constituents. He asked about any important differences between what members thought of their job and what their constituents thought it was. Finally he focussed on the conscience versus constituents question by asking:

Suppose you wanted to take a stand on an issue in the Legislature, but knew that a majority of people in your constituency would want you to take another stand, what would you probably do?

In what circumstances is an M.L.A. justified in voting contrary to the views of the people in his constituency?²

¹Gunlicks, "Representative Role Perceptions," p. 458.

²Smith, "Saskatchewan M.L.A.'s," pp. 20-21.

Most of the closed-choice multiple choice questions were constructed in an agree/disagree format, although Clarke, Price and Krause used an important/not important scale,¹ and Hadley employed three dichotomous pairs of questions, one of which was:

Some legislators may find themselves in disagreement with the views of their constituents. If you believe that most of your constituents agree with one position on an issue and you disagree with them, then which choice better describes your view: 'A or 'B?

A. A legislator is obligated to vote for the position favored by his constituents.

B. After due consideration of their views, the legislator should be free to follow his own view of what is right.²

Regardless of the format, all of the questions sought to measure representational role perceptions, yet Tables 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3 show a remarkable inconsistency of findings. In part, this may be the result of the diversity of questions and coding formats. In many of the cases where the same or a similar question was used, coding formats and criteria were not supplied.³ Thus, even leaving aside the question of inter-coder reliability, comparison of results cannot be made with any confidence. The situation is even worse with the multiple question format since in these cases the wording of the questions themselves differs considerably.

In order to determine whether there were discernible differences in the fluctuation of response patterns which might be related to the different question formats, the responses from previous studies were re-

¹ Clarke, Price and Krause, "Constituency Service," p. 527.

² Hadley, "Role Orientations," p. 330.

³ Notable for their presentation of complete question format and coding criteria were: Wahlke et al., Legislative System; Gross, "Representative Styles"; Bell and Price, "Prelegislative Sources"; and Clarke, Price and Krause, "Constituency Service."

classified in Table 3-5 according to question format. The mean for each column was calculated, and the difference from the mean recorded for each entry. These were then summed and divided by the number of studies in each category to arrive at a total difference from the mean for each column. An overall "score" for each category was then calculated.

Three of the question format categories show quite similar results: their overall differences range between $+10.0$ to $+11.7$. The fourth category, the dichotomy format, shows a significantly less overall difference. This, however, could entirely be due to the fact that only two studies adopted this type of question format. On the other hand, it could be argued that this format is less open to coding variations than the other open-ended formats, and provides less variation in responses than do the multiple closed-choice formats with their varied questions.

Lacking further evidence, this conclusion can only be tentative, since many other factors are involved, particularly when the studies cited cover a number of countries with different institutional settings and at different levels of government. However, as will be shown in the next chapter, it can be demonstrated that differences in question wording can lead to varying results, even among the same respondents.¹

¹ It might be noted that the calculation of means and differences from the means for Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 resulted in the following overall differences: Table 3-1 (federal/national level) $+7.6$; Table 3-2 (state/provincial level) $+14.3$; Table 3-3 (local level) $+4.7$. While this would seem to indicate that there is less variation in representational role style response categories at the local level of government than at the more senior levels, it might also be a reflection of the lower number of studies conducted at the local level.

TABLE 3-5

RE-CLASSIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES
AS FOUND IN PREVIOUS STUDIES BY QUESTION FORMAT
(In Percentages)

Study	Delegate	Politico	Trustee
1. Single Open-Ended:			
(A) Eulau Derivative			
Eulau (1959/1962)	20 (-4)	25 (+1)	55 (+5)
	17 (-7)	22 (-2)	61 (+11)
	15 (-9)	29 (+5)	56 (+6)
	6 (-18)	13 (-11)	81 (+31)
Prewitt, Eulau and Zisk (1967)	9 (-15)	29 (+5)	15 (-35)
Kornberg (1967)	49 (+25)	36 (+12)	15 (-35)
Davidson (1969)	23 (-1)	46 (+22)	28 (-22)
Hedlund and Friesema (1972)	25 (+1)	23 (-1)	33 (-17)
Eulau and Prewitt (1973)	18 (-6)	22 (-2)	60 (+10)
Fletcher and Goddard (1978)	55 (+29)	9 (-15)	38 (-12)
	32 (+8)	9 (-15)	59 (+9)
Column Means	24 (+11)	24 (+8)	50 (+15)
Overall Difference		(+11.3)	
(B) Dichotomy			
Newton (1976)	27 (+2)	26 (-4)	47 (+1)
Kuklinski and Elling (1977)	22 (-3)	33 (+3)	45 (-1)
Column Means	25 (+2)	30 (+4)	46 (+1)
Overall Difference		(+2.3)	
2. Multiple Open-Ended:			
Sorauf (1963)	39 (+4)	27 (-1)	33 (-2)
Friedman and Stokes (1965)	26 (-9)	4 (-24)	66 (+31)
Hoffman and Ward (1970)	30 (-5)	36 (+8)	33 (-2)
Smith (1970)	60 (+25)	28 (0)	6 (-29)
Gross (1978)	20 (-15)	44 (+16)	36 (+1)
Column Means	35 (+12)	28 (+10)	35 (+13)
Overall Difference		(+11.7)	

TABLE 3-5 - Continued

Study	Delegate	Politico	Trustee
3. Multiple Closed-Choice:			
Bell and Price (1969)	16 (-11)	55 (+3)	29 (+8)
	26 (-1)	65 (+13)	10 (-11)
Jones (1973)	51 (+24)	29 (-23)	20 (+1)
Clarke, Price and Krause (1975)	16 (-11)	60 (+8)	24 (+3)
Column Means	27 (+12)	52 (+12)	21 (+6)
Overall Difference		(+10.0)	

- NOTES:
1. Only those studies which permitted clear identification of question format and category responses have been included.
 2. Representational Role Style Responses other than delegate, politico, and trustee have been excluded.

SOURCES: Tables 3-1, 3-2, 3-3.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE PERCEPTIONS OF
NEWFOUNDLAND COUNCILLORS

As discussed in the previous chapter, the form and wording of questions can have a significant effect on the outcome of representational role style measurement. The first part of this chapter will outline the questions used in this study and the rationale behind them. The findings of representational role style perceptions as determined by these questions will then be presented. Finally, some specific hypotheses related to the representational role style perceptions will be outlined and discussed, and a comparison of background variable relationships made with other studies.

The Questions

Direct Assessment

In order to assess both representational role style perceptions and to test the effect of question wording, a series of four questions was devised. The first (question 51) was a general probe designed to measure the respondent's overall orientation. It was adapted from the interview schedule used by Eulau and Prewitt in the San Francisco Bay study, and is similar to the dichotomy used by Newton:¹

¹ Heinz Eulau and Kenneth Prewitt, Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1973), p. 665; and Kenneth Newton, Second City Politics: Democratic Processes and Decision-Making in Birmingham (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 118-119. The "dichotomy" form of question was chosen since it seemed to offer the clearest choice and most direct approach. See above, pp. 70-71.

Q. 51. There are often two main points of view expressed concerning how a member of council should act when he has to make up his mind on a particular issue.

- 1) One is that, having been elected, he should do what the voters want him to do, even if it isn't his own personal preference;
- 2) The second is that he should use his own judgment regardless of what others want him to do.

Which of these views comes closest to your own?

View (1)

View (2)

Depends/Undecided.

Those who chose view (1) were classified as delegates; those who chose view (2) were classified as trustees; and those who chose the "depends/undecided" category were classified as politicos.

The next question sought to focus more directly on the respondent's personal actions:

Q. 52. Do you generally try to vote on council issues as you feel most citizens would want you to vote?

or

Do you generally vote according to what you personally feel is best for the community?

Vote as most citizens would want

Vote as personally feel best

Depends on issue

Those who responded that they voted as most citizens would want were classified as delegates; those who stated that they voted as they personally felt was best were classified as trustees; and those who stated that it depended on the issue were classified as politicos.

The third question was designed to reduce the politico category by forcing the respondents into a voting choice on a specific

(hypothetical) issue:

- Q. 53. Suppose a particular issue which you thought might upset a number of citizens in your community was scheduled to come before council at its next regular meeting (for example, a tax increase or the location of a new garbage dump), what would you do?
- a) discuss the issue with as many citizens as possible and vote as you felt most would want you to?
 - b) discuss the issue as above, but vote as you felt would be best for the whole community? . .
 - c) vote as you felt best for the whole community without discussing the issue with the citizens? . .

The responses were coded as follows: choice (a) as delegates, choice (b) as trustees, and choice (c) as trustees.

A fourth question was designed to allow councillors to state in their own words what action they would take when faced with a situation such as that described in the previous question. The results from this open-ended format were not satisfactory. Most respondents gave no reply at all; of those who did respond, the majority were vague or tended to repeat one of the options from Question 53. Consequently, no use was made of the responses to this fourth question (Q. 54).

Indirect Assessment

The foregoing questions were designed to directly measure representational role role perceptions by focussing the respondent's thoughts upon a consideration of the issues involved. An alternative would be to use a more indirect approach. The following were adapted from a list of questions which Kornberg and Mishler asked federal Members

of Parliament in order to determine representational role perceptions.¹ They were included in this study in a series of eighteen agree/disagree statements at the end of the questionnaire.

- Q. 82 The job of a councillor entails being a sounding board for community opinion and then acting on it. I always try to find out what my fellow-citizens feel and make my decisions accordingly.
- Q. 88 My first duty is to my fellow-citizens. They are the ones who elected me.
- Q. 94 Even if a councillor wanted to find out what his fellow-citizens felt about a major public issue, it would be impossible. The majority of the people don't know. They don't have any information on these things. The rest, or most of the rest, simply don't care.
- Q. 96 A councillor seldom has to sound out his fellow-citizens because he thinks so much like them that he knows how they would react to almost any proposal.
- Q. 97 My primary responsibility as a councillor is to do as good a job as I can for the community, to act according to my conscience. The alternative is to give in to voters.
- Q. 98 If anyone tells you he makes his decisions in council on the basis of what his fellow-citizens want, assuming he knew what they want, he is either kidding you or himself.

It was anticipated that respondents holding a delegate perception would agree with questions 82 and 88, and would disagree with questions 94, 97 and 98. Conversely, a trustee would be expected to disagree

¹ Allan Kornberg and William Mishler, Influence in Parliament: Canada (Durham: Duke University Press, 1976), pp. 88-89. Two other questions (Q. 89 and Q. 92) which were adapted from Kornberg and Mishler and included in the questionnaire, were dropped from analysis since they were found during the personal interviews to be confusing and ambiguous.

with questions 82 and 88, and to agree with questions 94, 97 and 98. While delegates might be expected to agree more frequently than trustees with question 96, it was considered quite possible that trustees would also agree that councillors could accurately predict their constituents opinions, although not necessarily consider acting on them¹

The Results

Direct Assessment

Table 4-1 sets out the response pattern for the three direct assessment questions concerning representational role style.

TABLE 4-1
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO
DIRECT REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE QUESTIONS
(Column percentages)

Role Style	General View (Q. 51)	Personal Vote (Q. 52)	Specific Issue (Q. 53)
Delegate	19	17	17
Politico	33	25	--
Trustee	48	58	83
	100%	100%	100%
	(N=316)	(N=317)	(N=313)

NOTE: Don't know and refused responses excluded.

¹In fact Hedlund and Friesema found that trustees were much better at predicting their constituents' responses than were delegates. See Ronald D. Hedlund and Paul H. Friesema, "Representatives' Perceptions of Constituency Opinion," in Public Opinion and Public Policy, ed. Norman R. Luttbeg (Homewood, Ill: Dorsey, 1974), p. 405.

As anticipated, the results summarized in Table 4-1 indicate clearly that question wording has a significant impact on representational role style perception. Moving from the general view of how a councillor should act (Q. 51) to the more personal view of how the respondent normally does act (Q. 52), there was a decrease in the number of delegate and politico responses, with a concomitant increase in the number of trustee responses. This is not particularly surprising, since it is reasonable to expect some movement when going from a philosophical choice to a more practical one.¹

When the question was posed in even more specific terms with the politico category eliminated, the responses to Question 53 indicated that when forced to make a choice, those who would otherwise opt for the politico role style would choose the trustee style. The percentage of respondents choosing the delegate style, however, remained constant between Questions 52 and 53.²

Given the variation and inconsistency of role style choice as outlined above, it was decided to construct an index from the responses to the three questions in order to obtain the most accurate classification

¹The direction of this movement is precisely that which might be expected in light of studies on liberalism and civil rights. If the delegate role can be categorized as the more "liberal" one, then as respondents move from the more abstract choice in Question 51 to the practical choice based on their own behaviour in Question 52, the movement is in exactly the same direction as found in the American studies. See for instance, Samuel A. Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1955), pp. 29-42.

²This does not, however, mean that individual respondents remained constant in their answers to Questions 52 and 53. In fact, further analysis showed that only 54 percent of those who chose the delegate category in Question 52 chose the same category in Question 53.

possible. The coding for the index (called REPROLE) was as follows:

- Delegate: if response to Q. 51 was view (1);
 if response to Q. 52 was to "vote as most
 citizens would want;"
 and if response to Q. 53 was (a).
- Politico: if response to Q. 51 was "depends/undecided;"
 and if response to Q. 52 was "depends on issue."
- Trustee: if response to Q. 51 was view (2);
 if response to Q. 52 was to "vote as personally
 feel best;"
 and if response to Q. 53 was either (b) or (c).

For ease of comparison, the frequencies for the role style index are set out in Table 4-2 along with the frequencies for the three role style questions.

TABLE 4-2
 COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO
 REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE QUESTIONS
 AND ROLE STYLE INDEX (REPROLE)
 (Column percentages)

Role Style	General View (Q. 51)	Personal Vote (Q. 52)	Specific Issue (Q. 53)	Role Style Index (REPROLE)
Delegate	19	17	17	11
Politico	33	25	--	23
Trustee	48	58	83	66
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(N=316)	(N=317)	(N=313)	(N=197)

NOTE: Don't know and refused responses excluded.

The elimination of inconsistent responses reduced the number of usable responses to 197. However, the index provides a "cleaner"

classification of representative role style since it includes only those respondents who were consistent in their responses. This index will therefore be used as the measure of representational role style.

It might be noted that the distribution of role styles using the index is quite consistent with those found in other studies at the local level as listed in Table 3-3. It might also be noted that studies of representational role style at the local level generally reveal a lower percentage of delegates and a higher percentage of trustees than do studies at the more senior levels of government. Table 4-3 summarizes the data from the tables in Chapter 3.

TABLE 4-3
DISTRIBUTION OF REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES
FOUND IN PREVIOUS STUDIES: SUMMARIZED
BY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT
(Column percentages)

Role Style	Federal/National Level	Provincial/State Level	Local Level
Delegate	25	27	18
Politico	40	29	27
Trustee	30	44	55

Source: Tables 3-1, 3-2, 3-3.

Indirect Assessment

The results of the attitude questions designed to indirectly assess representational role style perception are as follows:¹

¹ Agree/tend to agree and disagree/tend to disagree categories have been combined for ease of presentation.

L

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>(N)</u>
	(PERCENTAGES)			

Q. 82	The job of a councillor entails being a sounding board for community opinion and then acting on it. I always try to find out what my fellow-citizens feel and act accordingly.	83	7	10	(316)
Q. 88	My first duty is to my fellow-citizens. They are the ones who elected me.	84	7	9	(311)
Q. 94	Even if a councillor wanted to find out what his fellow-citizens felt about a major public issue, it would be impossible. The majority of the people don't know. They don't have any information on these things. The rest, or most of the rest, simply don't care.	47	11	42	(314)
Q. 96	A councillor seldom has to sound out his fellow-citizens because he thinks so much like them that he knows how they would react to almost any proposal.	38	12	50	(314)
Q. 97	My primary responsibility as a councillor is to do as good a job as I can for the community--to act according to my conscience. The alternative is to give in to voters.	69	14	17	(313)
Q. 98	If anyone tells you he makes his decisions in council on the basis of what his fellow-citizens want, assuming he knew what they want, he is either kidding you or himself.	49	18	33	(308)

If these attitudinal questions are to be considered as either
supplementary or corroboratory to the representational role styles as

measured directly, then there should be a relationship between each attitudinal measure and the role style index in the direction indicated above.¹ Table 4-4 provides the crosstabulations between the representational role style index and each of the attitudinal measures.²

TABLE 4-4
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND RELATED ATTITUDE MEASURES
(Row Percentages)

ATTITUDE	ROLE STYLE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	(N)
Q. 82 The job of a council- or entails being a sounding board for community opinion. I always try to find out what my fellow-citizens feel and make my decisions accordingly.	Delegate	100	0	0	(21)
	Politico	85	11	4	(46)
	Trustee	71	9	20	(126)
	N =	(149)	(16)	(28)	(193)
gamma = .59; Tau b = .228					

¹ See above, pp. 78-82.

² The gamma statistic will be used as the primary measure of association in this thesis. Gamma has been widely used in other studies of representational role perception, and its use here will aid in comparative analysis. A comprehensive rationale for the use of gamma in such studies can be found in Heinz Eulau and Kenneth Prewitt, Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1973), pp. 629-631. Since some researchers prefer the Tau measures, the appropriate Tau statistic will also normally be supplied. Tau b will be used where tables are square; Tau c where tables are rectangular. It should be emphasized, however, that these statistics add little to what can be ascertained by an analysis of the data: their primary use is comparative--both through allowing ease of comparison between tables with regard to the strength of relationships, and through facilitating comparison of findings of this study with those of other studies.

TABLE 4-4
 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
 AND RELATED ATTITUDE MEASURES
 (Row Percentages)

	ATTITUDE	ROLE STYLE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	(N)
Q. 88	My first duty is to my fellow-citizens. They are the ones who elected me.	Delegate	100	0	0	(21)
		Politico	78	13	9	(46)
		Trustee	82	5	13	(123)
		N =	(158)	(12)	(20)	(190)
			gamma = .20; Tau b = .075			
Q. 94	Even if a councillor wanted to find out what his fellow-citizens felt about a major public issue, it would be impossible. The majority of the people don't know. They don't have any information on these things. The rest, or most of the rest, simply don't care.	Delegate	32	26	42	(19)
		Politico	41	18	41	(46)
		Trustee	49	6	45	(126)
		N =	(86)	(21)	(84)	(191)
			gamma = -.06; Tau b = -.035			
Q. 96	A councillor seldom has to sound out his fellow-citizens because he thinks so much like them he knows how they would react to almost any proposal.	Delegate	33	5	62	(21)
		Politico	17	15	68	(46)
		Trustee	40	11	49	(125)
		N =	(65)	(22)	(105)	(192)
			gamma = -.28; Tau b = -.152			
Q. 97	My primary responsibility as a councillor is to do as good a job as I can for the community--to act according to my conscience. The alternative is to give in to voters.	Delegate	62	29	9	(21)
		Politico	52	24	24	(46)
		Trustee	75	9	16	(124)
		N =	(130)	(28)	(33)	(191)
			gamma = -.26; Tau b = -.144			

TABLE 4-4
 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
 AND RELATED ATTITUDE MEASURES
 (Row Percentages)

ATTITUDE	ROLE STYLE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	(N)
Q. 98 If anyone tells you he makes his decisions in council on the basis of what his fellow-citizens want, assuming he knew what they want, he is either kidding you or himself.	Delegate	20	10	70	(20)
	Politico	36	35	29	(45)
	Trustee	62	12	26	(122)
	N =	(96)	(33)	(58)	(187)
gamma = -.45; Tau b = -.277					

The predicted relationship between the responses to question 82 and role style is present in part with 100 percent of the delegates agreeing with the statement. While the percentage of those who disagree with the statement increases from the politico to the trustee category, fully 71 percent of the trustees agree with the statement that "I always try to find out what my fellow-citizens feel and make my decisions accordingly." Logically, they might have been expected to disagree. It is possible, however, that some confusion arose between the first and second parts of the question, since it would be quite conceivable for a trustee to agree that "the job of a councillor entails being a sounding board for community opinion," without necessarily agreeing with the second part. In such cases, the trustees may have signified their agreement with the first part. Overall, however, the anticipated direction of relationship is present with a moderate strength.

The relationship between the second attitude (question 88) and role style is also as expected with respect to the delegates, 100 percent

2

of whom agree with the statement. But since 82 percent of the trustees and 78 percent of the politicians also agree that "my first duty is to my fellow-citizens," the strength of the relationship is relatively weak ($\gamma = .20$; $\tau_b = .075$). The problem here may lie in the wording of the question insofar as both politicians and trustees may believe they are fulfilling their duty to their fellow-citizens even when they vote according to their own personal judgment.

Even though the direction of relationship between role style and response to question 94 is as predicted, with agreement increasing from delegate to politician to trustee, the strength of relationship is negligible. Essentially there should be no reason why a delegate would agree with this statement since to do so is to deny the very basis of the delegate belief. One possible explanation is that the delegates who agreed did so in response to the second part of the question dealing with public information and concern.

While question 96 does not refer primarily to voting as an activity of representation, it does provide some indication of the degree to which councillors feel they can judge the reactions of their fellow-citizens. Delegates would be expected to be more likely to seek citizens' opinions than to try and assess them on their own and, as anticipated, 62 percent of the delegates disagreed with the statement. Interestingly, so did nearly one-half of the trustees. However, a higher percentage of trustees than either delegates or politicians agreed that councillors could judge citizen reactions without specifically asking them. This is not surprising since other studies have, in fact, shown trustees to be

much better judges of public opinion than politicians or delegates.¹

The wording of question 97 caused considerable difficulty during the personal interviews, since many respondents saw the two parts as being contradictory. Delegates particularly, it seems, had problems with the wording as indicated by the high percentage of undecideds. While delegates would have been expected to disagree with the statement, this was not the case: 62 percent agreed, and only 9 percent disagreed. This may have been a reflection of the question itself--after all, how many councillors would want to admit they do not try to do as good a job as they can for the community? The trustees had no such problem, and a full 75 percent of them agreed.

The responses to the final attitude statement, question 98, fell as predicted with delegates strongly tending to disagree and trustees tending to agree. It is not clear, however, why 20 percent of the delegates would agree that councillors cannot seriously make their decisions on the basis of what their fellow-citizens want.

In summary, the relationships between responses to the attitude measures and representative role style were in the direction predicted in five of the six cases. The strengths of the relationships, however, were only weak to moderate, thus raising the question of whether the attitude statements were, in fact, measuring the same characteristics as had been measured by the direct representational role style method.

¹See Ronald D. Hedlund and Paul H. Friesema, "Representatives' Perceptions of Constituency Opinion," in Norman L. Luttbeg, ed., Public Opinion and Public Policy, rev. ed., (Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press, 1974), pp. 404-406.

One way of indirectly assessing this is to determine whether the attitude questions themselves were measuring the same dimension.

Using the Guttman scaling procedure to test the unidimensionality of the attitude questions, we would expect to find a coefficient of reproducibility of at least .85 and a coefficient of scalability of at least .60 if the attitude questions could be considered to form a cumulative and unidimensional scale.¹ Guttman scaling Questions 82, 88, 94, 96, 97, and 98 produced a coefficient of reproducibility of .81 and a coefficient of scalability of .35, somewhat below the required minimums.²

Progressive elimination of scale items which did not correlate well biserially led to no significant improvement in the coefficients of reproducibility and scalability.³ Given the difficulties many

¹ These are standard minimum coefficients: see Barbara Leigh Smith et al., Political Research Methods: Foundations and Techniques (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976), pp. 192-193; and Norman H. Nye et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1975), pp. 531-533.

² For scaling purposes the response codes of questions 82 and 88 were reversed in order to standardize anticipated delegate responses at the high end of the scale and anticipated trustee responses at the low end.

³ Guttman scaling different combinations of attitude question produced the following results:

<u>Attitude questions</u>	<u>Coefficient of Reproducibility</u>	<u>Coefficient of Scalability</u>
82, 88, 94, 96, 98,	.8020	.3632
82, 88, 96, 98	.8427	.4477
82, 94, 96, 98	.7993	.4259
94, 96, 98	.7887	.4868

It is recognized that the attitude questions used in this study cannot easily be ordered by increasing degree of difficulty as is ideally required for Guttman scaling. The SPSS subprogram allows for this, however, by automatically ordering scale items by imputed degree of difficulty. See Nye et al., pp. 535-536.

respondents encountered with the wording of certain attitude questions, and considering the generally moderate correlations between individuals attitude question results and the representational role style scale, it is not surprising that the response failed to fully meet the formal criteria for a Guttman scale.

The coefficients of reproducibility and scalability, however, did indicate that the attitude questions demonstrated a cohesive pattern, even though they did not meet the formal criteria for a Guttman scale. Since the Guttman scaling procedure assumes an ordering of scale items in terms of increasing difficulty, and since no such assumption was built into the attitude questions, the failure to fully meet the Guttman scale criteria is not in itself sufficient cause for concluding that the attitude questions do not measure the same dimension.

This question of unidimensionality will be further explored in the next chapter as part of the assessment of the overall utility of representational role analysis. Here we will simply note that the initial idea of constructing a scale which would integrate the direct and indirect responses would seem to offer little advantage. In fact, given the generally moderate relationships found between the direct response index and the indirect question responses, a combined scale may well be misleading.

Variables and Hypotheses

The classification of representative role styles as set out in the previous sections does little more than indicate that our respondents

can be grouped into the categories employed by other researchers. By itself, such classification may be useful in a descriptive sense; but the next step is to inquire whether the role styles are actually indicative of more basic differences among councillors or legislators. The traditional approach to this inquiry has been to seek an explanation for role style possession by the examination of various background characteristics of either the respondents or their legislative surroundings. While the findings of previous studies have been inconclusive and contradictory when explanations for role styles have been sought in independent background variables, we will initially pursue the traditional approach in order to allow comparison.

Table 4-5 sets out some of the relationships which have been found between representative role style and independent background variables in previous studies as well as the present one. Statistical measures of association are listed in cases where they were provided by the researchers; for purposes of comparison, the gamma statistic is primarily used for data from the present study, although Tau B is also used where employed in other studies. The representational role style dependent variable is the role style index (REPROLE) as outlined previously.

Table 4-5 provides an overall summary of the findings of this and other studies of representational role style perceptions. In the early stages of this study, a number of hypotheses were developed concerning relationships between background variables and representational role styles. These, along with others which were developed during a more

extensive review of the literature, are set out below in the sections dealing with the related findings.

TABLE 4-5
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES AND
BACKGROUND VARIABLES OF LEGISLATORS AND COUNCILLORS:
SUMMARY OF VARIOUS STUDIES (INCLUDING THE PRESENT ONE)

FINDINGS	AUTHOR(S)	CORRELATION
Size of Community		
1. No significant variation associated with urban/rural difference.	Friedman and Stokes	
2. Metropolitan MPs tended to take other than delegate role.	Kornberg	.30 (G)
3. Urban legislators strongly party delegates.	Smith	
4. Urban Legislators tend toward Trustee Style.	Hoffman and Ward Boswell	.13 (G)
Competitiveness		
1. Not related according to objective competitiveness.	Kornberg	.09 (G)
No significant relation.	Friedman & Stokes McCrone & Kuklinski Jewell	
(With "method of election" variable)	Boswell	.02 (G)
2. Less competitive districts associated with trustee role.	Davidson Newton	
Members elected at large more likely to be trustees.	Jewell	.17 (G)
(With "wards" variable)	Boswell	.37 (G)
3. Delegates more sensitive to electoral competitiveness.	Kuklinski & Elling	

TABLE 4-5

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL RÔLE STYLES AND
BACKGROUND VARIABLES OF LEGISLATORS AND COUNCILLORS:
SUMMARY OF VARIOUS STUDIES (INCLUDING THE PRESENT ONE)

FINDINGS	AUTHORS (S)	CORRELATION
Complexity		
1. Increased complexity not related to trustee role.	Eulau Meller	
2. Delegate role style related to municipalities with lower budgets.	Boswell	.18 (G)
3. No overall relationships between type of council and role style.	Boswell	.04 (G)
Age		
1. Those over 60 inclined toward delegate role.	Hoffman and Ward	
Older councillors tend toward trustee style.	Boswell	.31 (G)
2. Younger legislators inclined toward trustee or politico role.	Hoffman and Ward	
Politico style associated more with younger councillors.	Boswell	.31 (G)
3. No significant relationship.	Friedman and Stokes	
Education		
1. Lower education associated with delegate role.	Kornberg	.39 (G)
2. No significant relationship.	Davidson Friedman and Stokes Hedlund Newton	
3. Higher education associated with trustee role.	Bell and Price Sorauf Jewell Soule Boswell	.366 (P) .45 (G) .35 (G) .14 (G)

TABLE 4.5 (Continued)

FINDINGS	AUTHOR(S)	CORRELATION
Occupation		
1. Higher status occupation associated with trustee role and away from delegate role.	Kornberg Hedlund Jewell	.25 (G) .17 (G) .19 (G)
2. No significant relationship.	Davidson Bell and Price Boswell	.05 (G)
Length of Service		
1. Related to role style.	Kornberg	.22 (G)
2. Freshmen tended toward politico role and away from trustee.	Cramer	
Less service associated with delegate style.	Davidson Boswell	.51 (G)
3. Longer service associated with trustee style.	Davidson Bell and Price Newton Boswell	.51 (G)
4. No overall relationship.	Sorauf Jewell Soule	.06 (G)
Leadership		
1. Non-leaders tended toward delegate role.	Davidson	
2. Leaders tended toward trustee role.	Davidson Newton	
3. Only slight difference around "status groups."	Fletcher and Goddard	
4. No significant relationship.	Boswell	.02 (G)

TABLE 4-5 (Continued)

FINDINGS	AUTHOR(S)	CORRELATION
Prior Political Experience		
1. Legislators with municipal background tend toward delegate role.	Hoffman and Ward	
2. Legislators with no political experience tend toward trustee role.	Hoffman and Ward	
3. No significant relationship.	Davidson Boswell	.15 (G)
Socialization		
1. Later political socialization associated with delegate role.	Hedlund	.061 (tau b)
2. No relationship.	Prewitt, Eulau and Zisk Boswell	.029 (tau b)
Political Party/Ideology		
1. Liberals slightly more inclined to delegate role.	Hoffman and Ward Smith	
2. PC's more inclined to trustee role.	Boswell	.16 (G)
PC/SC more likely to be delegates.	Kornberg	.47 (G)
Republicans (USA) more likely trustees.	Sorauf Jewell	
3. NDP most inclined toward trustee role.	Hoffman and Ward Boswell	.16 (G)
Left-wing (Lib./NDP) more likely to be trustees.	Kornberg	.47 (G)
Conservatism associated with trustees.	Jewell	.13 (G)
Democrats (USA) more politico than republicans.	Davidson	

TABLE 4-5 (Continued)

FINDINGS	AUTHOR(S)	CORRELATION
Political Party/Ideology Continued		
NDP inclined to politico role.	Smith	
Democrats (USA) tend to delegate role.	Jewell	
"Faith in People"		
1. Legislators with low faith in people more likely to be trustees.	Hedlund Boswell	.083 (tau b) -.163 (tau b)

NOTES:

1. Measures of association are: (G) Gamma, (P) Pearsonian, and Tau b.

2. SOURCES:

(a) At the federal and national level:

Allan Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour: A Study of the 25th Parliament (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967).

Roger H. Davidson, The Role of the Congressman (New York: Pegasus, 1969); David Hoffman and Norman Ward, Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the Canadian House of Commons (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970); Jack S. Cramer, "Parliamentary Experience and Legislative Behaviour" in Foundations of Political Culture: Political Socialization in Canada, eds. Jon H. Pammett and Michael S. Whittington (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976): 195-210; Allan Kornberg and William Mishler, Influence in Parliament: Canada (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1976); Donald A. Gross, "Representative Styles and Legislative Behaviour," Western Political Quarterly (September 1978): 359-71.

(b) At the state and provincial level:

Heinz Eulau et al., "The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Representation of

Edmund Burke," American Political Science Review 53 (September 1959):742-756; also John C. Wahlke et al., The Legislative System (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962); Frank J. Sorauf, Party and Representation: Legislative Politics in Pennsylvania (New York: Atherton, 1963); Robert S. Friedman and Sybil L. Stokes, "The Role of Constitution-Maker as Representative," Midwest Journal of Political Science 9 (1965):148-56; Norman Meller, "Representational Role Types: A Research Note," American Political Science Review 61 (June 1967): 474-77; Charles G. Bell and Charles Price, "Prelegislative Sources of Representational Roles," Midwest Journal of Political Science 13 (May 1969):254-70; David Smith, "The Recruitment, Role Perceptions and Political Attitudes of Saskatchewan M.L.A.'s," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, 1970; Bryan D. Jones, "Competitiveness, Role Orientations and Legislative Responsiveness," Journal of Politics 35 (1973):924-47; Harold D. Clarke, Richard G. Price, and Robert Krause, "Constituency Service Among Canadian Provincial Legislators: Basic Findings and a Test of Three Hypotheses," Canadian Journal of Political Science 8 (December 1975):520-42; James H. Kuklinski and R. C. Elling, "Representational Role, Constituency Opinion, and Legislative Roll-Call Behaviour," American Journal of Political Science 21 (February 1977):135-47; Frederick J. Fletcher and Arthur M. Goddard, "Government and Opposition: Structural Influences on Provincial Legislators," Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November 1978):647-69.

(c) At the local level:

Kenneth Prewitt, Heinz Eulau, and Betty H. Zisk, "Political Socialization and Political Roles," Public Opinion Quarterly 30 (Winter 1966-67): 569-82; Malcolm E. Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants of Legislative Behaviour: The Utility of Role Analysis," in Legislatures in Developmental Perspective, eds. Allan Kornberg and Lloyd D. Musolf (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1970):460-500; Heinz Eulau and K. Prewitt, Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptation, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973), p. 407; Kenneth Newton, Second City Politics: Democratic Processes and Decision-Making in Birmingham (London: Oxford, 1976).

Size of Community

Hypothesis: The smaller the community, the more likely councillors are to be delegates. Conversely, trustees are more likely to come from larger municipalities.

Result: Weakly confirmed.

Our initial hypothesis that councillors from smaller communities would be more likely to adopt a delegate role since they would be in more frequent contact with their fellow citizens, is only weakly confirmed. The data contained in Table 4-6 tend to more strongly support the second part of the hypothesis--that trustees are more likely to come from larger municipalities. These findings tend to agree with those of Hoffman and Ward insofar as respondents from the more urban areas tended toward a trustee role style.¹

TABLE 4-6
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND SIZE OF COMMUNITY
(Column Percentages)

Role Style	Population					N
	Under 1,000	1,001- 2,500	2,501- 5,000	5,001- 10,000	More Than 10,000	
Delegate	15	9	7	0	0	(21)
Politico	21	26	47	0	29	(46)
Trustee	64	65	46	100	71	(130)
	100	100	100	100	100	
N =	(110)	(43)	(15)	(12)	(17)	(197)
gamma = .13						

¹Hoffman and Ward, Bilingualism and Biculturalism, p. 73.

Competitiveness

Hypothesis (1): The existence of a ward system will result in a greater percentage of delegates than in municipalities with an at-large system of election.

Result: Confirmed.

One measure of competitiveness used in this study was the existence of a ward system, and the findings agree with those of Kuklinski and Elling insofar as delegates are more sensitive to electoral competitiveness as measured by the existence of a ward system.¹ This also accords with Jewell's finding that members elected at large are more likely to be trustees.²

TABLE 4-7
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND EXISTENCE OF A WARD SYSTEM
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	EXISTENCE OF WARD SYSTEM		N
	WARD SYSTEM	NO WARD SYSTEM	
Delegate	43	9	(21)
Politico	0	22	(37)
Trustee	57	69	(123)
	100	100	
N =	(14)	(167)	(181)
	gamma = .37		

¹ Kuklinski and Elling, "Representative Role," p. 145.

² Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," p. 481.

Hypothesis (2): Appointed (L.I.D.) councillors are more likely to act as trustees than those councillors who must run for re-election.

Result: Confirmed.

As a second measure of competitiveness, the method of selection was chosen. As noted above, Local Improvement District councillors were appointed, not elected; and it was expected that a lower number of delegates would be found in this category. As Table 4-8 indicates, no delegates at all were found to be appointed, thus confirming the hypothesis. The overall statistical association is weak, however, with a gamma of only .02. This suggests that while a complete absence of electoral concern mitigates against a delegate style, there is little difference in the role styles of those who have been acclaimed as compared to those who were elected to office.

TABLE 4-8
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND METHOD OF SELECTION
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	METHOD OF SELECTION			N
	ELECTED	ACCLAIMED	APPOINTED	
Delegate	10	15	0	(21)
Politico	23	27	17	(45)
Trustee	67	58	83	(130)
	100	100	100	
N =	(133)	(45)	(18)	(196)
	gamma = .02			

Complexity

Hypothesis: The delegate role style will be positively associated with less complex municipalities.

Result: Confirmed.

Eulau and his colleagues had hypothesized that the trustee role style would be positively related to complexity of governmental affairs, but found this not to be the case.¹ This finding was also confirmed by Meller.² Two measures of complexity were used in this study: amount of operating budget, and type of council. A weak relationship was found between role style and amount of operating budget, although 100 percent of delegates came from municipalities with an annual budget of less than \$100,000. There was little difference, however, in the distribution of politicians and trustees over the range of operating budgets.

TABLE 4-9
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND AMOUNT OF OPERATING BUDGET
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	AMOUNT OF OPERATING BUDGET			N
	LESS THAN \$100,000	\$100,000- \$500,000	MORE THAN \$500,000	
Delegate	15	0	0	(17)
Politico	18	33	25	(35)
Trustee	67	67	75	(113)
	100	100	100	
N =	(116)	(21)	(28)	(165)

gamma = .18

¹Eulau et al., Legislative System, p. 282.

²Meller, "Representational Role Types," p. 476.

For the second measure of complexity, the types of municipalities were re-classified into: least complex (Local Government Communities), medium complexity (Towns, Rural Districts, and Local Improvement Districts), and most complex (Cities).¹ As can be seen in Table 4-10, beyond the fact that delegates tended toward the less complex forms of municipality, no overall pattern is evident.

TABLE 4-10
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND TYPE OF MUNICIPALITY
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	TYPE OF MUNICIPALITY			N
	LEAST COMPLEX	MEDIUM COMPLEXITY	MOST COMPLEX	
Delegate	17	8	0	(21)
Politico	18	24	50	(46)
Trustee	65	68	50	(130)
	100	100	100	
N =	(66)	(121)	(10)	(197)
gamma = .04				

In sum, the data from this study support the findings of the Eulau and Meller studies, insofar as trustees are not found disproportionately in the more complex municipal structures. On the other

¹For a summary of the structure and operation of various forms of municipal government in Newfoundland, see Peter G. Boswell, "Legislative Reform in Newfoundland: The Case of Municipal Government," paper presented at the 1977 annual meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Political Studies Association, Halifax, October 1977; and Boswell, "Pilot Study," pp. 1-4.

hand, the data also confirmed (albeit weakly) the hypothesis that delegates are more likely to be associated with less complex municipalities.

Age

Hypothesis: The older a councillor, the more likely he is to adopt a trustee role style.

Result: Confirmed.

Unfortunately, very few previous studies have used age as an independent variable. This study found age to be one of the stronger predictors of representational role style. The data showed, in contrast to Hoffman and Ward,¹ that older councillors strongly tended toward the trustee role: 82 percent of those between 46 and 60, and 74 percent of

TABLE 4-11
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND AGE
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	AGE					N
	LESS THAN 25	25 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 60	MORE THAN 60	
Delegate	9	13	6	10	16	(21)
Politico	45	34	24	8	10	(46)
Trustee	45	53	70	82	74	(130)
	99	100	100	100	100	
N =	(11)	(68)	(50)	(49)	(19)	(197)
gamma = .31						

¹Hoffman and Ward, Bilingualism and Biculturalism, p. 76.

those more than 60 chose a trustee style. However, in common with Hoffman and Ward,¹ this study found that the politico style tended to be associated more with younger councillors. With a gamma of .31, age has a moderate correlation with role style, and the hypothesis is confirmed.

Education

Hypothesis: Trustees will possess a higher level of education than delegates.

Result: Weakly confirmed.

As indicated in Table 4-12, delegates are less likely to have a high level of education than are politicians or trustees. While the statistical strength of the relationship is not very strong, the

TABLE 4-12
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND EDUCATION
(Column Percentages; Row Percentages in Brackets)

ROLE STYLE	EDUCATION			
	MINIMAL	AVERAGE	HIGH	N
Delegate	12 (38)	12 (53)	5 (9)	(21)
Politico	12 (17)	29 (57)	31 (26)	(46)
Trustee	76 (39)	58 (41)	64 (20)	(127)
	100	99	100	
N =	(66)	(89)	(39)	(194)
gamma = -.14				

¹Ibid.

direction of the findings accords with those cited by Kornberg.¹ The hypothesis that trustees will possess a higher level of education than delegates appears to be weakly borne out, although not at as strong a level as found in other studies.²

Occupation

Hypothesis: Delegates will tend to have lower status occupations than will politicians or trustees.

Result: Not confirmed.

Some previous studies have found that higher status occupations are associated with trustee role styles and away from delegate styles.³

TABLE 4-13
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND OCCUPATION SCALE
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	OCCUPATION SCALE			N
	LOW STATUS	MIDDLE STATUS	HIGH STATUS	
Delegate	15	17	6	(18)
Politico	17	27	27	(40)
Trustee	68	57	67	(111)
	100	101	100	
N =	(54)	(30)	(85)	(196)

gamma = .05

¹Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour, p. 109.

²See for example: Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," p. 477; Soule, cited in Jewell, *ibid.*, p. 475.

³Kornberg, Canadian Legislative Behaviour, p. 109; Hedlund, "Legislative Socialization," cited in Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," p. 474; Jewell. *ibid.*

The data from this study, while indicative of this general direction, are too weak to confirm the expected hypothesis.

Length of Service

Hypothesis: The longer a respondent has been a member of council, the more likely he is to act as a trustee.

Result: Confirmed.

The relationship between role style and length of service was the strongest encountered in this study. Respondents with less service were associated with the delegate role, while those with longer service were associated with the trustee style. As indicated in Table 4-14, 90 percent of delegates had less than two year's service, compared with only 55 percent of trustees. Conversely, only 5 percent of the delegates had served for more than 5 years, whereas 23 percent of the trustees had done so.

TABLE 4-14
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND LENGTH OF SERVICE
(Column Percentages; Row Percentages in brackets)

ROLE STYLE	LENGTH OF SERVICE			N
	SHORT TIME (2 yrs. or less)	MEDIUM TIME (3 to 4 yrs.)	LONG TIME (5 yrs. or more)	
Delegate	15 (90)	3 (5)	3 (5)	(21)
Politico	28 (76)	17 (13)	13 (11)	(46)
Trustee	57 (55)	80 (22)	84 (23)	(130)
	100	100	100	
N =	(125)	(35)	(37)	(197)
gamma = .51				

This pattern accords with the findings of several other studies,¹ and confirms the anticipated hypothesis.

Leadership

Hypothesis: The trustee role will be held more frequently by leaders than by non-leaders.

Results: Not confirmed.

Unlike Davidson or Newton,² no significant relationship was found in this study between role style and position on council. The absence of any significant relationship may reflect the fact that in most (79%) of Newfoundland's municipalities the mayor or chairman is selected by council at the first meeting after an election and not directly by the citizens. Since the council leader is thus responsible to his fellow councillors for his position, rather than to the public at large, the role distinction found in the other studies may be mitigated in Newfoundland. But as Table 4-15 indicates, not only was the overall statistical relationship very weak, but the observed tendency was actually contrary to the hypothesis insofar as a greater percentage of delegates than trustees held a leadership position.

¹See for example: Davidson, Role of the Congressman, pp. 133-134; Bell and Price, "Pre-Legislative Sources," p. 264; and Newton, Second City Politics, p. 120.

²Davidson, Role of the Congressman, pp. 134-135; Newton, Second City Politics, p. 120.

TABLE 4-15
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
 AND POSITION ON COUNCIL
 (Column Percentages; Row Percentages in Brackets)

ROLE STYLE	POSITION ON COUNCIL		
	COUNCILLOR (NON-LEADER)	MAYOR/CHAIRMAN (LEADER)	N
Delegate	9 (67)	17 (33)	(21)
Politico	26 (87)	14 (13)	(46)
Trustee	65 (78)	69 (22)	(130)
	100	100	
N =	(155)	(42)	(197)
gamma = .02			

Prior Political Experience

Hypothesis: The less prior political experience a councillor has,
 the more he will tend toward a trustee role.

Result: Not confirmed.

In order to measure this variable, respondents were asked whether they had ever run for any other political office. While 73 percent of those who had run for other office were trustees as compared to 66 percent of those who had not, the very small number (11) in the former category necessitates that the relationship not be considered as significant. It is, however, interesting to note that the observed tendency is contrary to both the anticipated hypothesis and the findings of Hoffman and Ward.¹

¹Hoffman and Ward, Bilingualism and Biculturalism, p. 71.

TABLE 4-16
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
 AND PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE
 (Column Percentages; Row Percentages in Brackets)

ROLE STYLE	PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE		N
	HAS NOT RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE	HAS RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE	
Delegate	11 (95)	9 (5)	(21)
Politico	24 (96)	18 (4)	(46)
Trustee	66 (94)	73 (6)	(130)
	101	100	
N =	(186)	(11)	(197)
gamma = .15			

Socialization

Hypothesis: Respondents who were raised in families where politics was frequently discussed, will tend to be trustees.

Result: Not confirmed.

Only one variable was used to measure whether respondents had been politically socialized in their pre-adult years or not. Virtually no relationship was found between role styles and the respondents' answers to the question of whether, as a child, there was much discussion in their homes about politics. While there was a slight tendency for those who reported no political discussion in their homes as a child to adopt the trustee role, the tendency was not statistically significant, and the hypothesis was not sustained. This was a finding similar to that of Prewitt, Eulau and Zisk, who found a "consistent lack of relationship

between initial socialization into politics and incumbent orientations."¹

TABLE 4-17
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND FAMILY DISCUSSION OF POLITICS AS CHILD
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	FAMILY DISCUSSION OF POLITICS AS CHILD				N
	NONE	HARDLY ANY	SOME	GREAT DEAL	
Delegate	7	17	8	15	(21)
Politico	13	20	29	20	(46)
Trustee	80	63	63	65	(124)
	100	100	100	100	
N =	(15)	(35)	(101)	(40)	(191)
gamma = -.05 tau b = .029					

Political Party Affiliation

Hypothesis: New Democratic Party supporters will be most likely to adopt a trustee role style.

Result: Confirmed.

While the overall association between political party affiliation and representational role style was fairly weak, the trustee role style was more pronounced for NDP supporters (100%) than for Conservatives (71%) or Liberals (63%). Thus, while the findings as set out in Table 4-18 are similar to those of Hoffman and Ward with regard to NDP

¹Prewitt, Eulau, and Zisk, "Political Socialization," p. 579.

supporters,¹ they are at variance with Smith's finding that NDP members are inclined toward the politico role and that Liberals are strongly delegates.² It must of course be borne in mind that in these other studies, the respondents were elected political members, not municipal councillors merely expressing their party preferences.

TABLE 4-18
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE
(Column Percentages)

ROLE STYLE	POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE			
	PC	LIB.	NDP	N
Delegate	8	19	0	(16)
Politico	20	18	0	(21)
Trustee	71	63	100	(81)
	99	100	100	
N =	(49)	(62)	(7)	(118)
gamma = -.04				

Faith in People

Hypothesis: Councillors with a low faith in people will more frequently be trustees.

Result: Confirmed.

¹Hoffman and Ward, Bilingualism and Biculturalism, p. 71.

²Smith, "Saskatchewan M.L.A.s," p. 21.

One of the scaled attitude questions was selected as a test of the relationship between representational role style and faith in people. Hedlund¹ found that legislators with a low faith in people are more likely to be trustees. As Table 4-19 indicates, the data from this study support a similar finding and confirm the hypothesis. While delegates overwhelmingly disagreed with the statement that "Important community decisions are best left up to a few leading citizens," 20 percent of the politicians agreed as did 31 percent of the trustees.

TABLE 4-19
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE
AND AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT THAT "IMPORTANT
COMMUNITY DECISIONS ARE BEST LEFT UP TO A FEW
LEADING CITIZENS."

(Column Percentages; Row Percentages in Brackets)

ROLE STYLE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	N
Delegate	4 (10)	8 (5)	13 (85)	(20)
Politico	18 (20)	17 (4)	26 (76)	(46)
Trustee	78 (31)	75 (7)	61 (62)	(128)
	100	100	100	
N =	(50)	(12)	(132)	(194)
gamma = -.36 tau b = -.163				

In summary, as indicated on Table 4-5, previous studies of representational role style have produced an array of often contradictory findings. But on most of the variables considered here,

¹Hedlund, "Legislative Socialization," cited in Jewell, "Attitudinal Determinants," p. 474.

the findings from this study have been in line with findings of many previous studies. Only for the variables of leadership and complexity were results radically different from those of other research. With regard to other studies at the local level of government, it is interesting to note that we found agreement on most of the independent variables with Newton and Jewell, whose studies most closely resemble our own. We also found agreement with Prewitt, Eulau and Zisk on the political socialization variable which they examined in their study of California councillors.

In the following final chapter, further statistical analysis of these findings will be undertaken as part of the assessment of the usefulness of representational role style analysis in the study of municipal councillors.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE UTILITY OF REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE ANALYSIS IN THE STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

On the basis of the results discussed in the previous chapter, it could be plausibly argued that representational role style analysis has been shown to be as applicable at the local level as at the more senior levels of government. Using a variety of measures, it has been shown that municipal councillors in one Canadian province can be classified as to their representational role style in a manner similar to their legislative counterparts at other levels and in other countries. It has also been demonstrated that the relationships between background variables and the representational role styles held by Newfoundland councillors are comparable with those held by other legislators.

But further analysis is needed. The mere demonstration that Newfoundland councillors can be classified as to their representational role style in a manner relatively consistent with the subjects of other such studies is not sufficient. Two additional questions must be asked. First, do the traditional role style categories of delegate, politico, and trustee really measure discrete differences among legislators? Second, is there any alternative method of classifying legislators which might result in a clearer differentiation of their representational role styles? The further question of whether representational role styles, however measured, are useful predictors of legislative behaviour, is

beyond the scope of this thesis.¹

Representational Role Styles: Are They Discrete?

In the previous chapter, Newfoundland councillors were classified into three categories of representational role style: delegate, politico, and trustee. These categories were then developed into an index and crosstabulated with various background and attitude variables. The results were rather mixed: in some cases, a fairly strong statistical relationship was found; yet in other instances, the relationship was very weak. For some variables, the relationship was even in the opposite direction from that which had been predicted; and for nearly all of the background variables, the findings of this study were in conflict with those of some previous studies--although it should not be overlooked that the present findings were frequently in agreement with those of yet other previous works.

Perhaps these conflicting findings can be attributed to the methodological and question variations as discussed in Chapter Three, or perhaps there are still too few comparable case studies available to permit valid comparison to be drawn. This could certainly be argued with regard to such studies at the municipal level. Or perhaps the conflicting results indicate the difficulty, even impossibility, of this

¹This particular question has been addressed by a few previous studies, although no consistent conclusions have been reached. See, for example: Donald A. Gross, "Representative Styles and Legislative Behaviour," Western Political Quarterly, (September 1978), p. 370; and David J. Hadley, "Legislative Role Orientations and Support for Party and Chief Executive in the Indiana House," Legislative Studies Quarterly 2 (3), August 1977: 309-355. Data for a study of the predictive capability of representational role styles is presently being gathered on councillors in the City of St. John's, Newfoundland. It is proposed to study the newly-elected (November 1981) council over their four-year term of office.

form of research. In other words, representational role styles may, in fact, have limited applicability in the study of legislators insofar as their measurement by traditional methods may be inaccurate.

It was in an effort to overcome some of these traditional measurement problems that the Role Style Index was developed in Chapter Four. This index was designed to eliminate "inconsistent" responses to the three questions directly dealing with representational role style. But the question still remains of how well representational role style is being measured? To what degree can such attitudes be tapped by these means? Are there intervening variables which are not evident from simple cross-tabulations alone? It is to these questions that the first part of this concluding chapter will be devoted.

Turning first to a reexamination of the Role Style Index itself, it may be advisable to enquire further into the manner of its construction. In the previous chapter it was argued that the Role Style Index provided the "cleanest" measure of representational role style perceptions by eliminating those whose responses were inconsistent. A respondent who, for whatever reason, answered one of the three attitude measure questions as a delegate, yet answered another as a trustee or politico would be eliminated from the Index. We were thus left with the most consistent responses. But were these responses the strongest in terms of representational role style perceptions?

In order to test this, the three role questions were crosstabulated with the six attitude questions which were deemed to have specific relevance to representational role styles. The results are shown in Table 5-1. The Role Style Index figures are also provided for comparison.

TABLE 5-1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOUR MEASURES OF REPRESENTATIONAL
ROLE STYLE AND SELECTED ATTITUDE MEASURES

(ROW PERCENTAGES)

Q 82 Decisions According to Citizens Feelings				
COUNCACT (Q51)	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	N
What voters want (D)	95.1	1.6	3.3	(61)
Undecided (P)	85.4	10.7	3.9	(103)
Use own judgement (T)	75.5	6.8	17.7	(147)
			gamma = .47	
HOWVOTE (Q52)				
As citizens want (D)	98.1	1.9	0.0	(54)
Depends on issue (P)	87.3	7.6	5.1	(79)
As feel best (T)	76.0	8.4	15.6	(179)
			gamma = .57	
SPECISS (Q53)				
As citizens feel (D)	90.7	7.4	1.9	(54)
Trustee combination (T)	80.6	7.1	12.3	(253)
			gamma = .42	
REPROLE (INDEX)				
Delegate	100.0	0.0	0.0	(21)
Politico	84.8	10.9	4.3	(46)
Trustee	70.6	8.7	20.6	(126)
			gamma = .59	

Q 88 First Duty is to Fellow-Citizens				
COUNCACT (Q51)	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	N
What voters want (D)	95.1	1.6	3.3	(61)
Undecided (P)	78.0	11.0	11.0	(100)
Use own judgement (T)	82.8	6.2	11.0	(145)
			gamma = .18	
HOWVOTE (Q52)				
As citizens want (D)	98.1	1.9	0.0	(54)
Depends on issue (P)	80.8	11.5	7.7	(78)
As feel best (T)	81.1	5.7	13.1	(175)
			gamma = .34	

Table 5-1 - continued

		AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	N
<u>SPECISS (Q53)</u>					
As citizens feel	(D)	92.6	5.6	1.9	(54)
Trustee combination	(T)	82.3	6.5	11.3	(248)
					gamma = .47
<u>REPROLE (INDEX)</u>					
Delegate		100.0	0.0	0.0	(21)
Politico		78.3	13.0	8.7	(46)
Trustee		82.1	4.9	13.0	(123)
					gamma = .20

Q 94 Most People Don't Know or Care

		AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	N
<u>COUNCACT (Q51)</u>					
What voters want	(D)	44.1	15.3	40.7	(59)
Undecided	(P)	47.5	13.9	38.6	(101)
Use own judgement	(T)	48.6	6.1	45.3	(148)
					gamma = .01
<u>HOWVOTE (Q52)</u>					
As citizens want	(D)	42.3	17.3	40.4	(52)
Depends on issue	(P)	48.7	14.1	37.2	(78)
As feel best	(T)†	47.5	7.8	44.7	(179)
					gamma = .02
<u>SPECISS (Q53)</u>					
As citizens feel	(D)	53.8	9.6	36.5	(52)
Trustee combination	(T)	45.5	10.7	43.9	(253)
					gamma = .15
<u>REPROLE (INDEX)</u>					
Delegate		31.6	26.3	42.1	(19)
Politico		41.3	17.4	41.3	(46)
Trustee		48.4	6.3	45.2	(142)
					gamma = -.06

Table 5-1 - continued

Q 96 Councillors Think Like Fellow-Citizens

<u>COUNCACT (Q51)</u>		<u>AGREE</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>N</u>
What voters want	(D)	39.3	6.6	54.1	(61)
Undecided	(P)	35.6	12.9	51.5	(101)
Use own judgement	(T)	38.1	11.6	50.3	(147)
gamma = -.02					
<u>HOWVOTE (Q52)</u>					
As citizens want	(D)	37.0	11.1	51.9	(54)
Depends on issue	(P)	25.6	12.8	61.5	(78)
As feel best	(T)	42.7	10.7	46.6	(178)
gamma = -.16					
<u>SPECISS (Q53)</u>					
As citizens feel	(D)	42.6	9.3	48.1	(54)
Trustee combination	(T)	35.9	11.6	52.6	(251)
gamma = .10					
<u>REPROLE (INDEX)</u>					
Delegate		33.3	4.8	61.9	(21)
Politico		17.4	15.2	67.4	(46)
Trustee		40.0	11.2	48.8	(125)
gamma = -.28					

Q 97 Primary Responsibility is to do a Good Job

<u>COUNCACT (Q51)</u>		<u>AGREE</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>N</u>
What voters want	(D)	72.1	19.7	8.2	(61)
Undecided	(P)	60.4	20.8	18.8	(101)
Use own judgement	(T)	72.6	8.2	19.2	(146)
gamma = -.02					
<u>HOWVOTE (Q52)</u>					
As citizens want	(D)	61.1	22.2	16.7	(54)
Depends on issue	(P)	60.3	17.9	21.8	(78)
As feel best	(T)	75.7	10.2	14.1	(177)
gamma = -.23					
<u>SPECISS (Q53)</u>					
As citizens feel	(D)	70.4	16.7	13.0	(54)
Trustee combination	(T)	69.6	13.2	17.2	(250)
gamma = .04					

Table 5-1 - continued

<u>REPROLE (INDEX)</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>N</u>
Delegate	61.9	28.6	9.5	(21)
Politico	52.2	23.9	23.9	(46)
Trustee	75.0	8.9	16.1	(124)

gamma = -.26

Q 98 No One Decide on Basis of Citizen Wants

<u>COUNCACT (Q51)</u>		<u>AGREE</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>N</u>
What voters want	(D)	38.3	15.0	46.7	(60)
Undecided	(P)	40.8	30.6	28.6	(98)
Use own judgement	(T)	58.6	10.3	31.0	(145)

gamma = -.22

HOWVOTE (Q52)

As citizens want	(D)	34.0	13.2	52.8	(53)
Depends on issue	(P)	40.8	31.6	27.6	(76)
As feel best	(T)	56.6	13.7	29.7	(175)

gamma = -.27

SPECISS (Q53)

As citizens feel	(D)	32.1	13.2	54.6	(53)
Trustee combination	(T)	53.3	18.3	28.5	(246)

gamma = -.42

REPROLE (INDEX)

Delegate		20.0	10.0	70.0	(20)
Politico		35.6	35.6	28.9	(45)
Trustee		62.3	12.3	25.4	(122)

gamma = -.45

In all six cases, the Index clearly provides a stronger relationship than any of the other role questions. The crosstabulations between the role questions and attitude questions 82, 96, 97, and 98 all reveal a stronger gamma statistic when the Index is used than is the case with any of the other role questions. The stronger pattern is also visually evident.

In one of the two cases-where this stronger statistical relationship is not evident (Q88), it may be attributed to the higher percentage of undecided politicians found in the Index crosstabulations than found in any of the others. The pattern of delegate/agree and politico/disagree is clearer, however, when the Index is used than in any of the other crosstabulations.

In the other case (Q94), the very low strength of overall relationship would appear to indicate that this particular attitude question does not adequately measure the dimension of representational role style. This suggests that the question of unidimensionality should be further explored.

It was noted in the previous chapter that the attitude questions did not fully meet standard Guttman scaling requirements.¹ In order to test the possibility that this may have been caused by one or more of the attitude questions failing to measure the same dimension(s) as the others, the six attitude questions were re-subjected to the Guttman scaling procedure with one, two, and then three of the questions being deleted in all possible combinations. The results are reported in Table 5-2.

¹See p. 92.

TABLE 5-2

RESULTS OF GÜTTMAN SCALING

VARIOUS COMBINATIONS OF ATTITUDE QUESTIONS

Excluded questions	Questions included in Scaling procedures	Coefficient of reproducibility	Coefficient scalability
	82, 88, 94, 96, 97, 98	.8116	.3450
82	88, 94, 96, 97, 98	.8107	.3906
88	82, 94, 96, 97, 98	.8106	.3953
94	82, 88, 96, 97, 98	.8480	.4184
96	82, 88, 94, 97, 98	.8413	.3670
97	82, 88, 94, 96, 98	.8020	.3632
98	82, 88, 94, 96, 97,	.8323	.4093
82, 88	94, 96, 97, 98	.8043	.4413
82, 94	88, 96, 97, 98	.8505	.4721
82, 96	88, 94, 97, 98	.8488	.4400
82, 97	88, 94, 96, 98	.8030	.4306
82, 98	88, 94, 96, 97	.8388	.4815
88, 94	82, 96, 97, 98	.8465	.4655
88, 96	82, 94, 97, 98	.8399	.4121
88, 97	82, 94, 96, 98	.7993	.4259
88, 98	82, 94, 96, 97	.8442	.5026
94, 96	82, 88, 97, 98	.8904	.4741
94, 97	82, 88, 96, 98	.8427	.4477
94, 98	82, 88, 96, 97	.8820	.5248
96, 97	82, 88, 94, 98	.8344	.3846
96, 98	82, 88, 94, 97	.8766	.4774
97, 98	82, 88, 94, 96	.8230	.4301
82, 88, 94	96, 97, 98	.8488	.5251
82, 88, 86	94, 97, 98	.8426	.4875
82, 88, 97	94, 96, 98	.7887	.4868
82, 88, 98	94, 96, 97	.8452	.5701
88, 94, 96	82, 97, 98	.9079	.5882
88, 94, 97	82, 96, 98	.8557	.5600
88, 94, 98	82, 96, 97	.8989	.6357
94, 96, 97	82, 88, 98	.9010	.5500
94, 97, 98	82, 88, 96	.8740	.5397
96, 97, 98	82, 88, 94	.8671	.4764
82, 94, 96	88, 97, 98	.9139	.6080
82, 96, 97	88, 94, 98	.8504	.5037
82, 97, 98	88, 94, 96	.8322	.5291
82, 94, 97	88, 96, 98	.8592	.5631
82, 94, 98	88, 96, 97	.9020	.6400
82, 96, 98	88, 94, 97	.9038	.6239

There are four combinations reported in Table 5-2 which exceed the standard minimum coefficients of .8500 (reproducibility) and .6000 (scalability). Listed in order of coefficient of scalability strength, these are:

88, 96, 97
82, 96, 97
88, 94, 97
88, 97, 98.

If the attitude questions which are included in only one of the combinations are eliminated, the only consistent combination is that of 88, 96, and 97. This combination also has the strongest coefficient of scalability, indicating that the same dimensions are being measured in each of the three questions.

By scaling these three attitude questions, it should be possible to create a scale which will provide an index of representational role style perceptions based on a different series of measures than those of the REPROLE index. Table 5-3 sets out the attitude scale ATTSCALE.¹

¹Questions 96 and 97 were recoded to provide the "delegate" responses at the low end of the scale and the "trustee" responses at the upper end. The scale was built using the Compute format so that each response to the three questions would be additive. Thus, for example, a respondent who "agreed strongly" (1) with question 88, who "agreed" (2) with question 96, and who was "undecided" (3) for question 97 would have a scale score of 6.

TABLE 5-3

ATTITUDE SCALE COMPOSED OF
QUESTIONS 88, 96, AND 97
(ATTSCALE)

SCALE SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
3	12	3.9
4	4	1.3
5	16	5.2
6	23	7.5
7	53	17.3
8	53	17.3
9	36	11.8
10	46	15.0
11	55	18.0
12	2	0.7
13	3	1.0
14	1	0.3
15	2	0.7
	306	100.0

It would be expected that the attitude scale ATTSCALE would correlate highly with the REPROLE index since both are presumed to be measuring representational role styles. In order to test this, ATTSCALE was collapsed into 5 categories and cross-tabulated with the REPROLE index.¹ The results are displayed in Tables 5-4 and 5-5.

¹The categories are:

3, 4, 5, 6	= 1	(delegate)
7, 8	= 2	(weak delegate)
9	= 3	(politico)
10, 11	= 4	(weak trustee)
12, 13, 14, 15	= 5	(trustee).

TABLE 5-4

CROSSTABULATION OF ATTSCALE
WITH REPROLE INDEX
(column percentages)

REPROLE INDEX	ATTITUDE SCALE				
	DELEGATE	WEAK DELEGATE	UNCLEAR	WEAK TRUSTEE	TRUSTEE
DELEGATE	17.1	9.4	13.0	9.7	0.0
POLITICO	45.7	21.9	30.4	14.5	0.0
TRUSTEE	37.1	68.8	56.5	75.8	100.0
N =	100.0 (35)	100.0 (64)	100.0 (23)	100.0 (62)	100.0 (2)

TAU C = .187
GAMMA = .32

TABLE 5-5

CROSSTABULATION OF ATTSCALE
WITH REPROLE INDEX
(row percentages)

REPROLE INDEX	ATTITUDE SCALE					(N)
	DELEGATE	WEAK DELEGATE	UNCLEAR	WEAK TRUSTEE	TRUSTEE	
DELEGATE	28.6	28.6	14.3	28.6	0.0	(21)
POLITICO	34.8	30.4	15.2	19.6	0.0	(46)
TRUSTEE	10.9	37.0	10.9	39.5	1.7	(119)

TAU C = .187
GAMMA = .32

The expected positive correlation between the attitude scale ATTSCALE and the REPROLE index was found, but with only a moderate strength of correlation. This indicates that the two measures are not fully tapping the same dimension. Certainly, the largest percentage of delegates as measured by the REPROLE index (57.2%) was found in the "delegate/weak-delegate" categories of the attitude scale; but nearly one-half of the trustees (47.9%) had "delegate/weak-delegate" attitudes, as did 65% of the politicians. Conversely, while just over one-half (50.2%) of the REPROLE trustees were classified as "weak-trustee/trustee" on the attitude scale, so too were nearly 30% of the REPROLE delegates.

Thus, while there is some evidence to indicate that the two approaches to representational role style perceptions do measure the same dimensions, the evidence also suggests that these measures, while not being conflictual, are not interchangeable. But do these different measures yield similar patterns of correlation with the background variables? In order to ascertain this, cross-tabulations were performed between the ATTSCALE index and the same background variables considered in Chapter Four. For purposes of comparison, the REPROLE index correlation statistics are also presented in Table 5-6.

TABLE 5-6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDE SCALE
AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES

VARIABLE	CORRELATIONS	
	ATTITUDE SCALE	REPROLE
SIZE OF COMMUNITY		
-urban councillors tend toward trustee style		.13 (G)
-councillors from smaller towns tend toward trustee style	-.10 (G)	
COMPETITIVENESS		
-no significant relation to method of selection	.08 (G)	.02 (G)
-councillors elected to large tend toward trustee style (in ward systems)		.37 (G)
-no relationship to ward system	.01 (G)	
COMPLEXITY		
-delegate role style related to smaller budget		.18 (G)
-trustee style related to smaller budget	-.09 (G)	
-no relationship to type of council	-.04 (G)	.04 (G)
AGE		
-older councillors tend toward trustee style	.16 (G)	.31 (G)
EDUCATION		
-higher education related to trustee role		.14 (G)
-higher education related to delegate role	-.11 (G)	
OCCUPATION		
-no significant relationship	.00 (G)	.05 (G)
LENGTH OF SERVICE		
-less service associated with delegate style & longer service with trustee style		.51 (G)
-no significant relationship	-.00 (G)	
LEADERSHIP		
-no significant relationship	.07 (G)	.02 (G)
PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE		
-no significant relationship	-.031(tau C)	-.014 (tau C)
SOCIALIZATION		
-no significant relationship	.063 (tau b)	.029 (tau b)

Table 5-5 - continued

POLITICAL PARTY/IDEOLOGY

-PC's tend to trustee style		.16 (G)
-NDP tend to trustee style	-.10 (G)	.16 (G)

FAITH IN PEOPLE

-those with less faith in people more likely to be trustees	-.122 (tau b)	-.163 (tau b)
---	---------------	---------------

SEX

-females tend to be less trustee style	-.32 (G)	-.35 (G)
--	----------	----------

NOTE: For a complete description of the background variables and their relationships to the REPROLE index, see pp. 101-115.

Since both the ATTSCALE and REPROLE indices purportedly measure the same thing -- representational role style perceptions, it might have been anticipated that their relationship to various background variables would have been similar. But as can be seen from Table 5-6, this was not the case. Only a few of the correlations were similar, and in a number of cases the relationships were reversed. In a way, this should not have been too surprising, since the ATTSCALE and REPROLE indices did not correlate highly with each other; and this, in turn, was hardly unexpected given the difference in the distribution of delegates and trustees both in the two indices and in their component parts.

However, in order to double-check that the ATTSCALE index did not in any significant way distort its individual constituent variables, the attitude variables were individually crosstabulated with the background variables. The results are presented in Appendix L where it can be seen that, in some instances, there is a fairly wide variation between the attitude questions and the background variables and, in other cases, there is a consistent pattern throughout. Overall, it seems reasonable to conclude that the ATTSCALE index does not distort the relationship of the individual attitude questions to the background variables.

To summarize, the two indices -- ATTSCALE and REPROLE -- do not similarly correlate with many of the background variables. And, as Table 5-7 indicates, they provide quite different distributions of the traditional representational role styles.

TABLE 5-7

COMPARISON OF TRADITIONAL REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLES
 AS DETERMINED BY THE REPROLE AND ATTSCALE INDICES
 (column percentages)

TRADITIONAL ROLE STYLE	REPROLE	ATTSCALE
DELEGATE	10.7	18.0 34.6 (near-delegate)
POLITICO	23.4	11.8 33.0 (near-trustee)
TRUSTEE	66.0	2.6
	100.0	100.0
N =	(197)	(306)

In order to provide a basis for further research as well as in the interests of comparison, the factor-based indexes were crosstabulated with the same background variables as was the REPROLE index in the previous chapter. For clarity of presentation and ease of discussion, the relationships set out in Table 5-12 have been arranged by factor-based index.¹

¹The background variables have been listed in the same order and with the same coding categories as was done in Chapter 4. The relationships between the factor-based indexes and the REPROLE index have been set out in a separate table (5-13).

The results, shown in Table 5-8, however, indicate that the elimination of inconsistent responses left only 24 valid cases, too few for any analysis.

TABLE 5-8
ATTROLE FREQUENCIES

RESPONSE CODE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
DELEGATE	12	50.0
NEAR-DELEGATE	7	29.2
POLITICO	3	12.5
NEAR-TRUSTEE	0	0.0
TRUSTEE	2	8.3
	24	100.0

An Alternative Approach

From the foregoing, it is evident that the traditional measures of representational role style perceptions of municipal councillors in Newfoundland and Labrador do not stand up under close analysis. It may be that these particular councillors simply do not fit into neat theoretical categorizations of their attitudes toward representation. Alternatively, it may be that the methodological procedures for accurately measuring their representational role style perceptions have not yet been adequately developed. This section will explore an alternative approach using factor analysis.

Factor analysis is a statistical operation which attempts "to identify the common factors that underlie a large number of variables."¹ By subjecting the attitude question data to factor analysis it should be possible to determine whether any underlying common factors exist and, if so, with which variables they are most strongly associated. Since the attitude question variables are all coded on a five-point agree/disagree scale, the generally-accepted requirement of nominal data will be met.² Principal factoring with iteration (PA2) and Varimax orthogonal rotation were used in the factoring.³

¹G. David Garson, Handbook of Social Science Methods, (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1971), p. 191.

²Ibid., p. 210. See also Jae-On Kim and Charles W. Mueller, Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues, Sage University Papers, Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, no. 14 (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978), pp. 73-75.

³For a general discussion of factor analysis and the alternative methods of factoring see Norman H. Nye et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), pp. 489-499; Jae-On Kim and Charles W. Mueller, Factor Analysis pp. 7-60; and Jae-On Kim and Charles W. Mueller, Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and How to do it, Sage University Papers Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, no. 13 (Beverly Hills: Sage Publication: 1978), pp. 7-70.

Since the aim of this section is to explore alternative approaches to the measurement and classification of councillor attitudes, the initial factor analysis will be performed on all 18 attitude variables, not just those identified as specifically dealing with representational role style attitudes. The rationale for this is that by employing all of the attitude variables it may become evident that there are underlying attitude dimensions other than those of representational role style which may prove to be of importance in explaining the inconsistency between the two different measurements of representational role style employed in this work.

Table 5-9 sets out the initial principal components factor analysis. Six factors with an eigenvalue of greater than 1.0 have been produced. Together they explain just over 50 percent of the total variance. Using the generally-accepted minimum loading of .300 as a cut-off point, the first factor indicates a dimension of concern with services and benefits. The second factor indicates an anti-populist dimension somewhat analogous to the trustee style. The third factor appears to tap a similar dimension, while the remaining factors do not show any readily interpretable pattern.

TABLE 5-9

FACTOR MATRIX OF ATTITUDE VARIABLES
USING PRINCIPAL FACTORING WITH ITERATION

VARIABLE	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6	COMMUNITIES
ATT 1 vote as citizens feel	.337	-.542	-.317	.142	.235	-.122	-.599
ATT 2 council's job to get benefits	.559	-.328	.107	-.239	-.025	.149	.512
ATT 3 community has good leadership	-.050	-.181	.302	.302	.026	.064	.223
ATT 4 important decisions best by few	.268	.100	.307	-.063	-.165	.054	.209
ATT 5 citizens haven't enough say	.300	.049	-.333	-.017	.058	.141	.227
ATT 6 everyone's opinion equal	.131	-.009	-.196	.244	.052	.134	.136
ATT 7 first duty to fellow citizens	.247	-.171	-.040	.196	-.068	.013	.135
ATT 8 people want services/favours	.448	.189	-.000	-.003	.393	-.087	.399
ATT 9 public meetings cause trouble	.382	.276	.010	-.137	-.155	-.076	.271
ATT 10 outsiders don't understand needs	.456	.049	.041	-.123	.005	-.265	.297
ATT 11 election depends on service	.186	.089	.135	-.003	.146	.009	.083
ATT 12 businessmen too influential	.178	.190	-.392	-.052	-.044	.080	.233
ATT 13 people don't know or care	.407	.330	-.005	.062	-.147	.104	.311
ATT 14 council's job to help province	.438	-.260	.059	-.030	.165	.071	.296
ATT 15 councillors think like citizens	.337	-.103	.330	.102	-.128	.080	.267
ATT 16 first responsibility is good job	.215	.383	.000	.286	-.023	.150	.298
ATT 17 decisions not by citizens wants	.110	.387	.012	.109	-.132	-.183	.225
ATT 18 local gov't helps democracy	.184	-.082	.008	.229	.049	-.306	.189
% of total variance	14.0	9.8	8.2	6.8	6.1	6.0	50.9
eigenvalue	2.5	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.1	

In order to clarify the principal components factor matrix the data were subjected to a rotated factor analysis.¹ The results of this are shown in Table 5-10. Only the first three factors will be considered since they collectively account for 75.6 percent of the common variance; the remaining three factors each account for less than 10 percent of the variance and appear to be residual categories with little explanatory value.

¹Four separate rotations were actually performed: Varimax, Equimax, Quartimax and Oblique. There was no significant difference in the factor patterns produced by any of the methods. Varimax, however, has been used in the analysis since not only is it the most widely-accepted method of rotation, but it also provides the clearest definition of the factor structures. In addition, the orthogonal rotation of Varimax was deemed preferable to an oblique rotation since no assumption was made that the underlying dimensions would necessarily be correlated, and the orthogonal technique would most clearly differentiate the factors.

TABLE 5-10

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX
OF ATTITUDE VARIABLES

VARIABLE	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III
ATT 2 The main job of municipal councils is to obtain benefits for their citizens from the government.	.690	.141	.051
ATT 1 The job of a councillor entails being a sounding board for community opinion and then acting on it. I always try to find out what my fellow-citizens feel and make my decisions accordingly.	.483	-.100	-.342
ATT 14 The main job of a municipal council is to help the provincial government provide services to the local community.	.473	.008	-.021
ATT 15 A councillor seldom has to sound out his fellow-citizens because he thinks so much like them that he knows how they would react to almost any proposal.	.311	.297	-.275
ATT 13 Even if a councillor wanted to find out what his fellow-citizens felt about a major public issue, it would be impossible. The majority of the people don't know. They don't have any information on these things. The rest, or most of the rest, simply don't care.	.056	.487	.137
ATT 9 Public meetings here generally stir up more trouble than they are worth.	.089	.437	.226
ATT 4 Important community decisions are best left up to a few leading citizens.	.174	.380	-.120

Table 5-10 - continued

VARIABLE	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III
ATT 17 If anyone tells you he makes his decisions in council on the basis of what his fellow-citizens want, assuming he knew what they want, he is either kidding you or himself.	-.257	.358	.083
ATT 16 My primary responsibility as a councillor is to do as good a job as I can for the community - to act according to my conscience. The alternative is to give in to voters.	-.160	.364	-.014
ATT 3 This community has good leadership in dealing with its problems.	.044	-.033	-.458
ATT 12 The businessmen in this community have too much influence over how things are run.	-.012	.104	.414
ATT 5 Ordinary citizens don't have enough say in community decisions.	.163	.053	.329
ATT 6 Around here, one man's opinion is as good as another's in community affairs.	.046	.005	.045
ATT 7 My first duty is to my fellow-citizens. They are the ones who elected me.	.233	.000	-.062
ATT 8 Let's face it. Insofar as people care about council, what they care about is what you as a councillor can do for them in the way of services and favours.	.179	.190	.150
ATT 10 Outside officials and agencies don't really understand the needs of this community.	.273	.285	.152

Table 5-10 - continued

VARIABLE	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III
ATT 11 I am not at all certain that doing favours, running errands, or serving your constituents, call it whatever you wish, really helps you get elected. I am certain that not doing these things when asked will assure that you don't get elected.	.091	.130	-.046
ATT 18 Local government is important in maintaining democracy in Newfoundland.	.024	.030	-.078
Percentage of common variance explained	37.8	22.9	15.0

As indicated by the initial principal components factor matrix, the Varimax rotation confirms that the first factor taps a service-oriented dimension. The loadings of Attitudes 1 and 14 suggest that this group of councillors considers the provision of benefits and services to be the predominant functions of municipal councils. While the relatively high loading of Attitude 1 may suggest that this dimension might be associated with a delegate role style, the .311 loading of Attitude 15 may temper this somewhat. However, although it was previously assumed that a trustee rather than a delegate would be more likely to hold the view that since legislators think so much like citizens they need rarely be sounded out, this need not necessarily be the case. Particularly in smaller municipalities, councillors who identify themselves as delegates may also consider themselves to be good judges of their fellow-citizens' opinions.

Essentially, it is being suggested here that Factor I be considered as a service-delegate dimension.¹ This position is further enhanced by the negative loadings on Factor I of Attitudes 16 and 17, both of which are considered to reflect a trustee role style. Clearly, however, the representational role style aspect of this dimension is secondary to that of council's role as a provider of services and benefits.

¹This should not be confused with the delegate-servant role style identified by some other researchers. The distinction is that while the delegate-servant consciously acts as he interprets his constituents' wishes, the service-delegate dimension refers to a combination of the delegate role style with a belief that the main role of council is to provide services and obtain benefits for the community. The fact that Attitude 15 loaded almost as high on Factor II as it did on Factor I indicates that the belief that councillors think like their fellow-citizens may be applicable to more than one representative role style.

The dimension indicated by Factor II is an elitist, antipopulist one. While the moderate loadings of Attitudes 16 and 17 clearly suggest that the trustee role style is an integral part of this dimension, the strongest loadings (Attitudes 4, 9, and 13) indicate a less than complimentary view of the average citizen. This second factor, which explains 22.9 percent of the common variance, reveals a view of the ordinary citizen as being poorly-informed or not caring about public issues, of public meetings (where, presumably, these ill-informed and uncaring citizens might in their ignorance prevent better-informed and more concerned views from prevailing) being more trouble than they are worth, and of important community decisions best being made by a few leading citizens. The negative loading of Attitude I and the zero loading of Attitude 7 support the argument that this is at least partially a trustee dimension.

The third factor indicates a concern with community leadership: a concern that businessmen are too influential at the expense of ordinary citizens. While Factor III does not tap a major dimension, as evidenced by its 8.2 percent explanation of total variance and the limited number of respondents (28) who felt that their community did not have good leadership (Attitude 3), it is interesting that the anti-businessmen view is part of this dimension although it is not clearly a populist dimension.

Overall, it is evident that the three factors indicate discrete attitude dimensions. It is noteworthy, however, that the

representational role style attitudes do not cluster by themselves, only in conjunction with other variables.¹ Together with the moderate overall loadings and the relatively small percentage of variance for which the three main factors account, it seems clear that the representational role style attitudes as measured here are not the main attitudinal attributes.

As a way of confirming this, simple factor-based scales were constructed using the variables which had substantial loadings on each factor.² Since each of the variables used were identically coded, the scales were created by selecting responses to either the "agree strongly" or "agree" categories for the first code, the "undecided" for the second and the "disagree" or "disagree strongly" for the third. Attitudes 1, 2, 14, and 15 were used for the Factor I index, Attitudes 4, 9, 13, 16 and 17 for the Factor II index and Attitudes 3, 5 and 12 for the Factor III index.³ The frequencies of the three indexes are set out in Table 5-11.⁴

¹ It is also interesting to note that neither of the two questions Attitudes 8 and 11) which were previously found to be ambiguous and confusing to respondents (see above, p. 91) loaded high on the rotated factors.

² The decision to construct a simple factor-based index rather than a fully-fledged factor scale was based on two considerations. First, the use of factor scales per se is not universally accepted, largely because of what Kim and Mueller refer to as their "indeterminacy." Second, since the six factors identified explained barely 50 percent of the total variance and since the use of factor analysis in this study is exploratory rather than confirmatory, it seemed imprudent to employ full factor scaling. For an excellent discussion of factor scaling see Kim and Mueller, Factor Analysis, pp. 60-73.

³ Since Attitude 3 loaded negatively on Factor III, it was reverse coded for the purposes of this index.

⁴ The absence of all but one undecided in the indexes suggests that there was no significant pattern of individual respondents repeatedly selecting the undecided category. This is in keeping with the range of undecided responses for the attitude questions: from 6.0 to 23.1 percent.

TABLE 5-11

FREQUENCIES OF FACTOR-BASED INDEXES

FACTOR INDEX	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
I		
1 AGREE	107	54.9
2 UNDECIDED	-	0.0
3 DISAGREE	88	45.1
	195	100.0
II		
1 AGREE	89	62.7
2 UNDECIDED	-	0.0
3 DISAGREE	53	37.3
	142	100.0
III		
1 AGREE	29	14.1
2 UNDECIDED	1	0.5
3 DISAGREE	176	85.4
	206	100.0

In order to provide a basis for further research as well as in the interests of comparison, the factor-based indexes were crosstabulated with the same background variables as was the REPROLE index in the previous chapter. For clarity of presentation and ease of discussion, the relationships set out in Table 5-12 have been arranged by factor-based index.¹

¹The background variables have been listed in the same order and with the same coding categories as was done in Chapter 4. The relationships between the factor-based indexes and the REPROLE index have been set out in a separate table (5-13).

TABLE 5-12

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FACTOR-BASED INDEXES
AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(column percentages)

FACTOR-BASED INDEX I

	POPULATION				
	LESS THAN 1000	1000- 2500	2500- 5000	5000- 10000	OVER 10000
AGREE	62.7	59.6	46.2	28.6	11.1
DISAGREE	37.3	40.4	53.8	71.4	88.9
N =	(110)	(47)	(13)	(7)	(18)

Tau C = .25

Gamma = .40

	WARD SYSTEM	
	WARDS	NO WARDS
AGREE	66.7	53.8
DISAGREE	33.3	46.3
N =	(18)	(160)

Tau B = .08

Gamma = .26

	METHOD OF SELECTION		
	ELECTED	APPOINTED	ACCLAIMED
AGREE	54.3	52.9	58.3
DISAGREE	45.7	47.1	41.7
N =	(129)	(17)	(48)

Tau C = -.02

Gamma = -.05

	OPERATING BUDGET		
	LESS THAN \$100,000	\$100,000- \$500,000	MORE THAN \$500,000
AGREE	61.7	43.8	24.0
DISAGREE	38.3	56.3	76.0
N =	(115)	(16)	(25)

Tau C = .25

Gamma = .54

Table 5-12 - continued

	LEAST COMPLEX	TYPE MEDIUM COMPLEXITY	MOST COMPLEX
AGREE	67.7	51.7	10.0
DISAGREE	32.3	48.3	90.0
N =	(65)	(120)	(10)

Tau C = .22
Gamma = .43

	AGE			
	UNDER 25	25-35	36-45	OVER 60
AGREE	61.5	45.7	60.5	51.1
DISAGREE	38.5	54.3	39.5	48.9
N =	(13)	(70)	(43)	(47)

Tau C = -.12
Gamma = -.17

	EDUCATION		
	MINIMAL	AVERAGE	HIGH
AGREE	73.2	48.2	33.3
DISAGREE	26.8	51.8	66.7
N =	(71)	(85)	(33)

Tau C = .12
Gamma = .49

	OCCUPATION			
	LOW STATUS	MIDDLE STATUS	HIGH STATUS	OTHER
AGREE	64.7	62.5	40.0	64.0
DISAGREE	35.3	37.5	60.0	36.0
N =	(51)	(40)	(75)	(25)

Tau C = .13
Gamma = .18

	LENGTH OF SERVICE		
	SHORT	MEDIUM	LONG
AGREE	55.5	41.7	65.0
DISAGREE	44.5	58.3	35.0
N =	(119)	(36)	(40)

Tau C = -.02
Gamma = -.04

Table 5-12 - continued

	LEADERSHIP	
	LEADER	NON-LEADER
AGREE	57.4	54.1
DISAGREE	42.6	45.9
N =	(148)	(47)

Tau B = -.03

Gamma = -.07

	PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE	
	HAS RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE	HAS NOT RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE
AGREE	33.3	56.3
DISAGREE	66.7	43.7
N =	(12)	(183)

Tau B = -.11

Gamma = -.44

	FAMILY DISCUSSION OF POLITICS			
	GREAT DEAL	SOME	HARDLY ANY	NONE
AGREE	46.5	54.7	59.5	66.7
DISAGREE	53.5	45.3	40.5	33.3
N =	(43)	(95)	(37)	(15)

Tau C = -.12

Gamma = -.18

	POLITICAL PARTY			
	LIBERAL	PC	NDP	OTHER
AGREE	64.7	50.0	62.5	34.4
DISAGREE	35.3	50.0	37.5	65.6
N =	(68)	(50)	(8)	(32)

Tau C = .23

Gamma = .34

Table 5-12 - continuedFACTOR-BASED INDEX II

	POPULATION				
	LESS THAN 1000	1000- 2500	2500- 5000	5000- 10000	OVER 10000
AGREE	53.8	61.3	100.0	100.0	64.3
DISAGREE	42.6	38.7	0.0	0.0	35.7
N =	(78)	(31)	(8)	(11)	(14)

Tau C = -.22

Gamma = -.38

	WARD SYSTEM	
	WARDS	NO WARDS
AGREE	22.2	65.9
DISAGREE	77.8	34.1
N =	(9)	(123)

Tau B = -.23

Gamma = -.74

	METHOD OF SELECTION		
	ELECTED	APPOINTED	ACCLAIMED
AGREE	64.3	60.0	58.8
DISAGREE	35.7	40.0	41.2
N =	(98)	(10)	(34)

Tau C = .04

Gamma = .10

	OPERATING BUDGET		
	LESS THAN \$100,000	\$100,000- \$500,000	MORE THAN \$500,000
AGREE	58.8	77.8	75.0
DISAGREE	41.3	22.2	25.0
N =	(80)	(18)	(20)

Tau C = -.15

Gamma = -.35

	TYPE		
	LEAST COMPLEX	MEDIUM COMPLEXITY	MOST COMPLEX
AGREE	55.1	65.9	80.0
DISAGREE	44.9	34.1	20.0
N =	(49)	(88)	(5)

Tau C = -.11

Gamma = -.25

Table 5-12 - continued

	AGE				
	UNDER 25	25-35	36-45	46-60	OVER 60
AGREE	71.4	52.0	67.6	65.5	73.7
DISAGREE	28.6	48.0	32.4	34.5	26.3
N =	(7)	(50)	(37)	(29)	(19)

Tau C = -.13

Gamma = -.19

	EDUCATION		
	MINIMAL	AVERAGE	HIGH
AGREE	57.9	61.1	71.4
DISAGREE	42.1	38.9	28.6
N =	(38)	(72)	(28)

Tau C = -.09

Gamma = -.16

	OCCUPATION			
	LOW STATUS	MIDDLE STATUS	HIGH STATUS	OTHER
AGREE	50.0	36.4	70.5	81.0
DISAGREE	50.0	63.6	29.5	19.0
N =	(32)	(22)	(61)	(21)

Tau C = -.28

Gamma = -.41*

	LENGTH OF SERVICE		
	SHORT	MEDIUM	LONG
AGREE	58.9	67.9	70.8
DISAGREE	41.1	32.1	29.2
N =	(90)	(28)	(24)

Tau C = -.10

Gamma = -.20

	LEADERSHIP	
	LEADER	NON LEADER
AGREE	63.6	59.4
DISAGREE	36.4	40.6
N =	(32)	(110)

Tau B = .04

Gamma = .09

Table 5-12 -- continued

		PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE	
		HAS RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE	HAS NOT RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE
AGREE DISAGREE		45.5	64.1
		54.5	35.9
N =		(11)	(131)

Tau B = -.10

Gamma = -.36

		FAMILY DISCUSSION OF POLITICS			
		GREAT DEAL	SOME	HARDLY ANY	NONE
AGREE DISAGREE		65.6	71.6	50.0	33.3
		34.4	28.4	50.0	66.7
N =		(32)	(67)	(32)	(9)

Tau C = .18

Gamma = .27

		POLITICAL PARTY			
		LIBERAL	PC	NDP	OTHER
AGREE DISAGREE		59.6	62.2	75.0	63.6
		40.4	37.8	25.0	36.4
N =		(47)	(45)	(8)	(22)

Tau C = -.05

Gamma = -.08

Table 5-12 - continued
 FACTOR-BASED INDEX III *

	POPULATION				
	LESS THAN 1000	1000- 2500	2500- 5000	5000- 10000	OVER 10000
AGREE	10.4	15.0	30.8	25.0	20.0
DISAGREE	89.6	85.0	69.2	75.0	80.0
N =	(124)	(40)	(13)	(8)	(20)

Tau C = -.07
 Gamma = -.29

	WARD SYSTEM	
	WARDS	NO WARDS
AGREE	21.4	12.8
DISAGREE	78.6	87.2
N =	(14)	(172)

Tau B = -.14
 Gamma = -.40

	METHOD OF SELECTION		
	ELECTED	APPOINTED	ACCLAIMED
AGREE	14.5	19.0	10.9
DISAGREE	85.5	81.0	89.1
N =	(137)	(21)	(46)

Tau C = .02
 Gamma = .09

	OPERATING BUDGET		
	LESS THAN \$100,000	\$100,000- \$500,000	MORE THAN \$500,000
AGREE	8.7	14.3	23.1
DISAGREE	91.3	85.7	76.9
N =	(125)	(14)	(26)

Tau C = -.06
 Gamma = -.40

	TYPE		
	LEAST COMPLEX	MEDIUM COMPLEXITY	MOST COMPLEX
AGREE	6.4	17.1	36.4
DISAGREE	93.6	82.9	63.6
N =		(117)	(11)

Tau C = -.11
 Gamma = -.54

* NOTE: The one "undecided" case has been dropped from the tables.

Table 5-12 - continued

	AGE				
	UNDER 25	25-35	36-45	45-60	OVER 60
AGREE	20.0	24.3	9.3	2.1	14.3
DISAGREE	80.0	75.7	90.7	97.9	85.7
N =	(10)	(74)	(53)	(47)	(21)

Tau C = .12
Gamma = .43

	EDUCATION		
	MINIMAL	AVERAGE	HIGH
AGREE	6.8	16.0	20.6
DISAGREE	93.2	84.0	79.4
N =	(72)	(94)	(34)

Tau C = -.07
Gamma = -.33

	OCCUPATION			
	LOW STATUS	MIDDLE STATUS	HIGH STATUS	OTHER
AGREE	9.1	19.0	17.1	4.5
DISAGREE	90.9	81.0	82.9	95.5
N =	(55)	(41)	(82)	(22)

Tau C = -.00
Gamma = -.02

	LENGTH OF SERVICE		
	SHORT	MEDIUM	LONG
AGREE	17.2	9.5	9.5
DISAGREE	82.8	90.5	90.5
N =	(122)	(41)	(42)

Tau C = .05
Gamma = .25

	LEADERSHIP	
	LEADER	NON LEADER
AGREE	8.5	15.7
DISAGREE	91.5	84.3
N =	(47)	(158)

Tau B = .09
Gamma = .35

Table 5-12 - continued

	PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE	
	HAS RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE	HAS NOT RUN FOR OTHER OFFICE
AGREE	14.3	14.1
DISAGREE	85.7	85.9
N =	(14)	(191)

Tau B = -.00

Gamma = -.00

	FAMILY DISCUSSION OF POLITICS			
	GREAT DEAL	SOME	HARDLY ANY	NONE
AGREE	18.2	18.8	4.4	6.7
DISAGREE	81.8	81.2	95.6	93.3
N =	(44)	(95)	(45)	(15)

Tau C = .08

Gamma = .34

	POLITICAL PARTY			
	LIBERAL	PC	NDP	OTHER
AGREE	14.7	10.5	0.0	16.7
DISAGREE	85.3	89.5	100.0	83.3
N =	(61)	(57)	(9)	(30)

Tau C = .02

Gamma = .09

TABLE 5-13

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FACTOR-BASED INDEXES
AND REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE STYLE INDEX

FACTOR-BASED INDEX	REPROLE INDEX		
	DELEGATE	POLITICO	TRUSTEE
I			
AGREE	54.5	26.9	56.8
DISAGREE	45.5	73.1	43.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(11)	(26)	(81)
		Tau C = -.16	
		Gamma = -.34	
II			
AGREE	12.5	68.8	73.4
DISAGREE	87.5	31.2	26.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(8)	(16)	(64)
		Tau C = -.22	
		Gamma = -.51	
III			
AGREE	33.3	31.0	9.8
DISAGREE	66.7	69.0	90.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(12)	(29)	(92)
		Tau C = .19	
		Gamma = .56	

Overall, the councillors who are in strongest agreement with the four attitude questions from which the first factor-based index is constructed tend to be from smaller, less complex municipalities, with a lower education, less likely to hold a high status job, not to have run for any other office, to have had less family discussion about politics as a child, and are less likely to be either Liberal or NDP supporters. The method of selection, existence of a ward system, age, length of service and position of council made no appreciable difference to the pattern of responses.

Earlier, the first factor was identified as tapping primarily a service orientation along with a delegate-oriented role style. It is hardly unexpected, then, that the relationships between the first factor-based index and the background variables are quite similar to those of the delegate role style orientation as determined by the REPROLE index crosstabulations. The only significant differences pertain to ward systems, age, length of service and political party preference. While this does tend to reinforce the interpretation that Factor I consists partially of a delegate role style orientation, this should not be over-emphasized since it is not unreasonable to assume that a councillor who holds a service orientation would not radically differ from one who holds a delegate role style.

But Table 5-13 indicates that such an assumption cannot be made without qualification. The crosstabulation between the representational role style index and the first factor-based index shows that slightly more trustees than delegates agreed with the component attitude variables.

The dimension indicated by Factor II was described above as an elitist, anti-populist one. The crosstabulations between the second factor-based index and the background variables provide a profile of the respondents who hold these views.

They tend to come from larger but not the largest, more complex municipalities, to be elected at large, to be either younger or older than most of their colleagues, to have a higher education and a higher status occupation, to have served as a councillor longer, to not have run for any other office, and to have experienced greater discussion of politics as a child.

While this profile, constructed from the data contained in Table 5-12, intuitively corresponds to the expected background characteristics of an elitist, anti-populist councillor, it does not neatly correspond with the background characteristics of a trustee as portrayed in Chapter 4. More than one-half of the background variable characteristics differ between the stronger Factor II councillors and the trustees as measured by the REPROLE index.¹ But given that the analysis of Factor II indicated only a partial trustee dimension, and considering that politicians have nearly as high a percentage of agree responses as trustees to the second factor-based index in Table 5-13, any greater agreement between the results of the two series of crosstabulations would be unexpected. In sum, this analysis tends to confirm the earlier contention that the trustee dimension

¹ Differences were observed in the method of selection, type of municipality, age, education, occupation, prior political experience, and family discussion of politics.

is not the main component of Factor II.

Factor III was identified as relating to a dimension of concern with community leadership and a view that businessmen had too much influence while ordinary citizens had too little. As noted previously, the actual number of respondents positively identifying with the main variable in this factor is quite limited. This is borne out in Table 5-12 where the percentage of those who agree with the index attitude questions is consistently much below those who disagree. The crosstabulations, however, are useful in determining the background of those councillors who hold these views.

These councillors tend to come from medium sized, more complex municipalities with medium to high operating budgets, they tend to be either elected by ward or appointed, to be under 35 years of age with average to high education, to hold middle or high status jobs, to have served a short time as a non-leader, to have experienced family discussion of politics as a child and to be other than NDP supporters. Table 5-13 indicates that they also tend to hold other than trustee role styles.

In sum, this exploratory analysis has shown that the traditional concepts of representational role style are not the most important components of the three underlying dimensions of the attitude variables. The implications of this, both for this study and on directions for further research, will be considered in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The central concern of this thesis has been to assess the utility of representational role style analysis in the study of municipal government. In the process of this assessment, a great deal of data has been gathered and a number of interesting and important aspects of this topic have been explored.

First, with regard to the data gathered on Newfoundland municipalities and councillors, much of the information had never before been collected. The data concerning municipal operations and councillors' backgrounds and attitudes have been utilized by both the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Federation of Municipalities. Perhaps more important from an academic point of view, the data will form a significant part in a textbook on local government in Newfoundland.¹

Second, a contribution has been made to the ongoing debate about the relative merits of personal interviews versus mail questionnaires in survey research. The arguments for each side were presented in this study. Of particular interest, however, was the finding that relatively low response rates in mailed questionnaires do not necessarily imply significant

¹Peter G. Boswell, Local Government in Newfoundland and Labrador (St. John's: Breakwater Press, forthcoming).

response bias. . For those few variables in which a response bias appeared to be present, the subsequent search for explanations added further to the understanding of Newfoundland municipal councillors and their cultural environment.

Third, the summary and discussion of previous findings from other studies of representational role style perceptions provides for the first time since 1970 a comprehensive and updated listing of this form of research. In addition, the classification of such studies by level of government together with a brief analysis of each, provides a convenient basis for further research.

While these aspects were necessary antecedents to the main focus of the study and can be considered significant in their own right, it was the determination and analysis of representational role styles in the Province of Newfoundland and the assessment of their applicability to the study of local government which was of central importance.

Following the general approach used by most other researchers in this area, direct questions pertaining to representational role style perceptions were asked of respondents. An index composed of these responses was built and crosstabulated with background variables. At this point, the study was at a comparable level to other studies of the genre and, in fact, a comprehensive comparison of findings was provided in Chapter 4. It might have been possible at that point to conclude that by using traditional measures representational role styles were

found among municipal councillors in Newfoundland, and that the role style distribution among councillors of varying backgrounds and experience was similar in many respects to the distribution of delegates, politicians and trustees as reported in other studies.

Two potentially troublesome areas, however, became evident, both concerning measurement of the representational role styles. First, different wording of questions in the direct assessment format resulted in a variation of response categorization. This general phenomena was explored in Chapter 3 but was re-emphasized in Chapter 4 when the specific effects of question wording on representational role style classification were demonstrated. The construction of an index was designed to overcome this problem and provide a clear categorization of the various role types.

The second troublesome area, however, was of more concern. In order to ensure that the direct questions accurately measured representational role style, a series of indirect attitude questions was included. Since these questions were all adapted from a well-known study of Federal Members of Parliament and since they were used in that study as part of an index purporting to measure representational role style,¹ it was assumed that there would be a high degree of correlation between the direct and indirect question

¹ Allan Kornberg and William Mishler, Influence in Parliament: Canada (Durham: Duke University Press, 1976).

responses.¹

When this proved not to be the case, the obvious questions were: first, did the indirect attitude questions actually measure the same dimensions as the direct questions; and second, if not, which series of measures was the most accurate? Since there was no way to conclusively answer the latter question within the confines of the data, it was decided to test the first question by constructing an index of those attitude questions which most fully met the Guttman scaling criteria and then by crosstabulating the resulting scale with the REPROLE index. The result was not very successful. While some statistical relationship was found to exist between the two scales, the correlations were only moderate and the classifications were by no means clearly matched. A further test to determine whether the two scales yielded comparable results when crosstabulated with some background variables showed very little congruence to exist between the two scales. Further, the classification of representational role styles produced by each scale was significantly different.

The most logical conclusion to be drawn from this evidence

¹It is interesting to note the Kornberg and Mishler did not themselves test their assumption that these attitude questions actually did measure representational role style. It is, in fact, remarkable that they did not do so considering that the attitude questions were derived from answers to a previous study by one of the authors in which representational role style was based on one open-ended question and considering that the distribution of role styles apparently differed so greatly between the two studies. See above pp. 49-50.

is that the direct and indirect methods actually do not measure the same thing. Although there are certainly some aspects of similarity between the relationship of the two measures both to each other and to some of the background variables, the relationships are not sufficient to support any other conclusion.

Since the analysis of representational role style could be taken no further, the remaining task was to determine what the 18 attitude questions collectively measured and to what degree the role styles formed a part of these dimensions. The entire set of attitude questions was subjected to factor analysis and the results indicated that, while not entirely absent, representational role style was not the major component of the factors produced.

A great deal of caution must be used in generalizing from the results of one study of municipal councillors in one Canadian province. Yet it seems clear that representational role styles are neither as important nor as easily measured as has frequently been assumed in the past. A simple categorization of representatives into delegates, politicians and trustees may, in fact, be a rather meaningless exercise beyond heuristic or descriptive purposes. And even in these instances, the evidence presented here would indicate that unless the categorizations were based on identical measures, their accuracy would be open to doubt.

Perhaps more importantly, given the difficulties of

accurate measurement and the secondary role that representational role styles play in the attitude perceptions of representatives, the value of such an approach as a predictor of legislative behaviour is seriously open to question. This may well be why the few studies which have attempted to link representational role style to legislative behaviour have found the role styles to have limited predictive value. Perhaps in the final analysis, this study has demonstrated the difficulty of trying to operationalize Edmund Burke's political philosophy to today's legislative complexity.

This is not to suggest that the concepts of representational role style be abandoned either in political theory or in applied political research. It is rather to caution that on the basis of the evidence presented here, the precise measures for determining such perceptions have not yet been developed. This thesis will have made a significant contribution if it creates an awareness that the traditional measures of representational role style may be neither sufficient nor accurate, and that simple measures cannot be relied upon to determine what are obviously complex attitudes and perceptions. The findings and analysis presented here will hopefully provide the incentive and basis for further research in this direction.

APPENDIX A

MUNICIPALITIES SELECTED FOR PHASE ONE INTERVIEWS

SAMPLE AREA	MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	REMARKS
1	Gander	T	See Note 1
2	Stephenville	T	
3	Bay Roberts	T	
4	Marystown	T	
5	Bishop's Falls	T	See Note 1
6	Stephenville Crossing	T	
7	Badger's Quay	RD	
8	Baie Verte	T	dropped: see Note 2
9	Norris Arm	T	refused: see Note 3
10	Cupids	T	
11	Elliston	T	
12	Isle Aux Morts	LID	
12	Rose Blanche	LID	
13	Eastport	T	
13	Terra Nova	LGC	
13	Salvage	LID	
13	Traytown	LGC	
14	Dark Cove - Gambo	RD	
15	Cow Head	T	
15	Parson's Pond	LGC	
15	St. Pauls	LGC	see Note 4
16	South Brook	LGC	
16	Steady Brook	LGC	
16	Meadows	LGC	
17	Renews-Cappahayden	LGC	
17	Fermeuse	LGC	
18	Red Harbour	LGC	see Note 5
18	Parkers Cove	LGC	
19	Melrose	LGC	
19	King's Cove	LGC	

168
APPENDIX A CONTINUED

NEW AREAS	MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	REMARKS
20	Corner Brook	C	
21	St. John's	C	
14	Trinity	LID	

- Notes:
1. Interviews conducted by Ms. Kendra Goulding.
 2. The time and expense required to conduct interviews in this town were deemed too great, thus this sample area was subsequently dropped from phase one and included in phase two.
 3. The council in this town voted to have nothing to do with the survey on the grounds that they felt it was an attempt by the provincial government to check on the town's operations. Attempts by Ms. Goulding and myself to convince them otherwise were futile.
 4. Council inoperative, subsequently dropped from survey.
 5. Council inoperative, subsequently dropped from survey.

Summary

Cities	(C)	2
Towns	(T)	12
Rural Districts	(RD)	2
Local Improvement Districts	(LID)	4
Local Government Communities	(LGC)	13
		<u>33</u>

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

AREA	MUNICIPALITY	SCHEDULED DATE
<u>TRIP 1: TRINITY AND BONAVISTA</u>		
11	Elliston	August 8
19	Melrose	9
	King's Cove	10
13	Terra Nova	11
	Eastport	12
	Salvage	13
	Traytown	15
14	Trinity, B.B.	16
7	Badger's Quay-Valleyfield-Pool's Island	17
14	Dark Cove-Gambo-Middle Brook	18
<u>TRIP 2: West COAST</u>		
16	South Brook	22
	Steady Brook	23
	Summerside	24
	Meadows	25
20	Corner Brook	26
2	Stephenville	27
6	Stephenville Crossing	29
15	Parson's Pond	30
	Cow Head	31
	St. Pauls	September 1
12	Rose Blanch-Harbour Le Cou	2
	Isle Aux Morts	3

APPENDIX B CONTINUED

<u>AREA</u>	<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>SCHEDULED DATE</u>
<u>TRIP 3: AVALON AND BURIN</u>		
3	Bay Roberts	September 9
10	Cupids	10
17	Renews-Cappahayden	13
	Fermeuse	14
4	Marystown	16
18	Red Harbour	17
	Parkers Cove	18
21	St. John's	Fall 1978

TRIP 4: CENTRAL

1	Gander	Interviews in these municipalities were conducted by Ms. Kendra Goulding and dates during the month of August were scheduled by her.
5	Bishop's Falls	
9	Norris Arm

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5S7

Department of Political Science

Telex: 016-4101

Telephone: (709) 753-1200

August 8, 1977

Dear

As you are no doubt aware, local government in the province of Newfoundland has recently come under increasing study. Yet there is still a lack of knowledge about many aspects of council operations and personnel. As part of a province-wide study of local government, your council has been selected as one of 35 whose councillors I would like to personally interview. The remaining municipalities will be sent mail questionnaires.

The purpose of this study is to find out more about the operation of local governments in the province and about the people who make local government work—the councillors and senior administrative officials like yourself. The survey is designed to obtain some basic background information about your municipality, the major problems and issues it faces, the manner in which council decisions are reached, and how local government in the province might be improved.

I would like to interview each member of your council, as well as yourself. Each interview should take no more than 45 minutes and all results will be treated with the strictest of confidence. Both the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Federation of Municipalities are aware that the study is being conducted, and a copy of a covering letter from the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs is attached.

I plan to be in your area about August and would very much appreciate you advising the members of your council of the purpose of my visit and the hope that all will be willing to let me have a few minutes of their time for an interview. As a former municipal treasurer in the province of Ontario, I am aware of the many demands on your time and that of your council members; I will sincerely appreciate your cooperation.

I look forward to meeting you shortly; meanwhile, if you have any questions concerning the survey, please do not hesitate to write or phone (753-1200, extension 2178 or 2179).

Yours sincerely,

Enclosure

Peter G. Boswell
Assistant Professor

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

ST. JOHN'S

1977 08 01

Professor P. G. Boswell,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Memorial University of Newfoundland,
St. John's, Nfld.

Dear Professor Boswell:

I have read your questionnaire with considerable interest and I am sure that with the co-operation of the municipal governments in the Province, as well as their staff, your project will be of considerable assistance in preparing your thesis. As discussed with you this morning, this Department would be very greatly interested in your making available to us, upon its completion, a summary of the responses to the questionnaire as, of course, there is the element of confidentiality associated with individual replies.

I want to emphasize that, although this Department has no involvements with this particular exercise, it is, in our opinion, useful and we would anticipate that you will receive a favourable response from the persons interviewed. You may circulate this letter, if you desire, to the persons selected to be interviewed with respect to your project.

Yours truly,

P. G. Withers,
Deputy Minister..

PGM/bb

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5S7

Department of Political Science

Telex: 016-4101

Telephone: (709) 753-1200

August , 1977

Dear

I am sorry that I was unable to meet you personally during my recent visit to your community, however I would very much appreciate you taking a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire and to mail it back to me in the envelope provided.

As part of a study of local government in Newfoundland, all councillors and trustees in the province are being asked to complete these questionnaires. The purpose of the study is to find out more about the operation of local governments in the province and about the people who make municipal government work. It is designed to obtain some basic background information about your community, the major problems and issues it faces, the manner in which council decisions are reached, and how local government in the province might be improved.

It is anticipated that the results will be sufficient to allow the publication of a small book on local government in the province, which may be of interest to councillors and citizens alike. All replies will be held in the strictest confidence with all information being entered directly into a computer. Only aggregate data will be used for analysis, thus preventing the possibility of any community or individual being identified. Both the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Federation of Municipalities are aware that the study is being conducted, and a copy of a covering letter from the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been left with the council clerk or secretary.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated--in fact without it the study can be only partially completed. If you have any questions concerning the study, please do not hesitate to write or phone (753-1200, extension 2178 or 2179).

Yours sincerely,

Peter G. Boswell
Assistant Professor

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1G 5S7

Department of Political Science

Telex: 016-4101

Telephone: (709) 753-1200

October 7, 1977

Dear

As part of a study of all local governments in the province, I am enclosing a number of questionnaires. I would very much appreciate you asking each member of your council to take a few minutes to complete and return them directly to me in the enclosed pre-stamped envelopes. I would also appreciate your completion and return of the questionnaire marked "administrative employees."

The purpose of the study is to obtain information about the operation of local governments in the province, and about the people who make local government work -- the councillors and administrative employees like yourself. The study has received the endorsement of Mr. Peter Withers, deputy-minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs, although the department is not connected in any way with the project.

All questionnaire returns will be treated with the strictest confidence. Only aggregate data will be used, thus preventing the possibility of any individual or community being identified. It is hoped that a sufficient number of questionnaires will be completed to allow a comparative summary of the results to be prepared and made available to any interested councillors and administrative officials.

Your cooperation, and that of your councillors, in assisting with this study will be very much appreciated. If you have any questions, or would like further information, please do not hesitate to write to me or phone (753-1200, extension 2178/9).

Yours sincerely,

Peter G. Boswell
Assistant Professor

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND**St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5S7***Department of Political Science**Telex: 016-4101**Telephone: (709) 753-1200***October 7, 1977****Dear Councillor:**

I would very much appreciate you taking a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire and to mail it back to me in the envelope provided. No postage is required.

As part of a study of local government in Newfoundland and Labrador, all councillors and trustees are being asked to complete these questionnaires. The study is designed to provide information about each municipality, its councillors and administrative employees. A report summarizing the results will be available when the study is completed.

All replies will be held in strictest confidence, with information being entered directly into a computer. Only aggregate data will be used for analysis, thus preventing the possibility of any municipality or individual being identified. The study has received the endorsement of Mr. Peter Withers, deputy-minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs, although the department is not connected in any way with the project.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated -- in fact, without it the study cannot be completed; and I am sure you will agree that a comparative knowledge of how local government in the province operates will be of benefit not only to members of council, but also to the entire community.

If you have any questions about the study, please do not hesitate to write or phone (753-1200, extension 2178/9).

Yours sincerely,

Peter G. Boswell
Assistant Professor

APPENDIX H

MASTER REGISTER

REGION	CODE NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES	
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978 TOTAL
1	001	Admiral's Beach	LGC	5	5		
5	002	Anchor Point	LGC	5	5		
3	003	Appleton	LID	5	6	1	1
1	004	Aquaforte	LGC	5	5		
1	005	Arnold's Cove	T	7	7	1	1
1	006	Avondale	T	7	7	1	1
3	007	Badger	T	7	7		
*2	008	Badger's Quay- Valleyfield Pool's Island	RD	7	7	6	6
3	009	Baie Verte	T	7	7	2	2
4	010	Baine Harbour	LGC	5	5		
1	011	Bay de Verde	T	7	7		
4	012	Bay L'Argent	T	7	7		
*1	013	Bay Roberts	T	5	5	2	2
5	014	Bellburns	LGC	5	5		
3	015	Belleoram	T	7	7		
6	016	Berry Head	LGC	5	5	1	1
3	017	Port au Port East	LGC	5	5		
3	018	Bide Arm	LGC	5	5		
1	019	Birchy Bay	T	7	7		
1	020	Biscay Bay	LGC	5	5		
*3	021	Bishop's Cove	LGC	5	5		
2	022	Bishop's Falls	T	7	7	1	1
3	023	Bonavista	T	7	7		
1	024	Botwood Branch	LGC	5	5	1	1

REGION	CODE NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES		
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
3	025	Brent's Cove	LGC	5	5			
1	026	Brigus	T	7	7		1	1
3	027	Buchans	T	7	7		1	1
6	028	Burgeo	T	7	7			
4	029	Burin	T	7	7	4		4
3	030	Burlington	LGC	5	5			
3	031	Campbellton	T	7	7			
6	032	Cape St. George-Petit Jardin-Grand Jardin- De Grau-Marches Point- Loretta-Sheaves Cove	LGC	5	5	1		1
1	033	Carbonear	T	7	7	3		3
2	034	Carmanville	T	7	7			
5	035	Cartwright	LGC	5	5			
2	036	Catalina	T	7	7		1	1
2	037	Centreville	T	7	7			
1	038	Chance Cove	T	7	7	3		3
2	039	Change Islands	T	7	7	4		4
6	040	Channel-Port aux Basques	T	7	7			
1	041	Chapel Arm	T	7	7	1		1
2	042	Clarenville	T	7	7			
1	043	Clarke's Beach	T	7	7		1	1
3	044	Coachman's Cove	LGC	5	5			
1	045	Colinet	LGC	5	5			
1	046	Colliers	T	7	7			
1	047	Come By Chance	T	7	7			
3	048	Comfort Cove- Newstead	LGC	5	5			
1	049	Conception Bay South	T	7	7			
1	050	Conception Harbour	T	7	7			
5	051	Conche	LGC	5	5			

REGION	CODE NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES		
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
3	052	Conne River	LID	5	5			
5	053	Cook's Harbour	LID	5	5			
6	054	Cormack	LGC	5	5			
*6	055	Corner Brook	CITY	7	7	6	2	6
3	056	Cottles Island-	LID	5	7	2		4
		Lukes Arm						
*5	057	Cow Head	T	7	7	3		3
5	058	Cox's Cove	LGC	5	5			
3	059	Crow Head	LGC	5	5			
*1	060	Cupids	T	7	7	2		2
5	061	Daniel's Harbour	LGC	5	5			
*2	062	Dark Cove-Middle	RD	6	6	1		1
		Brook-Gambo						
5	063	Davis Inlet	LGC	5	5			
6	064	Deer Lake	T	7	7			
2	065	Dover	T	7	7	1		1
2	066	Duntara	LGC	5	5			
1	067	Dunville	T	7	7			
3	068	Durrell	T	7	7	5		5
*2	069	Eastport	T	7	7	1		1
*2	070	Elliston	T	7	7	7		7
3	071	Embree	T	7	7		1	1
5	072	Englee	T	7	5	4		4
4	073	English Harbour East	LGC	5	5	4		4
*1	074	Fermeuse	LGC	5	5	3		3
1	075	Ferryland	LGC	5	5			
1	076	Flatrock	T	7	7			
3	077	Fleur De Lys	LID	5	5			
5	078	Flower's Cove	LID	5	5	2		2
2	079	Fogo	T	7	7			
5	080	Forteau	LGC	5	5	1		1
4	081	Fortune	T	7	7	1		1

REGION	NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES	
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978 TOTAL
4	082	Fox Cove-Mortier	RD	7	7	1	4
1	083	Fox Harbour	LGC	5	5		
4	084	Frenchman's Cove	LGC	5	5		
1	085	Freshwater	T	7	7	1	1
6	086	Gallants	LGC	5	5		
*3	087	Gander	T	7	7	2	2
4	088	Garnish	T	7	7	1	2
1	089	Gaskiers-Point La Haye	LGC	5	5		
3	090	Gaultois	T	7	7	1	1
3	091	Gayside (Birchy Bay North)	LGC	5	5		
6	092	Gillams	LGC	5	5	2	2
3	093	Glenwood	T	7	7	1	1
2	094	Glovertown	T	7	7		
5	095	Goose Cove East	LGC	5	5		
1	096	Goulds	T	7	7	1	1
4	097	Grand Bank	T	7	7	2	2
3	098	Grand Falls	T	7	7	3	3
4	099	Grand La Pierre	LGC	5	5		
3	100	Great Harbour Deep	LGC	5	5		
2	101	Greenspond	T	7	7		
6	102	Halfway Point-Benoit Cove-John's Beach-Frenchman's Cove	RD	7	6	2	2
3	103	Hamperden	LGC	5	5	1	1
1	104	Hant's Harbour	LTD	5	5	1	1
2	105	Happy Adventure	LGC	5	5		
5	106	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	T	7	7	2	2
3	107	Harbour Breton	T	7	7	1	1
1	108	Harbour Grace	T	7	7		

REGION	NUMBER	CODE	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES	
					ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978
1	109	109	Harbour Grace South	LGC	5	5		
1	110	110	Harbour Main-Lakeview	RD.	7	7		
			-Chapel Cove					
2	111	111	Hare Bay	T	7	7		2
5	112	112	Hawkes Bay	T	7	7		2
1	113	113	Heart's Content	T	7	7		
1	114	114	Heart's Delight-	RD	7	7	4	4
			Islington					
1	115	115	Heart's Desire	LID	5	7	2	2
3	116	116	Hermitage-Sandyville	LGC	5	5		
	117	117	Hodge's Cove	LID	(DISBANDED)			
1	118	118	Hogan's Pond	LID	5	5		
1	119	119	Holyrood	T	7	7		
5	120	120	Hopedale	LGC	5	5		
5	121	121	Howley	LID	5	5		
6	122	122	Hughes Brook	LGC	5	5	2	2
2	123	123	Indian Bay	LGC	5	5		3
			(Parson Point)					
6	124	124	Irishtown	LGC	5	5		
*6	125	125	Isle Aux Morts	LID	5	5	2	2
4	126	126	Jacques Fontaine	LGC	5	5		1
1	127	127	Jerseyside	T	7	7		
2	128	128	Joe Batt's Arm-	RD	7	7	2	3
			Barr'd Islands					
2	129	129	Keels	LGC	5	4	2	2
*2	130	130	King's Cove	LGC	5	4	2	2
3	131	131	King's Point	LGC	5	5		
6	132	132	Kippens	LID	5	5	2	2
5	133	133	Labrador City	LID	5	5		1
4	134	134	Lamaline	T	7	7		
5	135	135	L'Anse au Clair	LGC	5	5	1	1

REGION	CODE NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES		
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
5	136	L'Anse Au Loup	LGC	5	5		1	1
6	137	Lark Harbour	LGC	5	5	1	2	3
3	138	La Scie	T	7	7			
4	139	Lawn	T	7	7	1		1
1	140	Lawrence Pond	LID	5	5			
3	141	Leading Tickles West	LGC	5	5		4	4
4	142	Lewin's Cove	LGC	5	5	1		1
3	143	Lewisporte	T	7	7		1	1
3	144	Little Bay	LGC	5	5			
3	145	Little Bay Islands	LGC	5	5			
2	146	Little Burnt Bay	T	7	7	1		1
1	147	Little Catalina	T	7	7			
1	148	Long Harbour-Mount	LID	5	5			
		Arlington Heights						
4	149	Lord's Cove	LGC	5	5			
5	150	Lourdes	LGC	5	5	2		2
2	151	Lumsden	T	7	6	4		4
3	152	Lushes Bight-Beaumont	LGC	5	5	2		2
		-Beaumont North						
5	153	Mainbrook, Hare Bay	T	7	7			
5	154	Makkovik	LGC	5	5		4	4
5	155	Mary's Harbour	LGC	5	5	2		2
*4	156	Marystown	T	6	6	4		4
6	157	Massey Drive	LID	5	5			
6	158	McIvers	LGC	5	4	1		1
*6	159	Meadows	LGC	5	5	2		2
*2	160	Melrose	LGC	5	5	4		4
3	161	Middle Arm, Green Bay	LGC	5	5			
3	162	Miles Cove	LGC	5	5			
3	163	Millertown	LGC	5	5			
3	164	Milltown-Head of Bay D'Espoir	RD	7	7			

REGION	CODE NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES		
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
3	165	Ming's Bight	LGC	5	5	1		1
3	166	Morrisville	LGC	5	5			
1	167	Mount Carmel-Mitchells Brook-St. Catherine's	RD	7	7			
6	168	Mount Moriah	LID	5	5	2		2
1	169	Mount Pearl	T	7	7	2	2	4
2	170	Musgrave Harbour	T	7	7	2		2
2	171	Musgravetown	T	7	7	5		5
5	172	Nain	LGC	5	5		2	2
1	173	New Perlican	LID	5	5			
1	174	Newtown	T	7	7			
3	175	Nipper's Harbour	LGC	5	5			
1	176	Norman's Cove-	RD	7	7			
182		Long Cove						
3	177	Norris Arm	T	7	7			
5	178	Norris Point	LGC	5	5	1		1
3	179	Northern Arm, Exploits	LID	5	5	1		1
1	180	North River	LGC	5	5			
5	181	Northwest River	T	7	6	3		3
1	182	Old Perlican	T	7	7			
3	183	Pacquet	LGC	5	5			
1	184	Paradise	T	7	7		1	1
*4	185	Parkers Cove	LGC	5	5	4		4
*5	186	Parson's Pond	LGC	5	5	4		4
6	187	Pasadena	T	7	7		1	1
3	188	Peterview	LID	5	5			
1	189	Petty Harbour-	RD	7	7			
3	190	Maddox Cove	LGC	5	5	2		2
1	191	Pilley's Island	T	7	7			
2	192	Placentia Plate Cove East	LGC	5	5	1		1

REGION	CODE NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES		
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
3	193	Plate Cove West	LGC	5	5			
4	194	Point au Gaul	LGC	5	5			
1	195	Point Lance	LGC	5	5		1	1
3	196	Point Leamington	T	7	7			
4	197	Point May	LGC	5	5	2		2
3	198	Point of Bay	LGC	5	5	1		1
3	199	Pool's Cove	LGC	5	5	1		1
3	200	Port Anson	LGC	5	5	2		2
4	201	Port au Bras	LGC	5	5			
5	202	Port aux Choix	T	7	7	1		1
6	203	Port au Port West-	T	7	7			
		Aguathuna-Felix Cove						
2	204	Port Blandford	LID	5	5	2		2
5	205	Port Hope Simpson	LGC	5	5			
1	206	Port Kirwan	LGC	5	5			
2	207	Port Rexton	LGC	5	5			
5	208	Port Saunders	T	7	7	1		1
1	209	Portugal Cove South	LGC	5	5			
2	210	Port Union	T	7	7	1		1
5	211	Postville	LGC	5	5			
1	212	Pouch Cove	T	7	7			
5	213	Raleigh	LGC	5	5			
6	214	Ramda	T	7	7	1		1
5	215	Red Bay	LGC	5	5		1	1
4	216	Red Harbour	LGC	5	5			
5	217	Reidville	LGC	5	5			
3	218	Rencontre East	LGC	5	5		1	1
*1	219	Renews-Cappahayden	LGC	5	5	3		3
1	220	Riverhead	LGC	5	5			
5	221	River of Ponds	LGC	5	5			
3	222	Roberts Arm	T	7	7	3		3
5	223	Rocky Harbour	LGC	5	5		1	1

(INACTIVE)

REGION	NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES		
				ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
5	224	Roddickton	T	7	7		2	2
*6	225	Rose Blanche-Harbour	LID	5	5	1		1
		Le Cou						
4	226	Rushoon	LGC	5	5			
3	227	St. Alban's	T	7	7		2	2
5	228	St. Anthony	T	7	7	1		1
4	229	St. Bernard's	LGC	5	5			
2	230	St. Brendan's	LGC	5	5			
1	231	St. Bride's	LGC	5	5			
6	232	St. George's	T	7	7			
3	233	St. Jacques	LID	5	5			
		Coomb's Cove						
*1	234	St. John's	CITY	9	9	7		7
1	235	St. Joseph's	LGC	5	5			
-	236	St. Joseph's	LGC	(INACTIVE)				
4	237	St. Lawrence	T	7	7	2		2
5	238	St. Lunaire-Grigniet	LGC	5	5	1		1
1	239	St. Mary's	LGC	5	5			
5	240	St. Pauls	LGC	(INACTIVE)				
1	241	St. Shotts	LGC	5	5			
1	242	St. Vincent's-St. Stephens-Peter's River	LID	5	5			
5	243	Sally's Cove	LGC	5	5			
1	244	Salmon Cove	T	7	7			
*2	245	Salvage	LID	7	7	5		5
2	246	Sandringham	LGC	5	5			
3	247	Sandy Cove	LGC	5	4	2		2
3	249	Seal Cove, F.B.	LGC	5	5		2	2
3	250	Seal Cove, W.B.	LGC	5	5			
2	251	Seldom-Little Seldom	LID	7	7			
1	252	Shoal Harbour	RD	7	7	2		2
			T	7	7			

CODE			NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES			
REGION	NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978	TOTAL
1	253	Small Point-Broad Cove	RD	7	6	1	1	2
		-Blackhead-Adams Cove						
3	254	South Brook, Hall's Bay	T	7	7		1	1
*6	255	South Brook, Humber Valley	LGC	5	5	3		3
1	256	Southern Harbour	T	7	7		1	1
1	257	South River	T	7	7	1	1	2
1	258	Spaniard's Bay	T	7	7	2		2
3	259	Springdale	T	7	7			
*6	260	Steady Brook	LGC	5	5	1		1
*6	261	Stephenville	T	7	7	6		6
6	262	Stephenville Crossing	T	7	7		1	1
3	263	Summerford	T	7	7			
6	264	Summerside	LGC	5	5			
1	265	Sunnyside	T	7	7			
*2	266	Terra Nova	LGC	4	4	1		1
4	267	Terrenceville	T	7	7			
3	268	Tilt Cove	LGC	5	5			
2	269	Tilting	LGC	5	5			
1	270	Tilton	LID	5	5			
1	271	Torbay	T	7	6	5		5
*2	272	Traytown	LGC	5	5	4		4
1	273	Trepassey	T	7	7	4		4
*2	274	Trinity, B.B.	LID	7	7	5		5
2	275	Trinity, T.B.	LGC	5	5	2		2
3	276	Triton-Jim's Cove-Card's Harbour	RD	7	7			
5	277	Trout River	LGC	5	5			
3	278	Twillingate	T	7	7	1		1
3	279	Upper Island Cove	T	7	7			
3	280	Victoria	T	7	7	2		2

REGION	CODE	NUMBER	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	TYPE	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS		RESPONSES ¹	
					ESTIMATED	ACTUAL	1977	1978
1	281	Wabana	T	7	7	2		2
5	282	Wabush	LID	5	5			
2	283	Wareham	LID	5	5			
1	284	Wedgewood Park	LID	5	5			
2	285	Wesleyville	T	7	7			
3	286	Westport	LGC	5	5			
5	287	West St. Modeste	LGC	5	5			
1	288	Whitbourne	T	7	7			
1	289	Whiteway	LGC	5	5	1		1
3	290	Wild Bight	LGC	5	5		2	2
3	291	Windsor	T	7	7		1	1
4	292	Winterland	LGC	5	5			
1	293	Winterton	T	7	7			
-	294	Wood's Island, Bay of Islands	LGC	(INACTIVE)		2		2
3	295	Woodstock	LGC	5	5		1	1
-	296	Woody Island	LGC	(INACTIVE)				
5	297	Woody Point	LGC	5	5		1	1
6	298	York Harbour	LGC	5	5	1		1
5	299	Bird Cove	LGC	5	5			
3	300	Buchans	LID	5	5			
6	301	Burnt Islands	T	7	7			

* Indicates personal interview (Phase One)

1977 responses include personal interviews (phase one) and first wave of mailed questionnaires (phase two). 1978 responses are those of the second wave of phase two mailed questionnaires.

APPENDIX I
COUNCILLOR QUESTIONNAIRESurvey of Local Governments in NewfoundlandDepartment of Political Science
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLANDSECTION A. GENERAL BACKGROUND OF MUNICIPALITY

1. TYPE OF MUNICIPALITY

City1
Town2
Community council3
Local improvement district4
Rural district5

2. DATE OF INCORPORATION

(exact date _____)

less than 1 year1
1 to 2 years2
2 to 3 years3
3 to 4 years4
4 to 5 years5
6 to 10 years6
more than 10 years7
don't know8

2A. (IF COMMUNITY HAS BEEN INCORPORATED WITHIN THE LAST 10 YEARS)

WHAT WERE THE MAJOR REASONS FOR INCORPORATION?

1) _____

2) _____

3. DOES YOUR MUNICIPALITY BELONG TO A JOINT COUNCIL OR SIMILAR ORGANIZATION WHERE A NUMBER OF COUNCILS MEET TO DISCUSS COMMON PROBLEMS?

yes1
no2

3A. IF YES, WHAT IS THE ORGANIZATION CALLED?

4. POPULATION

(exact number _____)

less than 2501
250-5002
500-10003
1000-25004
2500-50005
5000-10,0006
more than 10,0007
don't know8
refused9

5. NUMBER OF COUNCIL MEMBERS (including mayor or chairman)

31
42
53
64
75
86
9 or more7
don't know8
refused9

6. ARE THE COUNCIL MEMBERS

elected1
appointed (L.I.D.)2
don't know8
refused9

7. NUMBER OF FULLTIME PAID EMPLOYEES

none1
12
23
3 to 54
6 to 105
11 to 256
more than 257
don't know8
refused9

8. NUMBER OF PART-TIME PAID EMPLOYEES (including seasonal)

none1
 1-52
 6-103
 11 to 254
 more than 255
 don't know8
 refused9

9. HOW OFTEN ARE REGULAR COUNCIL MEETINGS HELD?

once a week1
 once every two weeks2
 twice a month3
 once a month4
 less than once a month5
 other (specify how often _____)6
 don't know8
 refused9

10. HOW FREQUENTLY ARE SPECIAL (NON-REGULAR) COUNCIL MEETINGS HELD?

often (more than 10 per year).....1
 sometimes (5 to 10 per year).....2
 rarely (2 to 3 per year)3
 never4
 don't know8
 refused9

11. HOW MANY COMMITTEES DOES COUNCIL HAVE?

none1
 1-32
 4-63
 7-104
 more than 105
 don't know8
 refused9

12. HOW FREQUENTLY DOES COUNCIL GO INTO CLOSED SESSION WHERE MEETINGS ARE NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC?

often (more than 10 per year).....1
 sometimes (5 to 10 per year).....2
 rarely (2 to 3 per year)3
 never4
 don't know8
 refused9

13. ARE COMMITTEE MEETINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC?

yes1
 no2

14. WHAT IS THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE LATEST ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET?

(exact sum \$ _____)
 don't know8

14A. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THIS BUDGET IS RAISED FROM LOCAL SOURCES?

(exact % _____)
 don't know8

14B. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THIS BUDGET COMES FROM THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT?

(exact % _____)
 don't know8

15. DOES YOUR MUNICIPALITY COLLECT PROPERTY TAXES?

yes1
 no2

16. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF YOUR GENERAL SERVICE FEE?

\$ _____ per month/year
 no fee charged.....0

16A. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF YOUR WATER/SEWAGE UTILITY FEE?

\$ _____ per month/year
 no fee charged.....0

SECTION B. GENERAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENT

17. WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT POSITION WITH THE MUNICIPALITY?

councillor1
 L.I.D. trustee2
 mayor3
 chairman4
 other (specify _____)9
 refused9

18. HOW LONG HAVE YOU HELD THIS POSITION?

less than 1 year1
 1 to 2 years2
 3 to 4 years3
 5 or more years4
 don't know8
 refused9

19. DO YOU CONSIDER THE POSITION
FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME?

full-time1
part-time2
don't know8
refused9

20. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DO YOU
GENERALLY SPEND WORKING ON
COUNCIL BUSINESS?

_____ hours
don't know8
refused9

21. WERE YOU ELECTED OR APPOINTED TO
YOUR POSITION AS (councillor,
etc.)?

elected (with opposition)1
appointed (by government)2
acclaimed (no opposition)3
don't know8
refused9

22. IF YOUR MUNICIPALITY HAS A WARD
SYSTEM OF ELECTION, HOW MANY
OPPONENTS RAN AGAINST YOU AT THE
LAST ELECTION?

_____ exact number
no ward system7
don't know8
refused9

23. IF YOU WERE ELECTED (NOT APPOIN-
TED BY GOVERNMENT), WHY DO YOU
THINK YOUR FELLOW-CITIZENS CHOSE
YOU TO REPRESENT THEM ON COUNCIL?

don't know8
refused9
not applicable0

24. WHY DID YOU FIRST DECIDE TO RUN FOR
COUNCIL OR ACCEPT APPOINTMENT TO
COUNCIL?

don't know8
refused9

25. HAVE ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY
OR CLOSE PERSONAL FRIENDS BEEN ACTIVE
IN POLITICS INCLUDING MUNICIPAL
GOVERNMENT?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

If yes, could you please provide
details?

26. HAVE YOU EVER RUN FOR ANY OTHER
ELECTED POLITICAL OFFICE (MHA, MP, ETC.)?

yes1
no2
refused9

27. IF YES, WHAT?

MHA1
MP2
mayor/chairman3
other (specify)4
don't know8
refused9
not applicable0

28. WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN RUNNING FOR
ANY OTHER ELECTED POLITICAL OFFICE?

MHA	1
MP	2
mayor/chairman	3
other	4
no	5
don't know	8
refused	9

29. WHEN DID YOU FIRST BECOME INTERESTED
IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

```

'don't know .....8
refused .....9

```

30. CAN YOU RECALL WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME INTERESTED IN POLITICS GENERALLY?

don't know 8
refused 9

31. AS A CHILD, WAS THERE MUCH DISCUSSION ABOUT POLITICS IN YOUR HOME?

a great deal	1
some	2
hardly any	3
none at all	4
don't know	8
refused	9

32. GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A LIBERAL, PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P. OR INDEPENDENT?

Liberal	1
P. C.	2
N.D.P.	3
other	4
don't know	8
refused	9

33. DO YOU THINK NATIONAL OR PROVINCIAL
POLITICAL PARTIES SHOULD PLAY A ROLE
IN LOCAL MUNICIPAL POLITICS?

yes	1
no	2
don't know	8
refused	9

WHY OR WHY NOT?

don't know8
 refused9
 not applicable0

34. WHAT IS YOUR PRINCIPAL JOB OR OCCUPATION? (Please be as specific as possible.)

refused 9

35. ARE YOU PRESENTLY EMPLOYED IN THIS OCCUPATION?

```

yes .....1
no (other work) .....2
no (unemployed) .....3
no (retired) .....4
no (ill, disabled) .....5
refused .....9

```

36. WILL YOU RUN FOR RE-ELECTION OR ACCEPT RE-APPOINTMENT TO YOUR PRESENT COUNCIL POSITION WHEN YOUR CURRENT TERM EXPIRES?

yes1
 no2
 don't know8
 refused9

WHY OR WHY NOT?

don't know8
 refused9

37. DO YOU BELONG TO ANY CLUB OR ORGANIZATIONS, SUCH AS CHURCH GROUPS, SOCIAL CLUBS, LABOUR UNIONS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

Please list names:

1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

none1
 refused9

38. ARE YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU BEEN AN OFFICER OF ANY SUCH ORGANIZATION?

yes1
 (Could you please give details)

no2
 refused9
 not applicable0

39. HOW MUCH FORMAL EDUCATION DO YOU HAVE?

completed primary school1
 some high school2
 completed high school (grade 11)3
 some university4
 completed university (B.A.)5
 post-graduate (M.A., M.D., etc.)6
 some trades and technical
 schooling completed7
 other (specify: _____)8
 don't know8
 refused9

40. COULD YOU PLEASE RECORD YOUR SEX?

male1
 female2

41. HOW OLD ARE YOU?

_____ years
 refused9

SECTION C. COUNCIL/COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The questions in this section are concerned with how you as a member of council relate to your community, and how you feel most citizens regard the council.

42. HOW AWARE DO YOU THINK THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS OF WHAT THE COUNCIL DOES IN THIS COMMUNITY?

highly aware1
 generally aware2
 not very aware3
 not aware at all4
 don't know8
 refused9

43. HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD YOU ESTIMATE GENERALLY ATTEND OPEN COUNCIL MEETINGS ON THE AVERAGE?

none1
 less than 52
 5 to 103
 more than 104
 don't know8
 refused9

44. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF CITIZENS WOULD YOU ESTIMATE KNOW THE NAME OF THE MAYOR (OR CHAIRMAN) OF THIS COMMUNITY?

_____ %

don't know8
refused9

45. HOW IS THE MAYOR (OR CHAIRMAN) SELECTED?

elected by council1
separately elected by citizens ...2

- 45A. IF ELECTED BY COUNCIL, IS THE PERSON WHO RECEIVED THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF VOTES FOR COUNCIL CHOSEN AS MAYOR?

always1
sometimes2
rarely3

46. ALTHOUGH MOST PEOPLE PAY FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL TAXES WITHOUT ANY PROBLEM, IT SEEMS THAT MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS IN NEWFOUNDLAND HAVE TROUBLE GETTING EVERYONE TO PAY SERVICE FEES AND OTHER LOCAL TAXES. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE MAIN REASON IS THAT SOME PEOPLE DON'T PAY THESE LOCAL TAXES?

don't know8
refused9

- 46A. IS THIS A PARTICULAR PROBLEM FOR YOUR COUNCIL?

yes1
no2

Could you briefly comment on why or why not? _____

47. MANY COUNCILS ALSO HAVE A PROBLEM GETTING PEOPLE TO TAKE AN INTEREST IN ATTENDING PUBLIC MEETINGS; BECOMING COUNCILLORS, AND SUPPORTING COUNCIL ACTIVITIES. WOULD YOU SAY THAT PEOPLE HERE TAKE AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN THE COUNCIL?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

48. IF ANSWER TO QUESTION 47 IS "NO", WHY IS IT THAT PEOPLE DON'T TAKE MORE INTEREST?

don't know8
refused9
not applicable0

49. DO YOU FIND THAT THERE IS MORE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON CERTAIN ISSUES THAN ON OTHERS?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

50. COULD YOU GIVE ONE OR TWO EXAMPLES OF SPECIFIC ISSUES ON WHICH THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION?

51. THERE ARE OFTEN TWO MAIN POINTS OF VIEW EXPRESSED CONCERNING HOW A MEMBER OF COUNCIL SHOULD ACT WHEN HE HAS TO MAKE UP HIS MIND ON A PARTICULAR ISSUE.

- 1) ONE IS THAT, HAVING BEEN ELECTED, HE SHOULD DO WHAT THE VOTERS WANT HIM TO DO, EVEN IF IT ISN'T HIS OWN PERSONAL PREFERENCE.
- 2) THE SECOND IS THAT HE SHOULD USE HIS OWN JUDGEMENT, REGARDLESS OF WHAT OTHERS WANT HIM TO DO.

WHICH OF THESE VIEWS COMES CLOSEST TO YOUR OWN VIEW?

- view (1)1
 view (2)2
 depends/undecided3
 don't know8
 refused9

52. DO YOU GENERALLY TRY TO VOTE ON COUNCIL ISSUES AS YOU FEEL MOST CITIZENS WOULD WANT YOU TO VOTE?

OR

DO YOU GENERALLY VOTE ACCORDING TO WHAT YOU PERSONALLY FEEL IS BEST FOR THE COMMUNITY?

- vote as most citizens would want...1
 vote as personally feel best2
 depends on issue3
 don't know8
 refused9

53. SUPPOSE A PARTICULAR ISSUE WHICH YOU THOUGHT MIGHT UPSET A NUMBER OF CITIZENS IN YOUR COMMUNITY WAS SCHEDULED TO COME BEFORE COUNCIL AT ITS NEXT REGULAR MEETING (FOR EXAMPLE, A TAX INCREASE OR THE LOCATION OF A NEW GARBAGE DUMP), WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

- a) discuss the issue with as many citizens as possible and vote as you felt most would want you to1
- b) discuss the issue as above, but vote as you felt would be best for the whole community2
- c) vote as you felt best for the whole community without discussing the issue with the citizens....3
- d) don't know8
 refused9

54. (IN YOUR OWN WORDS, COULD YOU BRIEFLY STATE WHAT ACTION YOU WOULD TAKE IN THE ABOVE EXAMPLE, AND WHY?

- don't know8
 refused9

55. HOW OFTEN DO YOU SPEAK TO PEOPLE OUTSIDE YOUR OWN FAMILY ABOUT COUNCIL MATTERS?

- daily1
 once or twice per week2
 less than once per week3
 less than once per month4
 never5
 don't know8
 refused9

56. DO YOU START THESE DISCUSSIONS?

- yes, usually1
 sometimes2
 rarely3
 don't know8
 refused9

57. HOW OFTEN ARE YOU CONTACTED BY CITIZENS ABOUT SOME PROBLEM OR COMPLAINT?

- every day1
 every week2
 about once per month3
 less than once per month4
 don't know8
 refused9

58. IS THIS CONTACT USUALLY BY TELEPHONE
OR IN PERSON?

by telephone1
in person2
don't know8
refused9

59. WHAT DO YOU UNDERSTAND BY THE TERM
"DEMOCRACY"?

don't know8
refused9

60. HERE ARE SOME REASONS THAT HAVE BEEN
GIVEN FOR HAVING LOCAL GOVERNMENT.
WHICH DO YOU THINK IS OF GREATEST
IMPORTANCE?

to provide efficient services1
to provide democracy at the local
level2
to get provincial grants3
don't know8
refused9

61. HOW WELL DO YOU KNOW YOUR FELLOW-
COUNCILLORS? DO YOU:

a) see them only at council sessions
or in connection with council
business1
b) occasionally have lunch together
or meet socially2
c) visit each other often in each
other's homes3
don't know8
refused9

62. HOW MANY OF YOUR FELLOW-COUNCILLORS
DOES THIS APPLY TO?

all1
most2
a few3
one or two4
don't know8
refused9

SECTION D: COUNCIL POLICY-MAKING

THIS SECTION IS DESIGNED TO FIND OUT WHAT
THE IMPORTANT ISSUES ARE IN YOUR COMMUNITY
AND HOW YOUR COUNCIL GOES ABOUT DEALING
WITH THEM.

63. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE MOST
IMPORTANT ISSUES OR PROBLEMS IN YOUR
COMMUNITY TODAY?

(PLEASE LIST IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

don't know8
refused9

64. IS THERE GENERALLY AGREEMENT AMONG
COUNCIL MEMBERS AS TO HOW TO DEAL
WITH IMPORTANT ISSUES?

yes, generally1
no2
don't know8
refused9

65. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IS MOST LIKELY TO BRING A PROBLEM BEFORE COUNCIL TO DEAL WITH?

yourself1
 another council member2
 mayor or chairman3
 clerk or secretary4
 town manager5
 other (please specify _____)

don't know8
 refused9

66. HOW FREQUENTLY DO YOU ATTEND COUNCIL MEETINGS?

less than 25%1
 25% to 50%2
 50% to 75%3
 75% to 100%4
 don't know8
 refused9

67. WITH REGARD TO POLICY MATTERS (SUCH AS, AMOUNT OF TAX, ROADS TO BE PAVED, ETC.) HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS YOUR PERSONAL ROLE IN:

1) initiation (bringing the matter up for discussion)
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

2) suggesting alternatives (such as a new tax or paving only a portion of a road, etc.)
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

3) actual taking of the decision (your personal influence in convincing other council members to your point of view)
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

67. 4) making sure the policy is carried out

very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

68. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE INFLUENCE OF THE CLERK (OR SECRETARY IF NO CLERK) IN POLICY MATTERS?

1) initiation (bringing the matter up for discussion)
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

2) suggesting alternatives
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

3) actual taking of the decision
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

4) making sure the policy is carried out
 very significant1
 significant2
 not very significant3
 of no importance4
 don't know8
 refused9

69. IF YOUR COMMUNITY HAS A TOWN MANAGER IN ADDITION TO THE CLERK (OR SECRETARY) HOW WOULD YOU RATE HIS INFLUENCE IN POLICY-MAKING?

1) initiation (bringing the matter up for discussion)

very significant1
significant2
not very significant3
of no importance4
don't know8
refused9

2) suggesting alternatives

very significant1
significant2
not very significant3
of no importance4
don't know8
refused9

3) actual taking of the decision

very significant1
significant2
not very significant3
of no importance4
don't know8
refused9

4) making sure the policy is carried out

very significant1
significant2
not very significant3
of no importance4
don't know8
refused9

70. DO YOU THINK THE CLERK (OR SECRETARY) HAS TOO MUCH INFLUENCE OVER POLICY?

too much1
about right2
not enough3
don't know8
refused9

71. HOW ABOUT THE MANAGER'S INFLUENCE OVER POLICY?

too much1
about right2
not enough3
don't know8
refused9
not applicable (no manager)0

72. DO ORGANIZED COMMUNITY GROUPS (SUCH AS THE LIONS CLUB, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS, ETC.) EVER MAKE PRESENTATIONS TO YOUR COUNCIL?

yes, often (at least once a week) .1
sometimes (about once per month) ..2
rarely (once or twice per year) ...3
never4
don't know8

Please state which group(s): _____

refused9

73. HAVE YOU YOURSELF BEEN ASKED BY A MEMBER OF SUCH A COMMUNITY GROUP TO MAKE PRESENTATIONS ON THEIR BEHALF?

yes, often (once per week)1
sometimes (about once per month) ..2
rarely (once or twice per year) ...3
never4
don't know8

Please state which group(s): _____

refused9

74. DO YOU FEEL THAT COUNCIL IS DOMINATED BY ONE OR TWO MEMBERS?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

SECTION E: RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROVINCE AND REFORM

IN THIS SECTION WE WANT TO EXAMINE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YOUR COMMUNITY AND THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN ST. JOHN'S, AND TO FIND OUT YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME REFORMS THAT HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE PROVINCE.

75. DO YOU THINK THERE IS TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE FROM THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN LOCAL MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

76. SHOULD THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HAVE THE FINAL SAY OVER THE BUDGET IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

77. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PRACTICE OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HAVING TO APPROVE YOUR BY-LAWS BEFORE THEY BECOME LEGALLY EFFECTIVE?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

78. DO YOU THINK THAT THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROVIDE MORE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO YOUR COMMUNITY?

yes1
no2
don't know8
refused9

79. COMPARED TO OTHER COMMUNITIES YOUR SIZE WOULD YOU SAY YOUR TREATMENT BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IS:

about the same1
much better2
much worse3
don't know8
refused9

80. THE WHALEN COMMISSION RECOMMENDED THAT THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTE A NUMBER OF CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE AND OPERATION OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS IN NEWFOUNDLAND. TWO OF THESE RECOMMENDED CHANGES ARE LISTED BELOW.

1) THAT A SERIES OF REGIONAL MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS BE SET UP ACROSS THE PROVINCE TO LOOK AFTER ASPECTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT GO BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES OF MORE THAN ONE MUNICIPALITY (FOR EXAMPLE, WATER SUPPLY OR GARBAGE DISPOSAL OR PLANNING). DO YOU THINK SUCH REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS WOULD BE:

a) a good idea1
b) a bad idea2
c) don't know8
d) refused9

additional comments:

2) THAT "NUISANCE TAXES" SUCH AS THE FUEL TAX AND VEHICLE TAXES BE ABOLISHED, AND THAT ALL DEVELOPED MUNICIPALITIES (THOSE WITH WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES) ADOPT THE REAL PROPERTY TAX (ON THE ASSESSED VALUE OR LAND AND BUILDINGS).

a) Do you agree or disagree that "nuisance taxes" should be abolished?
agree1
disagree2
don't know8
refused9
b) Do you agree or disagree that real property taxes should be imposed?
agree1
disagree2
don't know8
refused9

81. BASED ON YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE, ARE THERE ANY OTHER CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND? IF SO, WOULD YOU PLEASE LIST THEM BELOW AND BRIEFLY STATE WHY YOU BELIEVE THEY WOULD IMPROVE LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN YOUR COMMUNITY.

SECTION F: THE FOLLOWING ARE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS ABOUT LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BY COUNCILLORS, MAYORS, CLERKS, POLITICAL SCIENTISTS, AND THE PRESS. SOME OF THEM MAY APPEAR TO BE OVERSIMPLIFICATIONS OF RATHER COMPLEX MATTERS. SOME YOU WILL PROBABLY AGREE WITH, SOME YOU WILL NO DOUBT DISAGREE WITH, AND OTHERS YOU MAY BE SOMEWHAT UNCERTAIN ABOUT. THAT'S FINE: THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS, ONLY VIEWPOINTS. AFTER READING EACH STATEMENT WOULD YOU PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER INDICATING WHETHER YOU AGREE WITH IT; WHETHER YOU TEND TO AGREE WITH IT; WHETHER YOU ARE UNDECIDED (FOR EXAMPLE IF YOU AGREE WITH ONE PART BUT DISAGREE WITH ANOTHER PART); WHETHER YOU TEND TO DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT OR WHETHER YOU TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH IT.

82. THE JOB OF A COUNCILLOR ENTAILS BEING A SOUNDING BOARD FOR COMMUNITY OPINION AND THEN ACTING ON IT. I ALWAYS TRY TO FIND OUT WHAT MY FELLOW-CITIZENS FEEL AND MAKE MY DECISIONS ACCORDINGLY.

Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5

83. THE MAIN JOB OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILS IS TO OBTAIN BENEFITS FOR THEIR CITIZENS FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5

84. THIS COMMUNITY HAS GOOD LEADERSHIP IN DEALING WITH ITS PROBLEMS.

Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5

85. IMPORTANT COMMUNITY DECISIONS ARE BEST LEFT UP TO A FEW LEADING CITIZENS.

Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5

86. ORDINARY CITIZENS DON'T HAVE ENOUGH SAY IN COMMUNITY DECISIONS.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
87. AROUND HERE, ONE MAN'S OPINION IS AS GOOD AS ANOTHER'S IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
88. MY FIRST DUTY IS TO MY FELLOW-CITIZENS. THEY ARE THE ONES WHO ELECTED ME.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
89. LET'S FACE IT. INsofar AS PEOPLE CARE ABOUT COUNCIL, WHAT THEY CARE ABOUT IS WHAT YOU AS A COUNCILLOR CAN DO FOR THEM IN THE WAY OF SERVICES AND FAVOURS.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
90. PUBLIC MEETINGS HERE GENERALLY STIR UP MORE TROUBLE THAN THEY ARE WORTH.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
91. OUTSIDE OFFICIALS AND AGENCIES DON'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THE NEEDS OF THIS COMMUNITY.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
92. I AM NOT AT ALL CERTAIN THAT DOING FAVOURS, RUNNING ERRANDS, OR SERVING YOUR CONSTITUENTS, CALL IT WHATEVER YOU WISH, REALLY HELPS GET YOU ELECTED. I AM CERTAIN THAT NOT DOING THESE THINGS WHEN ASKED WILL ASSURE THAT YOU DON'T GET ELECTED.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
93. THE BUSINESSMEN IN THIS COMMUNITY HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENCE OVER HOW THINGS ARE RUN.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5

94. EVEN IF A COUNCILLOR WANTED TO FIND OUT WHAT HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS FELT ABOUT A MAJOR PUBLIC ISSUE, IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE: THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE DON'T KNOW. THEY DON'T HAVE ANY INFORMATION ON THESE THINGS. THE REST, OR MOST OF THE REST, SIMPLY DON'T CARE.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
95. THE MAIN JOB OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL IS TO HELP THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDE SERVICES TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
96. A COUNCILLOR SELDOM HAS TO SOUND OUT HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS BECAUSE HE THINKS SO MUCH LIKE THEM THAT HE KNOWS HOW THEY WOULD REACT TO ALMOST ANY PROPOSAL.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
97. MY PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY AS A COUNCILLOR IS TO DO AS GOOD A JOB AS I CAN FOR THE COMMUNITY -- TO ACT ACCORDING TO MY CONSCIENCE. THE ALTERNATIVE IS TO GIVE IN TO VOTERS.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
98. IF ANYONE TELLS YOU HE MAKES HIS DECISIONS IN COUNCIL ON THE BASIS OF WHAT HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS WANT, ASSUMING HE KNEW WHAT THEY WANT, HE IS EITHER KIDDING YOU OR HIMSELF.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
99. LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS IMPORTANT IN MAINTAINING DEMOCRACY IN NEWFOUNDLAND.
- Agree1
Tend to agree2
Undecided3
Tend to disagree4
Disagree5
100. ONE LAST QUESTION: DO YOU NOW HAVE ANY DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT WHAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAN YOU HAD BEFORE FIRST JOINING THE COUNCIL?

APPENDIX J

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS TEST BETWEEN PERSONAL INTERVIEW AND MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLES

In formal terms, since the working hypothesis is that there will be no statistically significant difference between the means of the variables from each phase, the null hypothesis must be that there will be a statistically significant difference between the means of the samples. Symbolically, where the mean score for a variable in phase one is designated P_1 and the mean score for a variable in phase two is designated P_2 , then the working hypothesis (H_1) is:

$$H_1 : P_1 = P_2$$

The null hypothesis (H_0) is:

$$H_0 : P_1 \neq P_2$$

Since we wish to avoid Type I error, that of rejecting the null hypothesis if it is true, a .01 level of significance will be used; and since no specific direction can be predicted, a two-tailed test will be performed. Since the number of cases is large enough to assume a normal distribution,¹ the standard difference of means test can be used.² The complete results of the t-test are contained at the

¹See Blalock, Social Statistics, p.223.

²Dr. B. Kim and Mrs. Ruth Cornish of the Statistics Lab at Memorial University were most helpful in assisting me with the statistical analysis, particularly in the choice of appropriate tests and in interpretation of the findings. The advice of my colleague Michael Wallack was also invaluable.

end of this Appendix,¹ and an examination of the data indicates that the means of group 1 (phase one interviews less those from St. John's, and Corner Brook, since they are not included in the 1973 sample areas) compared to those of group 2 (the questionnaires returned by mail) are in most cases very similar. In fact, 81.8 percent of the variables have means which are not statistically different.

While it would be unreasonable to expect a 100 percent congruity between the two samples, some attempt should be made to explain why a statistically significant difference of means appears in 22 of the 121 variables. In 5 cases the time difference between the two samples provides a reasonable explanation. The personal interviews were conducted in the summer of 1977, whereas the mail survey was carried out in the fall of 1977 and the spring of 1978. Municipal elections were held across the province in October and November 1977,² and the personnel of many municipal councils changed with a number of older, experienced councillors

¹The data are listed only by variable name and the short description allowed on the VAR LABELS card. However, the variables are listed in order, and complete details of each question along with the overall results can readily be obtained by referring to the Codebook in Appendix K. For comparison, F-test results are also reported.

²Elections were held November 8, 1977, for councils in cities, town, and rural districts; and on December 12, 1977, for Local Government Communities. There were a few exceptions in cases where incorporation had recently been granted, or where a question of annexation was pending. In a few cases, elections were held again in the spring of 1978 in some municipalities where an insufficient number of candidates had been nominated.

dropping out of municipal service to be replaced by younger and inexperienced members. This was anticipated in the research design where length of service was proposed as an independent variable to be used in the explanation of representative roles.¹ The variable HOWLONG, which measures the length of service as a municipal councillor, clearly shows fewer years experience among group 2 respondents as compared to those in group 1, although the difference just fits within the limits of not being statistically significant. The fact that group 1 respondents tend to be older than those in group 2 as seen in the variable AGE is therefore not surprising. Similarly, the difference in scores for the variable HOWMANY may be explained by the fact that the newer councillors may not yet know their fellow-councillors as well as did the more experienced councillors whom they replaced.

The time variation between the two samples may also explain the statistically significant differences in the variable pertaining to financial revenue. OPERBUDG, which measures the amount of the municipality's annual operating budget, is reported as somewhat larger by group 2. This is not surprising, since the respondents from group 1 would have reported the 1977 budget figures, while those from group 2 would most likely have reported the 1978 budget estimates, which would either have been in preparation or use depending on precisely when the questionnaire was completed. Similarly, the much higher water and sewage fees (WSFEE) reported by group 2

¹See page 17 of my thesis proposal.

undoubtedly reflects a provincial government policy designed to sharply increase the water and sewage fees levied by municipalities starting in the 1978 fiscal year. This provincial action may also explain the greater number of councillors in group 2 who felt that the provincial government should not have the final say over the municipality's budget. The differences in this variable (BUDGET) may also reflect the surprise of new councillors who had just realized that municipal budgets must receive the approval of the provincial Municipal Affairs Department before taking effect.¹

The statistically significant differences between the means of 7 other variables can perhaps be explained by the nature of the data collection. During personal interviews, some respondents may have been reluctant to reveal "sensitive" information, despite guarantees of anonymity.² The responses to the question asking party identification (PARTY) may be a case in point, since the considerably high mean recorded for group 1 reflects the greater number of respondents who stated in personal interviews that they were "independents" as opposed to those in group 2.

A somewhat similar explanation may be offered in several other cases. It is not unreasonable to assume a certain defence of community

¹This requirement of prior budget approval was removed under provisions of the new Municipalities Act (1980).

²See for instance Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design, pp. 30-31; Seymour Sudman and Norman M. Bradburn, Response Effects in Surveys: A Review and Synthesis (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 93-139; Julian L. Simon, Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 92-94; David and Chave Nachmias, Research Methods in the Social Sciences (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), pp. 106-7.

in Newfoundland society.¹ This defence could well be reflected in responses designed to present the members of the community as being more united and knowledgeable than may actually be the case. This representation of the community in as good a light as possible may be particularly operative where the interviewer has the double distinction of being a "come from away," as well as representing the university community in the alien and perceivedly disreputable capital city of St. John's. This attitude could well have accounted for the higher percentage estimated by group 1 respondents of citizens who knew the name of the mayor (KNOWMYR). It may also be presumed to be a factor in responses to the variable dealing with the internal selection of mayor (HIGHVOTE) insofar as group 2 respondents were more willing to implicitly admit the conflict that is often present when the person selected by council to be mayor is not necessarily the person who received the highest number of votes in the election.² Similarly, in the question asking whether tax collection was a particular problem in their community (TAXPROB), group 1 respondents were more likely to answer "no," resulting in the higher numerical mean.

¹For an expansion of this idea see John Szwed, Private Cultures and Public Imagery (St. John's: ISER, 1966) pp. 104-105; and A. P. Cohen, The Management of Myths (St. John's: ISER, 1975).

²The Local Government Act allows Newfoundland towns and rural districts to either elect the mayor directly or to have council select one of its own members as mayor. The traditional assumption has been that the person receiving the highest popular vote would be selected as mayor. During the personal interviews, I encountered a few communities where in the previous elections, the highest vote recipient had not been chosen mayor, and nearly four years later, the incident was still remembered--sometimes with acrimony. The data indicate that just less than 50% of councils actually always choose the popular vote winner to be mayor or chairman.

The statistically significant difference in the means for three of the attitude questions may also be explained by the desire to present the community in a good light during the personal interviews. More respondents in group 1 agreed with the statement that "This community has good leadership in dealing with its problems" (ATT3) than did those in group 2. Likewise, more group 1 respondents tended to disagree with the statement that "Ordinary citizens don't have enough say in community decisions" (ATT5); and in ATT9, which stated "Public meetings here generally stir up more trouble than they are worth," group 1 respondents tended to disagree more than their group 2 counterparts.

The final variable whose difference in means may be explained by interviewer bias is CLCLOSED, which sought to determine the frequency of closed council sessions. The fact that personally interviewed respondents reported a lower number of closed council meetings than did the mail questionnaire respondents, may well reflect a reluctance to admit in a face-to-face interview a practice which might be considered to have negative connotations.

A somewhat more mechanical explanation may be offered for two variables, HOWCONT and WHYLOGOV, which each had an additional response category added to the "high" end of the response codes in order to accommodate a number of councillors (48 and 27 respectively) from group 2 who circled more than one response. The effect of this was to raise the medians of the group 2 responses for these variables, introducing an "artificial" difference of means.

Seven variables remain with unexplained differences. Some of these (WHYELECT, WHYNOINT) may result from the large number of

open-ended coding response categories. Others (DATEINC, YOUPRES) may be the result of the personally-interviewed councillors having less time to think about the answers than those who responded to the mail questionnaires. For the remaining three (MUNPTYS, ROLEIMP, ATT14), no logical explanation seems readily available. However, some variation might be expected, since different data-gathering techniques were used for each of the two samples.

In summary, when the means of each of the 121 variables contained in the two samples were compared, 99 (81.8%) were shown to have no statistically significant difference, and could therefore be assumed to have come from the same population. Arguments have been presented to show that the statistically different means observed in a further 15 variables (12.4%) can be logically explained. On the basis of this evidence it is clear that the null hypothesis (that the means of the two groups were not equal) can be rejected, and the working hypothesis (that the means are equal) can be accepted.

COMPARISON OF MEANS

BETWEEN PERSONALLY-INTERVIEWED RESPONDENTS (GROUP 1)
AND THOSE REPLYING TO MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES (GROUP 2)

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
DATEINC	YEARS SINCE INCORPORATION								
GROUP 1	79	6.4684	0.985	0.111	1.45	0.059	2.75	307	0.006
GROUP 2	230	6.0609	1.184	0.078					
JTCOUNC	JOINT COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP								
GROUP 1	78	1.6667	0.474	0.054	1.45	0.038	-2.61	306	0.010
GROUP 2	230	1.8087	0.394	0.026					
JTCNAME	NAME OF JOINT COUNCIL								
GROUP 1	26	2.5385	1.104	0.216	2.82	0.007	-1.72	68	0.090
GROUP 2	44	3.2273	1.854	0.279					
POP	POPULATION								
GROUP 1	79	3.4304	1.550	0.174	1.27	0.181	0.63	307	0.527
GROUP 2	230	3.3130	1.376	0.091					
NOCOUNC	NUMBER OF COUNCILLOWS								
GROUP 1	79	4.2025	0.952	0.107	1.09	0.680	0.39	307	0.695
GROUP 2	230	4.1522	0.993	0.065					
COUNTEEC	METHOD OF COUNCILLOWS SELECTION								
GROUP 1	79	1.1013	0.304	0.034	1.13	0.538	-0.39	307	0.698
GROUP 2	230	1.1174	0.323	0.021					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
EMPFULL NUMBER OF FULLTIME EMPLOYEES									
GROUP 1	79	2.4177	2.211	0.249	1.62	0.007	0.13	305	0.897
GROUP 2	228	2.3860	1.738	0.115					
EMPART NUMBER OF PARTTIME EMPLOYEES									
GROUP 1	79	2.0886	0.936	0.105	1.74	0.002	0.82	294	0.411
GROUP 2	217	2.0046	0.710	0.048					
REGFREQ FREQUENCY OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETINGS									
GROUP 1	79	3.0127	1.214	0.137	1.24	0.274	0.46	305	0.649
GROUP 2	228	2.9342	1.350	0.089					
SPECFREQ FREQUENCY OF SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETINGS									
GROUP 1	78	2.1538	0.823	0.093	1.18	0.363	-1.37	290	0.172
GROUP 2	214	2.2944	0.758	0.052					
NOCOMM NUMBER OF COUNCIL COMMITTEES									
GROUP 1	79	1.7468	0.898	0.101	1.02	0.877	-0.22	297	0.825
GROUP 2	220	1.7727	0.888	0.060					
CLOSED FREQUENCY OF CLOSED COUNCIL MEETINGS									
GROUP 1	78	2.9744	1.227	0.139	1.58	0.012	3.15	287	0.002
GROUP 2	211	2.5355	0.977	0.067					
COMMOEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS OPEN?									
GROUP 1	38	1.4474	0.504	0.082	1.01	1.000	0.31	196	0.755
GROUP 2	160	1.4187	0.507	0.040					
OPERBUDG AMOUNT OF OPERATING BUDGET									
GROUP 1	79	2.6329	1.650	0.186	1.14	0.470	-2.97	252	0.003
GROUP 2	175	3.2686	1.543	0.117					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
PERLOC % OF BUDGET RAISED FROM LOCAL SOURCES									
GROUP 1	79	48.9747	13.805	1.553	1.21	0.350	0.66	240	0.509
GROUP 2	163	47.6380	15.175	1.189					
PERPROV % OF BUDGET RECEIVED FROM PROVINCE									
GROUP 1	79	51.0253	13.805	1.553	1.22	0.330	-0.64	240	0.520
GROUP 2	163	52.3313	15.236	1.193					
PROPTAX DOES MUNICIPALITY LEVY PROPERTY TAX?									
GROUP 1	72	1.8611	0.348	0.041	1.24	0.288	0.87	299	0.385
GROUP 2	229	1.8166	0.388	0.026					
GSFEE YEARLY AMOUNT OF GENERAL SERVICE FEE									
GROUP 1	66	22.6060	5.817	0.716	1.83		2.24	286	0.026
GROUP 2	222	24.9459	7.876	0.529					
WSFEE YEARLY AMOUNT OF WATER & SEWAGE FEES									
GROUP 1	34	68.2941	24.421	4.188	2.25	0.008	-5.34	168	0.000
GROUP 2	136	103.7132	36.629	3.141					
POSIT RESPONDENT'S POSITION WITH MUNICIPALITY									
GROUP 1	79	1.8734	1.202	0.135	1.32	0.116	1.78	307	0.077
GROUP 2	230	1.6217	1.045	0.069					
HOWLONG NUMBER OF YEARS IN POSITION									
GROUP 1	79	2.4177	1.194	0.134	1.04	0.853	2.04	307	0.042
GROUP 2	230	2.0957	1.218	0.080					
FULLTIME STATUS OF MUNICIPAL WORKLOAD									
GROUP 1	79	1.8606	0.348	0.039	1.29	0.186	1.09	304	0.278
GROUP 2	227	1.8062	0.396	0.026					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
HOURS	WEEKLY TIME SPENT ON COUNCIL BUSINESS								
GROUP 1	72	10.4861	12.720	1.499	2.12	0.000	1.43	225	0.153
GROUP 2	155	8.4065	8.737	0.702					
ELECT	METHOD OF RESPONDENT'S SELECTION								
GROUP 1	79	1.7215	0.919	0.103	1.26	0.194	1.59	306	0.112
GROUP 2	229	1.5459	0.819	0.054					
WARDS	NUMBER OF OPPONENTS IF WARD SYSTEM								
GROUP 1	77	6.7143	0.191	0.136	2.26	0.000	-0.46	276	0.645
GROUP 2	201	6.7711	0.792	0.056					
WHYELECT	RESP'S PERCEPTION OF ELECTORAL SUCCESS								
GROUP 1	41	2.4878	1.468	0.229	1.18	0.501	-3.11	147	0.002
GROUP 2	108	3.2778	1.352	0.130					
WHYRUN	REASONS FOR CANDIDACY								
GROUP 1	67	3.8209	2.110	0.258	1.01	0.949	0.95	260	0.344
GROUP 2	195	3.5385	2.104	0.151					
FAMACT	RESPONDENT'S FAMILY ACTIVE IN POLITICS?								
GROUP 1	79	1.6962	0.463	0.052	1.10	0.630	1.16	300	0.247
GROUP 2	223	1.6233	0.486	0.033					
OTHEROFF	HAD RESP EVER RUN FOR OTHER POL OFFICE?								
GROUP 1	79	1.9367	0.245	0.028	1.21	0.286	-0.37	307	0.710
GROUP 2	230	0.9478	0.223	0.015					
WHATOFF	WHAT OTHER OFFICE WAS SOUGHT?								
GROUP 1	5	2.0000	1.414	0.632	2.29	0.262	-2.47	14	0.027
GROUP 2	11	3.4545	0.934	0.282					

VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
INT WAS RESP INTERESTED IN OTHER POL OFFICE?									
GROUP 1	68	3.9412	1.701	0.206	1.45	0.053	-1.24	253	0.216
GROUP 2	187	4.2032	1.411	0.103					
INTLOC DURATION OF INTEREST IN LOC GOVT									
GROUP 1	63	3.0317	1.282	0.162	3.05	0.000	0.46	227	0.649
GROUP 2	166	2.9699	0.734	0.057					
INTPOL DURATION OF INTEREST IN POLITICS									
GROUP 1	61	2.7213	1.762	0.226	1.95	0.002	-1.39	170	0.165
GROUP 2	111	3.0450	1.260	0.120					
HOMEDISC AMT OF POL DISCUSSION IN HOME AS CHILD									
GROUP 1	77	2.0779	0.870	0.099	1.23	0.259	-1.18	296	0.241
GROUP 2	221	2.2036	0.786	0.053					
PARTY RESP'S POL PARTY IDENTIFICATION									
GROUP 1	70	2.4000	1.221	0.146	1.56	0.023	4.24	239	0.000
GROUP 2	171	1.7661	0.978	0.075					
MUNPTYS MUNICIPAL PARTIES BENEFICIAL?									
GROUP 1	72	1.5694	0.499	0.059	1.13	0.507	3.75	268	0.000
GROUP 2	198	1.3232	0.469	0.033					
WHYMP REASONS FOR VIEWS ON MUN PARTIES									
GROUP 1	23	7.6522	4.839	1.009	1.17	0.584	1.13	135	0.262
GROUP 2	114	6.4825	4.481	0.420					
OCCUP RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATION									
GROUP 1	79	6.5190	3.508	0.395	1.13	0.490	-0.48	298	0.634
GROUP 2	221	6.7285	3.300	0.222					

VARIABLE	CASES	NUMBER OF	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
EMPLOYED PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS										
GROUP 1	78		1.5256	1.159	0.131	1.36	0.088	0.16	302	0.877
GROUP 2	226		1.5044	0.994	0.066					
REJECT WILL RESP RUN FOR REJECTION?										
GROUP 1	54		1.3519	0.482	0.066	1.12	0.610	0.81	166	0.417
GROUP 2	114		1.2895	0.456	0.043					
WHYRE REASONS FOR REJECTION DECISION										
GROUP 1	24		7.2917	5.154	1.052	1.15	0.659	0.44	82	0.659
GROUP 2	60		6.7667	4.817	0.622					
CLUBONE CATEGORY OF FIRST CLUB MEMBERSHIP										
GROUP 1	79		6.3038	4.527	0.509	1.16	0.457	-1.33	303	0.186
GROUP 2	226		7.1327	4.870	0.324					
CLUBTWO CATEGORY OF SECOND CLUB MEMBERSHIP										
GROUP 1	40		4.8000	3.743	0.592	1.01	0.948	-0.61	133	0.541
GROUP 2	95		5.2316	3.729	0.383					
CLIBTHREE CATEGORY OF THIRD CLUB MEMBERSHIP										
GROUP 1	20		5.6500	4.069	0.910	1.44	0.296	0.54	72	0.594
GROUP 2	54		5.1481	3.389	0.461					
OFFICER HAS RESP BEEN CLUB OFFICER?										
GROUP 1	71		1.3099	0.466	0.055	1.15	0.498	-2.23	282	0.026
GROUP 2	213		1.4601	0.500	0.034					
EDUC EDUCATION LEVEL										
GROUP 1	78		3.4615	1.891	0.214	1.11	0.587	-0.54	297	0.589
GROUP 2	221		3.6018	1.997	0.134					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
SEX									
GROUP 1	79	1.0759	0.267	0.030	1.48	0.046	-1.05	305	0.295
GROUP 2	228	1.1184	0.324	0.021					
AGE									
GROUP 1	79	45.5570	13.958	1.570	1.20	0.309	2.91	301	0.004
GROUP 2	224	40.5804	12.748	0.852					
PUBLIC AWARENESS OF COUNCIL ACTIVITIES									
GROUP 1	78	1.9872	0.798	0.090	1.14	0.462	-1.81	302	0.071
GROUP 2	226	2.1681	0.747	0.050					
ATTENDANCE AT REGULAR COUNCIL MEETINGS									
GROUP 1	77	2.1299	1.196	0.136	1.13	0.499	-2.08	290	0.038
GROUP 2	215	2.4465	1.126	0.077					
% OF POPULATION KNOWING MAYOR'S NAME									
GROUP 1	75	96.3467	7.549	0.872	3.75	0.006	3.12	294	0.002
GROUP 2	221	90.8326	14.623	0.984					
METHOD OF MAYOR'S SELECTION									
GROUP 1	79	1.1772	0.384	0.043	1.02	0.945	-0.12	306	0.902
GROUP 2	229	1.1834	0.388	0.026					
IF COUNCIL CHOICE, HIGHEST POPULAR VOTE?									
GROUP 1	54	1.2037	0.451	0.061	1.71	0.024	-5.28	233	0.000
GROUP 2	181	1.6630	0.589	0.044					
WHY RELUCTANCE TO PAY MUNICIPAL TAXES?									
GROUP 1	39	3.3846	1.886	0.302	1.24	0.369	-0.69	201	0.492
GROUP 2	164	3.5976	1.697	0.133					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
TAXPROB PROBLEM WITH TAX COLLECTION HERE?									
GROUP 1	78	1.7308	0.446	0.051	1.22	0.311	5.06	300	0.000
GROUP 2	224	1.4107	0.493	0.033					
PEOPINT PUBLIC INTEREST IN YOUR MUNIC. AFFAIRS?									
GROUP 1	77	1.5714	0.498	0.057	1.10	0.595	-1.37	289	0.173
GROUP 2	214	1.6589	0.475	0.032					
WHYNOINT WHY ARE PUBLIC NOT INTERESTED?									
GROUP 1	30	2.7667	1.794	0.328	1.81	0.070	-3.51	122	0.001
GROUP 2	94	4.4468	2.417	0.249					
COUNCACT GENERAL REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE OF COUNC'S									
GROUP 1	79	1.9494	0.618	0.070	1.39	0.093	-2.45	301	0.015
GROUP 2	224	2.1741	0.728	0.049					
HOWVOTE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE: GENERAL									
GROUP 1	77	1.9351	0.592	0.068	1.23	0.296	-2.02	302	0.044
GROUP 2	227	2.1057	0.657	0.044					
SPECISS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE: SPECIFIC									
GROUP 1	76	1.9211	0.583	0.067	1.40	0.063	0.15	298	0.880
GROUP 2	224	1.9107	0.493	0.033					
FREOTALK FREQUENCY OF DISCUSSION RE COUNCIL									
GROUP 1	76	1.8816	1.058	0.121	1.31	0.179	-1.32	276	0.189
GROUP 2	202	2.0891	1.210	0.085					
WHOSTART DOES RESP START THESE DISCUSSIONS?									
GROUP 1	76	2.1711	0.473	0.054	1.57	0.024	1.80	276	0.073
GROUP 2	202	2.0347	0.593	0.042					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
FREQCNT FREQUENCY OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS									
GROUP 1	77	2.4286	0.979	0.112	1.11	0.548	0.66	272	0.511
GROUP 2	197	2.3452	0.927	0.066					
HOWCONT METHOD OF CITIZEN CONTACT									
GROUP 1	77	1.3377	0.553	0.063	1.99	0.001	-4.25	286	0.000
GROUP 2	211	1.7488	0.780	0.054					
WHATDEM * RESP'S DEFINITION OF DEMOCRACY									
GROUP 1	53	3.1509	1.854	0.255	1.15	0.519	0.84	206	0.404
GROUP 2	155	2.9161	1.732	0.139					
WHYLOGOV MOST IMP REASON FOR LOCAL GOVT									
GROUP 1	75	1.3200	0.661	0.076	2.25	0.000	-3.00	295	0.003
GROUP 2	222	1.6892	0.992	0.067					
KNOWCOUN HOW WELL RESP KNOWS FELLOW-COUNCILLORS									
GROUP 1	78	2.2436	0.585	0.066	1.62	0.015	2.07	294	0.039
GROUP 2	218	2.0505	0.745	0.050					
HOWMANY NUMBER OF FELLOW-COUNCILLORS SO KNOWN									
GROUP 1	78	1.2949	0.584	0.066	1.89	0.001	-4.32	299	0.000
GROUP 2	223	1.7220	0.802	0.054					
PROBI FIRST MAJOR PROBLEM IN COMMUNITY									
GROUP 1	76	29.9211	27.028	3.100	1.12	0.582	-1.04	284	0.301
GROUP 2	210	33.8286	28.579	1.972					
PROB2 SECOND MAJOR PROBLEM IN COMMUNITY									
GROUP 1	49	37.1224	26.457	3.780	1.16	0.476	0.02	229	0.986
GROUP 2	182	37.0494	24.524	1.818					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
PROB3 THIRD MAJOR PROBLEM IN COMMUNITY									
GROUP 1	19	41.4737	25.652	5.885	1.03	0.998	-0.14	152	0.891
GROUP 2	135	42.3481	26.084	2.245					
AGRMNT COUNCIL AGREEMENT ON PROBLEM SOLUTIONS?									
GROUP 1	76	1.0263	0.161	0.018	2.14	0.000	-1.11	295	0.266
GROUP 2	221	1.0588	0.236	0.016					
WHOBRING WHO USUALLY BRINGS PROBLEMS TO COUNCIL?									
GROUP 1	75	3.5067	1.614	0.186	1.18	0.416	-0.10	279	0.923
GROUP 2	206	3.5291	1.752	0.122					
FREQUATT RESP'S ATTENDANCE AT COUNCIL MEETINGS									
GROUP 1	79	3.8861	0.453	0.051	5.18	0.000	-2.45	303	0.015
GROUP 2	226	3.9779	0.199	0.013					
ROLEINI RESP'S ROLE IN POLICY INITIATION									
GROUP 1	74	1.6486	0.650	0.076	1.32	0.132	0.18	280	0.860
GROUP 2	208	1.6346	0.566	0.039					
ROLEALT RESP'S ROLE IN POLICY ALTERNATIVES									
GROUP 1	73	1.6575	0.650	0.076	1.30	0.168	-0.45	267	0.656
GROUP 2	196	1.6939	0.571	0.041					
ROLEDEC RESP'S ROLE IN POLICY DECISIONS									
GROUP 1	72	1.5972	0.683	0.081	1.10	0.604	-2.31	263	0.022
GROUP 2	193	1.8083	0.653	0.047					
ROLEIMP RESP'S ROLE IN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION									
GROUP 1	74	1.9324	0.728	0.085	1.53	0.021	4.08	271	0.000
GROUP 2	199	1.5829	0.588	0.042					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
CROLEINI CLERK'S ROLE IN POLICY INITIATION									
GROUP 1	62	2.0000	0.923	0.117					
GROUP 2	203	2.0049	0.920	0.065	1.01	0.944	-0.04	263	0.971
CROLEALT CLERK'S ROLE IN POLICY ALTERNATIVES									
GROUP 1	63	2.2857	1.038	0.131					
GROUP 2	196	2.1429	0.889	0.063	1.37	0.114	1.06	257	0.288
CROLEDEC CLERK'S ROLE IN POLICY DECISIONS									
GROUP 1	64	2.4844	1.054	0.132					
GROUP 2	193	2.3161	0.957	0.069	1.21	0.322	1.19	255	0.236
CROLEIMP CLERK'S ROLE IN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION									
GROUP 1	65	2.0000	0.919	0.114					
GROUP 2	196	1.8418	0.877	0.063	1.10	0.626	1.24	259	0.214
MROLEINI MGR'S ROLE IN POLICY INITIATION									
GROUP 1	20	1.4500	0.605	0.135					
GROUP 2	46	1.7826	0.814	0.120	1.81	0.160	-1.64	64	0.406
MROLEALT MGR'S ROLE IN POLICY ALTERNATIVES									
GROUP 1	21	1.6667	0.658	0.144					
GROUP 2	46	1.8043	0.833	0.123	1.60	0.254	-0.67	65	0.507
MROLEDEC MGR'S ROLE IN POLICY DECISIONS									
GROUP 1	21	1.9048	0.831	0.181					
GROUP 2	45	2.0667	0.837	0.125	1.01	1.000	-0.73	64	0.466
MROLEIMP MGR'S ROLE IN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION									
GROUP 1	21	1.4762	0.814	0.178					
GROUP 2	47	1.6809	0.887	0.129	1.19	0.690	-0.90	65	0.371

VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
CINFL CLERK'S OVERALL INFLUENCE ON POLICY									
GROUP 1	66	1.9697	0.173	0.021	4.51	0.000	-2.18	244	0.030
GROUP 2	180	2.0722	0.367	0.027					
MINFL MGR'S OVERALL INFLUENCE ON POLICY									
GROUP 1	24	1.9583	0.204	0.042	4.86	0.000	0.09	62	0.932
GROUP 2	40	1.9500	0.450	0.071					
GRPSPRES 'FREQ OF INT GRPS APPROACHING COUNCIL									
GROUP 1	75	3.2400	0.819	0.095	1.18	0.386	1.00	259	0.320
GROUP 2	186	3.1344	0.756	0.055					
YOUNPRES FREQ OF RESP ACTING FOR INT GRP									
GROUP 1	76	3.7763	0.479	0.055	3.05	0.000	3.61	277	0.000
GROUP 2	203	3.4089	0.836	0.059					
COUNCDOM DOMINATION OF COUNCIL BY ONE OR TWO?									
GROUP 1	78	1.9359	0.247	0.028	1.65	0.012	1.21	290	0.226
GROUP 2	214	1.8878	0.316	0.022					
PROVINT PROVINCIAL INTEREST IN MUNIC SUFFICIENT?									
GROUP 1	76	1.8816	0.325	0.037	1.41	0.087	1.26	284	0.209
GROUP 2	210	1.8190	0.386	0.027					
BUDGET SHOULD PROV HAVE FINAL SAY ON BUDGET?									
GROUP 1	77	1.2857	0.455	0.052	1.19	0.387	-4.48	289	0.000
GROUP 2	214	1.5748	0.496	0.034					
BYLAWS SHOULD PROV HAVE FINAL SAY ON BYLAWS?									
GROUP 1	76	1.2895	0.457	0.052	1.12	0.526	0.76	290	0.451
GROUP 2	216	1.2454	0.431	0.029					

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
FINHELP SHOULD PROV PROVIDE MORE FINANCIAL HELP?									
GROUP 1	77	1.0260	0.160	0.018	1.73	0.006	-0.77	291	0.441
GROUP 2	216	1.0463	0.211	0.014					
TREATMENT PROV TREATMENT COMPARED TO OTHER MUNIC'S									
GROUP 1	71	1.3944	0.727	0.086	1.55	0.034	-2.23	272	0.026
GROUP 2	203	1.6601	0.905	0.064					
REGGOV ATTITUDE TO CONCEPT OF REGIONAL GOV'T									
GROUP 1	69	1.2319	0.425	0.051	1.31	0.163	1.24	244	0.217
GROUP 2	177	1.1638	0.371	0.028					
COMMENTS COMMENTS ON REGIONAL GOVERNMENT									
GROUP 1	23	7.8261	4.313	0.899	1.14	0.766	-1.41	68	0.162
GROUP 2	47	9.4468	4.596	0.670					
NUISTAX SHOULD NUISANCE TAXES BE ABOLISHED?									
GROUP 1	68	1.2500	0.436	0.053	1.23	0.330	-1.78	256	0.077
GROUP 2	190	1.3684	0.484	0.035					
TAXPROP SHOULD PROPERTY TAX BE LEVIED?									
GROUP 1	71	1.4648	0.502	0.060	1.01	0.947	-0.07	250	0.945
GROUP 2	181	1.4696	0.500	0.037					
CHANGES RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN MUN GOV'T									
GROUP 1	22	11.9091	7.609	1.622	1.32	0.486	1.05	83	0.299
GROUP 2	63	9.7143	8.744	1.102					
ATTN VOTE ACCORDING TO CITIZENS FEELINGS									
GROUP 1	78	1.8718	1.155	0.131	1.62	0.007	0.56	301	0.576
GROUP 2	225	1.8000	0.906	0.060					

VARIANCE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
ATT2	MAIN JOB OF COUNCIL TO OBTAIN BENEFITS								
GROUP 1	78	2.4359	1.401	0.159	1.04	0.819	-0.10	301	0.924
GROUP 2	225	2.4533	1.375	0.092					
ATT3	COMMUNITY HAS GOOD LEADERSHIP								
GROUP 1	78	1.4231	0.765	0.087	2.07	0.000	-2.77	302	0.006
GROUP 2	226	1.7965	1.101	0.073					
ATT4	IMPORTANT DECISIONS BEST BY FEW LEADERS								
GROUP 1	79	3.7975	1.480	0.166	1.13	0.479	1.16	302	0.245
GROUP 2	225	3.5822	1.390	0.093					
ATT5	ORDINARY CITIZENS DON'T HAVE ENOUGH SAY								
GROUP 1	79	2.9494	1.709	0.192	1.46	0.034	2.83	302	0.005
GROUP 2	225	2.3956	1.414	0.094					
ATT6	ONE MAN'S OPINION AS GOOD AS ANOTHER'S								
GROUP 1	79	3.3291	1.639	0.184	1.22	0.263	-0.07	302	0.948
GROUP 2	225	3.3422	1.483	0.099					
ATT7	FIRST DUTY IS TO FELLOW CITIZENS								
GROUP 1	79	1.5190	0.959	0.108	1.33	0.140	-2.19	296	0.029
GROUP 2	219	1.8265	1.108	0.075					
ATT8	PEOPLE ONLY CARE ABT SERVICES & FAVOURS								
GROUP 1	79	1.8734	1.213	0.136	1.12	0.575	-1.49	303	0.138
GROUP 2	226	2.1195	1.282	0.085					
ATT9	PUBLIC MEETINGS STIR UP TROUBLE								
GROUP 1	79	3.8734	1.488	0.167	1.02	0.932	3.32	302	0.001
GROUP 2	225	3.2222	1.504	0.100					

VARIANCE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
ATT10	OUTSIDERS DON'T REALLY UNDERSTAND NEEDS								
GROUP 1	79	1.9873	1.382	0.155					
GROUP 2	226	1.9911	1.170	0.078	1.40	0.062	-0.02	303	0.981
ATT11	NOT SERVING CONSTITUENTS = NON-ELECTION								
GROUP 1	78	2.6026	1.313	0.149					
GROUP 2	221	2.6561	1.341	0.090	1.04	0.842	-0.30	297	0.761
ATT12	BUSINESSMEN HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENCE								
GROUP 1	79	4.3418	1.239	0.139					
GROUP 2	227	3.9119	1.294	0.086	1.09	0.668	2.57	304	0.011
ATT13	MOST PEOPLE DON'T KNOW & DON'T CARE								
GROUP 1	79	3.1266	1.596	0.180					
GROUP 2	222	2.8423	1.361	0.091	1.38	0.075	1.52	299	0.129
ATT14	MAIN JOB OF COUNCIL TO HELP PROV GOVT								
GROUP 1	79	1.6582	1.024	0.115					
GROUP 2	223	2.0987	1.259	0.084	1.51	0.035	-2.80	300	0.005
ATT15	COUNCILORS THINK LIKE FELLOW-CITIZENS								
GROUP 1	79	3.1646	1.629	0.183					
GROUP 2	223	3.1973	1.400	0.094	1.35	0.092	-0.17	300	0.864
ATT16	PRIMARY RESP IS TO DO GOOD JOB FOR CMTY								
GROUP 1	79	2.2278	1.544	0.174					
GROUP 2	221	2.0633	1.270	0.085	1.48	0.029	0.93	298	0.352
ATT17	NO ONE DECIDES ON BASIS OF CITIZEN WANTS								
GROUP 1	79	3.0253	1.510	0.170					
GROUP 2	216	2.6713	1.377	0.094	1.20	0.303	1.90	293	0.058

VARIANCE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAILED PROB.	POOLED T VALUE	VARIANCE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE 2-TAILED PROB.
ATT18	LOC GOVT IMP IN MTNG DEMOCRACY								
GROUP 1	79	1.4304	0.943	0.106	1.05	0.830	-0.92	295	0.360
GROUP 2	218	1.5459	0.965	0.065					
ANYDIFF									
GROUP 1	77	1.4935	0.503	0.057	1.06	0.763	1.49	231	0.138
GROUP 2	156	1.3910	0.490	0.039					
AREA	DIVISIONS OF PROVINCE FOR THIS STUDY								
GROUP 1	79	3.1392	1.774	0.200	1.28	0.166	0.37	307	0.711
GROUP 2	230	3.0609	1.568	0.103					

APPENDIX K
SURVEY OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS
IN
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Summary of Results

Professor Peter G. Boswell
Department of Political Science
Memorial University of Newfoundland

February 1979

PLEASE NOTE: THE CONTENTS OF THIS SUMMARY ARE FOR YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION ONLY. NO PUBLICATION, DISSEMINATION, REPRODUCTION, OR OTHER USE OF THESE RESULTS WITHOUT THE EXPRESS AND WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR.

REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS
IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR*

CODEBOOK AND SUMMARY

Survey Questionnaire
with
Response Codes and Frequency Distributions

This codebook is a modification of the interview questionnaire and provides a summary of the results. Questions are listed in the order asked, and questionnaire wording is identical to that of the original survey.

Format of Codebook Entries

1. COLUMN (COL.) Card and column location of data for each variable.
(Of relevance only for technical aspects of computer analysis.)
2. VARIABLE The variable name used for identification in SPSS format computer analysis.
3. QUESTION The question number and wording from the questionnaire.
4. Responses Codes and Categories
 - a. For questions with pre-determined response alternatives in the questionnaire, response categories and alternatives are generally identical with those in the original questionnaire.
 - b. For open-ended questions, response categories listed here were derived and coded from written and oral responses to the questions. Open-ended questions are indicated with an asterisk (*).
 - c. Coding conventions and abbreviations:

<u>Code</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Response Category</u>
8,98	DK	Don't know or no opinion
9,99	REF	Refused or no response
0,00	NA	Not Applicable

*Financed by the Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

5. Response Frequency (N)

The number of responses for each response category.

6. Percentage Distributions (%)

The percent of responses for each response category, excluding the missing responses of "8", "9", and "0".

7. Total Responses (N=)

The total number of usable responses (i.e. excluding the missing responses) for each variable:

Sample Codebook Entry

(Keyed to above outline)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/19 ↑ ①	SPECFREQ ↑ ②	Q.10* ④b HOW FREQUENTLY ARE SPECIAL (NON-REGULAR) COUNCIL MEETINGS HELD? ③	⑤ ↓	⑥ ↓
		④ { Often (more than 10 per year) 1 66 21.6 Sometimes (5 to 10 per year) 2 116 38.0 Rarely (2 to 3 per year) 3 117 38.4 Never 4 6 2.0 DK 8 14 --- REF 9 3 ---		
			⑦ →	(N=305)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/1	MODE	Method of Data Collection	-	-
1/2-4	TOWN	Code Number for each Municipality (See Appendix A)	-	-
1/5	INVO	Interview Identification Number	-	-
1/6-7	CASE	Respondent Serial Number	-	-
1/8	CARDNUM	Computer Card Number (1)	-	-

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/9	TYPE	Q.1 TYPE OF MUNICIPALITY		
		City..... 1	13	4.0
		Town..... 2	146	45.3
		Community council..... 3	107	33.2
		Local improvement district. 4	35	10.9
		Rural district..... 5	21	6.5
			(N = 322)	
1/10	DATE INC	Q.2 DATE OF INCORPORATION		
		less than 1 year..... 1	1	0.3
		1 to 2 years..... 2	4	1.2
		2 to 3 years..... 3	6	1.9
		3 to 4 years..... 4	19	5.9
		4 to 5 years..... 5	34	10.6
		6 to 10 years..... 6	83	25.8
		more than 10 years..... 7	175	54.3
			(N = 322)	
1/11	JT COUNC	Q.3 DOES YOUR MUNICIPALITY BELONG TO A JOINT COUNCIL OR SIMILAR ORGANIZATION WHERE A NUMBER OF COUNCILS MEET TO DISCUSS COMMON PROBLEMS?		
		yes..... 1	76	23.7
		no..... 2	245	76.3
		DK 8	1	---
			(N = 321)	
1/12	JTCNAME	Q.3*IF YES, WHAT IS THE ORGANIZATION CALLED?		
		Public Service Committee... 1	12	15.8
		Great Humber..... 2	22	28.9
		Burin..... 3	26	34.2
		Bay St. George..... 4	8	10.5
		Bay D'Espoir..... 5	2	2.6
		Lower Trinity..... 6	6	7.9
		DK..... 8	1	---
		NA..... 0	245	---
			(N = 76)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/13	POP	Q.4 POPULATION		
		less than 250.....1	21	6.5
		250-500.....2	70	21.7
		500-1000.....3	93	28.9
		1000-2500.....4	71	22.0
		2500-5000.....5	26	8.1
		5000-10,000.....6	17	5.3
		more than 10,000.....7	24	7.5
			(N = 322)	
1/14	NOCOUNC	Q.5 NUMBER OF COUNCIL MEMBERS (including mayor or chair- man)		
		3.....1	1	0.3
		4.....2	1	0.3
		5.....3	118	36.6
		6.....4	15	4.7
		7.....5	175	54.3
		8.....6	---	---
		9 or more.....7	12	3.7
			(N = 322)	
1/15	COUNELEC	Q.6 ARE THE COUNCIL MEMBERS		
		elected.....1	287	89.1
		appointed (L.I.D.).....2	35	10.9
			(N = 322)	
1/16	EMPFULL	Q.7 NUMBER OF FULLTIME PAID EMPLOYEES		
		none.....1	149	46.6
		1.....2	62	19.4
		2.....3	24	7.5
		3 to 5.....4	24	7.5
		6 to 10.....5	12	3.7
		11 to 25.....6	18	5.6
		more than 25.....7	31	9.7
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	1	---
			(N = 320)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/17	EMPPART	Q.8 NUMBER OF PART-TIME PAID EMPLOYEES (including seasonal)		
		none.....1	59	19.1
		1-5.....2	189	61.2
		6-10.....3	36	11.7
		11 to 25.....4	5	1.6
		more than 25.....5	20	6.5
		DK.....8	10	---
		REF.....9	3	---
			(N = 309)	
1/18	REGFREQ	Q.9 HOW OFTEN ARE <u>REGULAR</u> COUNCIL MEETINGS HELD?		
		once a week.....1	47	14.7
		once every two weeks.....2	108	33.7
		twice a month.....3	38	11.9
		once a month.....4	92	28.7
		less than once a month.....5	28	8.7
		other.....6	7	2.2
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	1	---
			(N = 320)	
1/19	SPECFREQ	Q.10 HOW FREQUENTLY ARE <u>SPECIAL</u> (NON-REGULAR) COUNCIL MEETINGS HELD?		
		often (more than 10 per year).....1	66	21.6
		sometimes (5 to 10 per year).....2	116	38.0
		rarely (2 to 3 per year)....3	117	38.4
		never.....4	6	2.0
		DK.....8	14	---
		REF.....9	3	---
			(N = 305)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/20	NOCOMM	Q.11 HOW MANY COMMITTEES DOES COUNCIL HAVE?		
		none.....1	142	45.5
		1-3.....2	101	32.4
		4-6.....3	44	14.1
		7-10.....4	15	4.8
		more than 10.....5	10	3.2
		DK.....8	5	---
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 312)	
1/21	CLCLOSED	Q.12 HOW FREQUENTLY DOES COUNCIL GO INTO CLOSED SESSION WHERE MEETINGS ARE NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC?		
		often (more than 10 per year).....1	69	22.8
		sometimes (5 to 10 per year).....2	58	19.2
		rarely (2 to 3 per year).....3	101	33.4
		never.....4	74	24.5
		DK.....8	15	---
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 302)	
1/22	COMMOPEN	Q.13 ARE COMMITTEE MEETINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC?		
		yes.....1	115	54.5
		no.....2	95	45.0
		sometimes.....3	1	0.5
		DK.....8	3	---
		REF.....9	2	---
		NA.....0	106	---
			(N = 211)	
1/23	OPERBUDG	Q.14*WHAT IS THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE LATEST ANNUAL <u>OPERATING</u> BUDGET?		
		Under \$10,000.....1	41	15.4
		\$10,001 to \$25,000.....2	75	28.1
		\$25,001 to \$50,000.....3	51	19.1
		\$50,001 to \$100,000.....4	28	10.5
		\$100,001 to \$500,000.....5	31	11.6
		\$500,001 to \$2,500,000.....6	27	10.1
		Over \$2,500,000.....7	14	5.2
		DK.....8	55	---
			(N = 267)	

COL.	VARIABLE	QUESTION	N	%
------	----------	----------	---	---

1/24-25	PERLOC	Q.14a* WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THIS BUDGET IS RAISED FROM LOCAL SOURCES?		
---------	--------	---	--	--

Actual Percentage as
Reported by Respondents:

SUMMARY		
	N	%
Less Than 20%	1	0.4
20% to 40%	88	34.5
41% to 60%	111	43.5
61% to 80%	45	17.6
More Than 80%	10	3.9

19	1	0.4
20	1	0.4
25	13	5.1
30	19	7.4
33	17	6.7
34	2	0.8
35	16	6.3
36	2	0.8
37	3	1.2
40	15	5.9
43	5	2.0
45	3	1.2
47	5	2.0
48	2	0.8
50	66	25.9
52	1	0.3
53	2	0.8
55	11	4.3
56	1	0.4
58	2	0.8
60	13	5.1
65	6	2.3
67	8	3.1
70	8	3.1
75	11	4.3
76	2	0.8
77	2	0.8
80	8	3.1
85	3	1.2
97	7	2.7
DK.....	08	67

(N = 255)

1/26-27	PERPROV	Q.14b* WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THIS BUDGET COMES FROM THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT?		
---------	---------	---	--	--

Actual Percentage as

Reported by Respondents:

03	7	2.7
15	3	1.2
20	9	3.5
23	2	0.8
24	2	0.8
25	10	3.9
30	8	3.1

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
		Q.14b* .(continued)			
			33	8	3.1
			35	6	2.3
			40	13	5.1
			42	2	0.8
			44	1	0.4
			45	11	4.3
			47	2	0.8
			48	1	0.4
			50	66	25.9
			52	2	0.8
			53	5	1.9
			55	3	1.2
			57	5	1.9
			60	15	5.9
			63	3	1.2
			64	2	0.8
			65	16	6.3
			66	2	0.8
			67	17	6.7
			70	19	7.5
			75	13	5.1
			80	1	0.4
			81	1	0.4
		DK.....	08	67	---
(N = 255)					

SUMMARY		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Less Than 20%	10	3.9
20% to 40%	58	22.7
41% to 60%	113	44.3
61% to 80%	73	28.6
More Than 80%	1	0.4

1/28	PROPTAX	Q.15	DOES YOUR MUNICIPALITY COLLECT PROPERTY TAXES?		
		yes.....	1	65	20.7
		no.....	2	249	79.3
		DK.....	8	3	---
		REF.,.....	9	5	---
(N = 314)					

1/29-30	GSFEE	Q.16*	WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF YOUR GENERAL SERVICE FEE?		
		Yearly Amount as Reported by Respondents:			
		\$16	1		0.3
		20	176		61.1
		22	2		0.7
		24	4		1.4
		25	46		16.0
		27	2		0.7
		30	14		4.9
		35	13		4.5
		40	24		8.3
		45	1		0.4

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.16* (continued)		
		\$50	3	1.0
		60	2	0.7
		DK.....08	7	---
		NA.....00	27	---
(N = 288)				

1/31-33 WSFEE

Q.16a* WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF
YOUR WATER/SEWAGE FEE?

Yearly Amount as

Reported by Respondents: \$20	6	3.5
24	1	0.6
30	2	1.2
36	4	2.4
40	2	1.2
45	3	1.8
48	6	3.5
60	10	5.9
72	26	15.3
84	7	4.1
90	6	3.5
96	29	17.1
108	4	2.3
114	1	0.6
120	16	9.4
132	4	2.3
144	42	24.7
150	1	0.6
DK.....08	14	---
REF.....09	7	---
NA.....00	131	---

(N = 170)

1/34 POSIT

Q.17 WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT
POSITION WITH THE
MUNICIPALITY?

councillor.....1	222	68.9
L.I.D. trustee.....2	23	7.1
mayor.....3	40	12.4
chairman.....4	37	11.5

(N = 322)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/35	HOWLONG	Q.18 HOW LONG HAVE YOU HEAD THIS POSITION?		
		less than 1 year.....1	141	43.8
		1 to 2 years.....2	52	16.1
		3 to 4 years.....3	57	17.7
		5 or more years.....4	72	22.4

(N = 322)

1/36	FULLTIME	Q.19 DO YOU CONSIDER THE POSITION FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME?		
		full-time.....1	56	17.6
		part-time.....2	263	82.4
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	2	---

(N = 319)

1/37-38 HOURS	Q.20*	HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DO YOU GENERALLY SPEND WORKING ON COUNCIL BUSINESS?		
---------------	-------	---	--	--

Actual Number of Hours as

Reported by Respondents:

00	1	0.4
01	8	3.3
02	22	9.2
03	21	8.8
04	24	10.0
05	32	13.3
06	17	7.1
07	7	2.9
08	14	5.8
09	4	1.7
10	30	12.5
11	2	0.8
12	8	3.3
13	2	0.8
14	1	0.4
15	8	3.3
16	3	1.2
18	2	0.8
20	15	6.3
22	1	0.4
24	2	0.8
25	2	0.8
27	1	0.4
30	3	1.2
35	5	2.1
38	1	0.4

SUMMARY

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Less Than 5	76	31.7
5 to 10	104	43.3
11 to 15	21	8.7
16 to 20	20	8.3
21 to 40	17	7.1
More Than 40	3	1.3

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.20* (continued)	40	2	0.8
			48	1	0.4
			81	1	0.4
			83	1	0.4
		DK	98	69	---
		REF	99	13	---
				(N = 240)	
1/39	ELECT	Q.21 WERE YOU ELECTED OR APPOINTED TO YOUR POSITION AS (councillor, etc.)?			
		elected (with opposition).....1	212	66.0	
		appointed (by government).2	36	11.2	
		acclaimed (no opposition).3	73	22.7	
		REF.....9	1	---	
				(N = 321)	
1/40	WARDS	Q.22 IF YOUR MUNICIPALITY HAS A WARD SYSTEM OF ELECTION, HOW MANY OPPONENTS RAN AGAINST YOU AT THE LAST ELECTION?			
		Number of Opponents as Reported by Respondent:	1	3	1.0
			2	3	1.0
			3	1	0.3
			4	2	0.6
			5	4	1.2
		6 or more	17	5.3	
		No Ward System.....7	261	81.1	
		DK.....8	12	---	
		REF.....9	10	---	
		NA...?...0	9	---	
				(N = 291)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/41	WHYELECT	Q.23* IF YOU WERE ELECTED (NOT APPOINTED BY GOVERNMENT), WHY DO YOU THINK YOUR FELLOW- CITIZENS CHOSE YOU TO REPRESENT THEM ON COUNCIL?		
		Well-Known in Community..1	39	24.1
		Experience.....2	35	21.6
		Honesty.....3	11	6.8
		Ability.....4	59	36.4
		Interest.....5	13	8.0
		New Face.....6	5	3.1
		DK.....8	69	---
		REF.....9	22	---
		NA.....0	69	---
			(N = 162)	
1/42	WHYRUN	Q.24* WHY DID YOU FIRST DECIDE TO RUN FOR COUNCIL OR ACCEPT APPOINTMENT TO COUNCIL?		
		To serve community..1	90	33.0
		Challenge.....2	9	3.3
		No others running.....3	25	9.2
		Pressured or Drafted.....4	20	7.3
		Wanted input or change...5	58	21.2
		Wanted to improve community.....6	67	24.5
		To act as Liason between Public and Council.....7	4	1.5
		DK.....8	33	---
		REF.....9	16	---
			(N = 273)	
1/43	FAMACT	Q.25 HAVE ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY OR CLOSE PERSONAL FRIENDS BEEN ACTIVE IN POLITICS INCLUDING MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT?		
		yes.....1	113	35.9
		no.....2	202	64.1
		don't know.....8	4	---
		refused.....9	3	---
			(N = 315)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/44	OTHEROFF	Q.26 HAVE YOU EVER RUN FOR ANY OTHER ELECTED POLITICAL OFFICE (MHA, MP, ETC.)?		
		yes.....1	18	5.6
		no.....2	304	94.4
			(N = 322)	
1/45	WHATOFF	Q.27 IF YES, WHAT?		
		MHA.....1	5	29.4
		MP.....2	0	---
		mayor/chairman.....3	4	23.5
		other.....4	8	47.1
		REF.....9	2	---
		NA.....0	303	---
			(N = 17)	
1/46	INT	Q.28 WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN RUNNING FOR ANY OTHER ELECTED POLITICAL OFFICE?		
		MHA.....1	41	15.5
		MP.....2	6	2.3
		mayor/chairman.....3	25	9.4
		other or combination....4	9	3.4
		no.....5	184	69.4
		DK.....8	46	---
		REF.....9	11	---
			(N = 265)	
1/47	INTLOC	Q.29* WHEN DID YOU FIRST BECOME INTERESTED IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT?		
		Always.....1	24	10.0
		Long Time (more than 20 years).....2	20	8.3
		Recently (up to 10 years)3	134	55.6
		Semi-Recently (10 to 19 years).....4	50	20.7
		Always as Adult.....5	13	5.4
		DK.....8	65	---
		REF.....9	16	---
			(N = 241)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/48	INTPOL	Q.30* CAN YOU RECALL WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME INTERESTED IN POLITICS GENERALLY?		
		Always.....1	38	20.5
		Long Time (more than 20 years).....2	42	22.7
		Recently (up to 10 years)3	28	15.1
		Semi-Recently (10 to 19 years).....4	41	22.2
		Always as Adult.....5	30	16.2
		Little Interest.....6	6	3.2
		DK.....8	111	---
		REF.....9	26	---
			(N = 185)	
1/49	HOMEDISC	Q.31 AS A CHILD, WAS THERE MUCH DISCUSSION ABOUT POLITICS IN YOUR HOME?		
		A great deal.....1	60	19.3
		Some.....2	166	53.4
		Hardly any.....3	62	19.9
		None at all.....4	23	7.4
		DK.....8	9	---
		REF.....9	2	---
			(N = 311)	
1/50	PARTY	Q.32 GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A LIBERAL, PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P. OR INDEPENDENT?		
		Liberal.....1	110	43.3
		P.C.2	85	33.5
		N.D.P.3	11	4.3
		Other (Independent).....4	48	18.9
		D.K.8	10	---
		REF.....9	58	---
			(N = 254)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/51	MUNPTYS	Q.33 DO YOU THINK NATIONAL OR PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES SHOULD PLAY A ROLE IN LOCAL, MUNICIPAL POLITICS?		
		Yes.....1	165	51.2
		No.....2	117	41.5
		DK.....8	25	---
		REF.....9	15	---
(N - 282)				

1/52-53 WHYMP

Q.33a*WHY OR WHY NOT?

Categories in favour:

Will increase interest..01	2	1.4
More attention to needs.02	26	18.4
More money.....03	25	17.7
Better provincial-local relations.....04	21	14.9
People can decide.....05	1	0.7
Will increase awareness.06	3	2.1
Generally in favour.....07	8	5.7

Categories opposed:

Will overload the system.....10	3	2.1
Too political.....11	23	16.3
Bad for provincial-local relations.....12	11	7.8
Community too small.....13	4	2.8
Will reduce local control.....14	6	4.3
No particular benefit...15	8	5.7
DK.....08	81	---
REF.....09	100	---

(N = 141)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/54-55	OCCUR	Q.34* WHAT IS YOUR PRINCIPAL JOB OR OCCUPATION? (Please be as specific as possible.)		
		Labourer.....01	16	5.1
		Fisherman-farmer.....02	23	7.3
		Plant worker/machine operator.....03	27	8.6
		Service worker.....04	17	5.4
		Skilled craftsman.....05	43	13.7
		Clerical.....06	17	5.4
		Businessperson.....07	63	20.1
		Professional.....10	68	21.7
		Housewife.....11	11	3.5
		Retired.....12	27	8.6
		Sick/disabled.....15	1	0.3
		REF.....09	9	---
			(N = 313)	
1/56	EMPLOYED	Q.35 ARE YOU PRESENTLY EMPLOYED IN THIS OCCUPATION?		
		Yes.....1	250	79.1
		No (other work).....2	10	3.2
		No (unemployed).....3	26	8.2
		No (retired).....4	27	8.5
		No (ill, disabled).....5	3	0.9
		REF.....9	6	---
			(N = 316)	
1/57	REELECT	Q.36 WILL YOU RUN FOR RE-ELECTION OR ACCEPT RE-APPOINTMENT TO YOUR PRESENT COUNCIL POSITION WHEN YOUR CURRENT TERM EXPIRES?		
		Yes.....1	123	69.5
		No.....2	54	30.5
		DK.....8	140	---
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 177)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/58-59	WHYRE	Q.36a* WHY OR WHY NOT?		
		Positive responses:		
		If no other qualified candidates.....01	2	2.4
		If not enough others...02	5	5.9
		Want to continue.....03	41	48.2
		If time permits.....04	1	1.2
		Negative responses:		
		Been on council long enough.....11	12	14.1
		Someone else's turn....12	12	14.1
		Not enough time.....13	6	7.1
		Better things to do....14	2	2.4
		If enough others run...15	1	1.2
		Personal reasons.....16	2	2.4
		Lack of cooperation from citizens.....17	1	1.2
		DK.....08	122	---
		REF.....09	115	---

(N = 85)

1/60-61 CLUBONE Q.37* DO YOU BELONG TO ANY CLUB OR ORGANIZATIONS, SUCH AS CHURCH GROUPS, SOCIAL CLUBS, LABOUR UNIONS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

Please list names:

(First club or group mentioned)		
Church groups.....01	39	12.3
Denominational/		
fraternal.....02	2	7.1
Service veterans.....03	57	18.0
Sports, youth, recreation,.....04	29	9.2
Special interest.....05	6	1.9
Union, professional....06	43	13.6
Charity.....07	1	0.3
Political.....11	1	0.3
Citizens' or special grievance.....12	24	7.6
No memberships.....13	93	29.4
REF.....09	6	---

(N = 316)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/62-63	CLUBTWO	Q.37a* (Second club or group mentioned):		
		Church groups.....01	22	15.4
		Denominational/		
		fraternal.....02	15	10.5
		Service/veterans.....03	17	11.9
		Sports, youth,		
		recreation.....04	27	18.9
		Special interest.....05	15	10.5
		Union, professional....06	20	14.0
		Citizens' or special		
		grievance.....12	27	18.9
		No other memberships...00	175	---
		REF.....09	4	---
			(N = 143)	
1/64-65	CLBTHREE	Q.37b* (Third club or group mentioned):		
		Church groups.....01	12	15.4
		Denominational/		
		fraternal.....02	5	6.4
		Service/veterans.....03	4	5.1
		Sports, youth,		
		recreation.....04	22	28.2
		Special interest.....05	4	5.1
		Union, professional....06	14	17.9
		Charity.....07	1	1.3
		Political.....11	2	2.6
		Citizens' or special		
		grievance.....12	14	17.9
		No other memberships...00	239	---
		REF.....09	9	---
			(N = 78)	
1/66	OFFICER	Q.38 ARE YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU BEEN AN OFFICER OF ANY SUCH ORGANIZATION?		
		Yes.....1	175	59.1
		No.....2	121	40.9
		REF.....9	12	---
		NA.....0	14	---
			(N = 296)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/67	EDUC	Q.39 HOW MUCH FORMAL EDUCATION DO YOU HAVE?		
		Completed primary school.1	39	12.5
		Some high school.....2	75	24.0
		Completed high school (grade 11).....3	63	20.2
		Some university.....4	31	9.9
		Completed university (B.A., B.ED., Etc.).....5	39	12.5
		Post-graduate (M.A., M.D., Etc.).....6	18	5.8
		Some trades and technical schooling completed.....7	47	15.1
		Other (specify) _____		
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	9	---
(N = 312)				

1/68	SEX	Q.40	COULD YOU PLEASE RECORD YOUR SEX?		
			Male.....1	284	88.7
			Female.....2	36	11.2
			REF.....9	2	---
(N = 320)					

1/69-70 AGE Q.41* HOW OLD ARE YOU?

Age in years as recorded by respondents:

SUMMARY			
		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
20 to 24		11	3.5
25 to 34		106	33.5
35 to 44		85	26.9
45 to 54		45	14.2
55 to 64		43	13.6
65 and over		26	8.2

20	1	0.3
21	1	0.3
22	1	0.3
23	5	1.6
24	3	1.0
25	2	0.6
26	7	2.2
27	10	3.2
28	12	3.8
29	15	4.7
30	11	3.5
31	11	3.5
32	14	4.4
33	11	3.5
34	13	4.1

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>T</u>
		Q.41* (continued)		
		35	6	1.9
		36	10	3.2
		37	11	3.5
		38	13	4.1
		39	9	2.8
		40	6	1.9
		41	6	1.9
		42	9	2.9
		43	6	1.9
		44	9	2.9
		45	3	1.0
		46	7	2.2
		47	7	2.2
		48	5	1.6
		49	5	1.6
		50	8	2.5
		51	4	1.3
		52	1	0.3
		53	2	0.6
		54	3	1.0
		55	5	1.6
		56	8	2.5
		57	6	1.9
		58	3	1.0
		59	5	1.6
		60	4	1.3
		61	1	0.3
		62	7	2.2
		63	4	1.3
		65	6	1.9
		66	2	0.6
		67	3	1.0
		68	4	1.3
		69	2	0.6
		70	1	0.3
		71	3	1.0
		72	1	0.3
		73	1	0.3
		74	2	0.6
		75	1	0.3
	REF.....	09	6	---

(N = 316)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1/71	PUBAWARE	Q.42 HOW AWARE DO YOU THINK THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS OF WHAT THE COUNCIL DOES IN THIS COMMUNITY?		
		Highly aware.....1	62	19.6
		Generally aware.....2	161	50.8
		Not very aware.....3	80	25.2
		Not aware at all.....4	14	4.4
		DK.....8	2	---
		REF.....9	3	---
(N = 317)				

1/72	PEOPATT	Q.43 HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD YOU ESTIMATE GENERALLY ATTEND OPEN COUNCIL MEETINGS ON THE AVERAGE?		
		None.....1	79	25.9
		Less than 5.....2	116	38.0
		5 to 10.....3	27	8.9
		More than 10.....4	83	27.2
		DK.....8	11	---
		REF.....9	5	---
		"Never had one".....0	1	---
(N = 305)				

1/73-74	KNOWMYR	Q.44* WHAT PERCENTAGE OF CITIZENS WOULD YOU ESTIMATE KNOW THE NAME OF THE MAYOR (OR CHAIRMAN) OF THIS COMMUNITY?		
Actual Percentage as recorded by respondent:				
		10	1	0.3
		40	2	0.6
		50	9	2.9
		55	1	0.3
		60	8	2.6
		65	1	0.3
		70	2	0.6
		75	9	2.9
		80	12	3.9
		85	4	1.3
		90	38	12.3
		95	26	8.4
		97	1	0.3

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.44* (continued)	98	6 1.9
			100	188 61.0
		DK..... 08	13	---
		REF..... 09	1	---
			(N = 308)	
1/75	SELECTMR	Q.45 HOW IS THE MAYOR (OR CHAIRMAN) SELECTED?		
		Elected by council.....1	252	78.5
		Separately elected by citizens.....2	69	21.5
		Appointed.....0	1	---
			(N = 321)	
1/76	HIGHVOTE	Q.45 IF ELECTED BY COUNCIL IS THE PERSON WHO RECEIVED THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF VOTES FOR COUNCIL CHOSEN AS MAYOR?		
		Always.....1	116	49.4
		Sometimes.....2	107	45.5
		Rarely.....3	12	5.1
		REF.....9	14	---
		NA.....0	73	---
			(N = 235)	
1/77	NO PAYTAX	Q.46* ALTHOUGH MOST PEOPLE PAY FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL TAXES WITHOUT ANY PROBLEM, IT SEEMS THAT MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS IN NEWFOUNDLAND HAVE TROUBLE GETTING EVERYONE TO PAY SERVICE FEES AND OTHER LOCAL TAXES. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE MAIN REASON IS THAT SOME PEOPLE DON'T PAY THESE LOCAL TAXES?		
		People want something for nothing.....1	38	17.9
		Because they are direct taxes.....2	12	5.7
		People unaware or unhappy with services....3	77	36.3
		Too many taxes.....4	7	3.3

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Lack of enforcement.....5	49	23.1
		Some people are opposed to council.....6	21	9.9
		Poverty, unemployment...7	8	3.8
		DK.....8	97	---
		REF.....9	13	---
(N = 212)				

1/78	TAXPROB	Q.46 IS THIS A PARTICULAR PROBLEM FOR YOUR COUNCIL?		
		Yes.....1	154	48.9
		No.....2	161	51.1
		DK.....8	4	---
		REF.....9	3	---
(N = 315)				

1/79	PEOPINT	Q.47 MANY COUNCILS ALSO HAVE A PROBLEM GETTING PEOPLE TO TAKE AN INTEREST IN ATTENDING PUBLIC MEETINGS, BECOMING COUNCILLORS, AND SUPPORTING COUNCIL ACTIVITIES. WOULD YOU SAY THAT PEOPLE HERE TAKE AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN THE COUNCIL?		
		Yes.....1	110	36.2
		No.....2	194	63.8
		DK.....8	14	---
		REF.....9	4	---
(N = 304)				

2/1	MODE	Method of data collection	---	---
2/2-4	TOWN	Code number for each municipality (See Appendix A)	---	---
2/5	INVO	Interview identification number	---	---
2/6-7	CASE	Respondent serial number	---	---
2/8	CARDNUM	Computer card number (2)	---	---

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/9	WHYNOINT	Q48* IF ANSWER TO QUESTION 47 IS "NO", WHY IS IT THAT PEOPLE DON'T TAKE MORE INTEREST?		
		Afraid of criticism, particularly in small towns.....1	23	17.4
		Content to let others do all the work.....2	31	23.5
		Too much work.....3	11	8.3
		Don't want responsibility.....4	6	4.5
		Council divided.....5	1	0.8
		People don't care.....6	24	18.2
		Hostility toward council.....7	36	27.3
		DK.....8	70	---
		REF.....9	26	---
		NA.....0	94	---
(N = 132)				

Q.49 DO YOU FIND THAT THERE IS
MORE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON
CERTAIN ISSUES THAN ON OTHERS?

Not coded

Q.50 COULD YOU GIVE ONE OR TWO
EXAMPLES OF SPECIFIC ISSUES
ON WHICH THERE HAS BEEN A
LOT OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION?

Not coded

2/10	COUNCACT	Q.51 THERE ARE OFTEN TWO MAIN POINTS OF VIEW EXPRESSED CONCERNING HOW A MEMBER OF COUNCIL SHOULD ACT WHEN HE HAS TO MAKE UP HIS MIND ON A PARTICULAR ISSUE.
------	----------	---

- 1) ONE IS THAT, HAVING BEEN
ELECTED, HE SHOULD DO WHAT
THE VOTERS WANT HIM TO DO,
EVEN IF IT ISN'T HIS OWN
PERSONAL PREFERENCE.

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		2) THE SECOND IS THAT HE SHOULD USE HIS OWN JUDGEMENT, REGARDLESS OF WHAT OTHERS WANT HIM TO DO.		
		WHICH OF THESE VIEWS COMES CLOSEST TO YOUR OWN VIEW?		
		View (1).....1	61	19.3
		View (2).....2	152	48.1
		Depends/Undecided.....3	103	32.6
		DK.....8	2	---
		REF.....9	4	---
			(N = 316)	
2/11	HOWVOTE	Q.52 DO YOU GENERALLY TRY TO VOTE ON COUNCIL ISSUES AS YOU FEEL MOST CITIZENS WOULD WANT YOU TO VOTE? OR DO YOU GENERALLY VOTE ACCORDING TO WHAT YOU PERSONALLY FEEL IS BEST FOR THE COMMUNITY?		
		Vote as most citizens would want.....1	55	17.4
		Vote as personally feel best.....2	183	57.7
		Depends on issue.....3	79	24.9
		DK.....8	3	---
		REF.....9	2	---
			(N = 317)	
2/12	SPECISS	Q.53 SUPPOSE A PARTICULAR ISSUE WHICH YOU THOUGHT MIGHT UPSET A NUMBER OF CITIZENS IN YOUR COMMUNITY WAS SCHEDULED TO COME BEFORE COUNCIL AT ITS NEXT REGULAR MEETING (FOR EXAMPLE, A TAX INCREASE OR THE LOCATION OF A NEW GARBAGE DUMP); WHAT WOULD YOU DO?		

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.53 (continued)		
		a. Discuss the issue with as many citizens as possible and vote as you felt most would want you to.....1	54	17.3
		b. Discuss the issue as above, but vote as you felt would be best for the whole community....2	229	73.2
		c. Vote as you felt best for the whole community without discussing the issue with the citizens...3	30	9.6
		DK.....8	4	---
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 313)	

Q.54 IN YOUR OWN WORDS, COULD YOU
BRIEFLY STATE WHAT ACTION
YOU WOULD TAKE IN THE ABOVE
EXAMPLE, AND WHY?

Not coded

2/13	FREQTALK	Q.55 HOW OFTEN DO YOU SPEAK TO PEOPLE OUTSIDE YOUR OWN FAMILY ABOUT COUNCIL MATTERS?		
		Daily.....1	118	40.5
		Once or twice per week...2	117	40.2
		Less than once per week..3	18	6.2
		Less than once per month.4	17	5.8
		Never.....5	21	7.2
		DK.....8	24	---
		REF.....9	7	---
			(N = 291)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/14	WHOSTART	Q.56 DO YOU START THESE DISCUSSIONS?		
		Yes, usually.....1	36	12.4
		Sometimes.....2	194	66.7
		Rarely.....3	61	21.0
		DK.....8	8	---
		REF.....9	19	---
		NA.....0	4	---
			(N = 291)	
2/15	FREQCONT	Q.57 HOW OFTEN ARE YOU CONTACTED BY CITIZENS ABOUT SOME PROBLEM OR COMPLAINT?		
		Every day.....1	64	22.3
		Every week.....2	105	36.6
		About once per month.....3	82	28.6
		Less than once per month.....4	36	12.5
		DK.....8	29	---
		REF.....9	6	---
			(N = 287)	
2/16	HOWCONT	Q.58 IS THIS CONTACT USUALLY BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON?		
		By telephone.....1	162	54.0
		In person.....2	90	30.0
		Both by telephone and in person.....3	48	16.0
		DK.....8	10	---
		REF.....9	10	---
		NA.....0	2	---
			(N = 300)	
2/17	WHATDEM	Q.59 WHAT DO YOU UNDERSTAND BY THE TERM "DEMOCRACY"?		
		Majority rule, people decide.....1	55	25.2
		Freedom of speech, thought, press, etc.....2	66	30.3
		Voting rights.....3	4	1.8
		Say in government.....4	52	23.9
		Openness of system.....5	10	4.6

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>
		Q.59 (continued)		
		General rights.....6	28	12.8
		"Our system".....7	3	1.4
		DK.....8	55	---
		REF.....9	49	---
			(N = 218)	

2/18	WHYLOGOV	Q.60 HERE ARE SOME REASONS THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN FOR HAVING LOCAL GOVERNMENT. WHICH DO YOU THINK IS OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE?		
		To provide efficient services.....1	192	62.1
		To provide democracy at the local level.....2	72	23.3
		To get provincial grants.....3	18	5.8
		Combination of above.....4	27	8.7
		(Category provided to include cases where more than one answer was circled)		
		DK.....8	6	---
		REF.....9	7	---
			(N = 309)	

2/19	KNOWCOUN	Q.61 HOW WELL DO YOU KNOW YOUR FELLOW-COUNCILLORS? DO YOU:		
		See them only at council sessions or in connection with council business.....1	67	21.7
		Occasionally have lunch together or meet socially.....2	151	48.7
		Visit each other often in each other's homes....3	91	29.4
		DK.....8	7	---
		REF.....9	6	---
			(N = 313)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/20	HOWMANY	Q.62 HOW MANY OF YOUR FELLOW-COUNCILLORS DOES THIS APPLY TO?		
		All.....1	167	53.2
		Most.....2	115	36.6
		A few.....3	21	6.7
		One or two.....4	11	3.5
		Don't know.....8	4	---
		Refused.....9	4	---
(N = 314)				

2/21-22 PROBI

Q.63* WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES OR PROBLEMS IN YOUR COMMUNITY TODAY?

(Please list in order of importance)

FIRST PROBLEM MENTIONED:

Water and Sewerage,....11	86	28.8
Water (only).....12	43	14.4
Sewerage (only).....13	19	6.4
Garbage, waste disposal.....14	11	3.4
General community facilities.....20	1	0.3
Lack of housing.....21	5	1.7
Lack of land for housing.....22	6	2.0
Inadequate medical facilities.....25	1	0.3
Inadequate stores.....27	2	0.7
Need municipal building.....29	3	1.0
General lack of recreation, social activities.....30	1	0.3
Lack of parks.....34	1	0.3
Poor transportation....40	1	0.3
Poor roads and maintenance, including ploughing in winter....41	21	7.0
Lack of public transportation facilities.....42	8	2.7
Poor TV reception.....43	1	0.3

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.63* (continued)		
	Area dirty, polluted.....	52	1	0.3
	Appearance of town is bad.....	55	4	1.3
	Dogs and animals not controlled.....	56	3	1.0
	Boundaries.....	57	1	0.3
	Poor economic conditions.....	60	2	0.7
	Lack of jobs, employment.....	61	23	7.7
	Need industries.....	62	5	1.7
	Lack of civic responsibility.....	73	3	1.0
	Need civic education....	74	2	0.7
	Conflict in community...	75	1	0.3
	Social problems.....	76	2	0.7
	Local government (general).....	80	1	0.3
	Present council not good.....	82	3	1.0
	Taxes too high.....	85	1	0.3
	Tax collection.....	86	9	3.0
	Lack of planning.....	87	4	1.3
	Need government grants..	93	3	1.0
	Lack of finances.....	94	19	6.3
	No problems.....	97	2	0.7
	DK.....	98	15	---
	REF.....	99	8	---
			(N = 299)	

2/23-34 PROB2

Q.63a*SECOND PROBLEM MENTIONED:

Lack of municipal amenities.....	10	1	0.4
Water and Sewerage.....	11	27	11.4
Water (only).....	12	13	5.5
Sewerage (only).....	13	16	6.8
Garbage, waste disposal.	14	12	5.1
Streets in town.....	15	3	1.3
Street lights.....	16	1	0.4
Lack of fire protection.	19	10	4.2
General community facilities.....	20	2	0.8
Lack of housing.....	21	2	0.8
Lack of land for housing.....	22	6	2.5

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>z</u>
Q.63a* (continued)				
	Lack of adequate schools.....	23	1	0.4
	Inadequate medical facilities.....	25	1	0.4
	Inadequate stores.....	27	2	0.8
	Inadequate breakwater...	28	4	1.7
	Need municipal building.	29	3	1.3
	General lack of recreation, social activities.....	30	10	4.2
	Lack recreation facilities.....	31	3	1.3
	Need cemetery.....	35	1	0.4
	Poor roads and maintenance, including ploughing in winter.....	41	50	21.1
	Lack of public transportation facilities.....	42	4	1.7
	Poor TV reception.....	43	1	0.4
	Traffic, safety.....	46	3	1.3
	Area dirty, polluted.....	52	1	0.4
	Appearance of town is bad.....	55	3	1.3
	Dogs and animals not controlled.....	56	6	2.5
	Boundaries.....	57	1	0.4
	Poor economic conditions.....	60	3	1.3
	Lack of jobs, employment.....	61	5	2.1
	Need industries.....	62	3	1.3
	General quality of people.....	70	1	0.4
	Lack of civic responsibility.....	73	4	1.7
	Civic education.....	74	3	1.3
	Conflict in community...	75	1	0.4
	Local government (general).....	80	1	0.4
	Present council not good.....	82	2	0.8
	Regulations not enforced.....	83	3	1.3
	Taxes too high.....	85	1	0.4
	Tax collection.....	86	7	2.9
	Lack of planning.....	87	4	1.7
	Need government grants...	93	2	0.8
	Lack of finances.....	94	9	3.8

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.63a* (continued)		
	No problems.....	97	1	0.4
	DK.....	98	77	---
	REF.....	99	8	---
			(N = 237)	

2/25-26 PROB3

Q.63b*THIRD PROBLEM MENTIONED:

Lack of municipal amenities.....	10	4	2.5
Water and sewerage.....	11	7	4.4
Water (only).....	12	9	5.7
Sewerage (only).....	13	4	2.5
Garbage, waste disposal..	14	10	6.3
Fire protection.....	19	8	5.1
General community facilities.....	20	2	1.3
Lack of housing.....	21	2	1.3
Lack of land for housing.....	22	2	1.3
Inadequate schools.....	24	1	0.6
Inadequate stores.....	26	1	0.6
Inadequate breakwater...	28	1	0.6
Need municipal building.	29	2	1.3
General lack of recreation, social activities.....	30	16	10.1
Lack recreation facilities.....	31	2	1.3
Lack sports facilities..	32	1	0.6
Poor roads and maintenance, including ploughing in winter....	41	23	14.6
Lack of public transportation facilities.....	42	1	0.6
Traffic, safety.....	46	3	1.9
Location, environment...	50	1	0.6
Appearance of town.....	55	2	1.3
Dogs and animals not controlled.....	56	9	5.7
Poor economic conditions.....	60	2	1.3
Lack of jobs, employment.....	61	9	5.7
Need industries.....	62	4	2.5

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.63b* (continued)		
		General quality of people.....70	1	0.6
		Lack of civic responsibility.....73	7	4.4
		Civic education.....74	1	0.6
		Present council not good.....82	1	0.6
		Regulations not enforced.....83	1	0.6
		Taxes too high.....85	1	0.6
		Tax collection.....86	7	4.4
		Lack of planning.....87	3	1.9
		Need government grants..93	4	2.5
		Lack of finances.....94	5	3.2
		No problems.....97	1	0.6
		DK.....98	156	---
		REF.....99	8	---

(N = 158)

2/27 AGRMNT Q.64 IS THERE GENERALLY AGREEMENT
AMONG COUNCIL MEMBERS AS TO
HOW TO DEAL WITH IMPORTANT
ISSUES?

Yes, generally.....1	287	92.6
No.....2	23	7.4
DK.....8	5	---
REF.....9	7	---

(N = 310)

2/28 WHOBRING Q.65 WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IS
MOST LIKELY TO BRING A
PROBLEM BEFORE COUNCIL TO
DEAL WITH?

Yourself.....1	51	17.3
Another council member...2	23	7.8
Mayor or chairman.....3	81	27.6
Clerk or secretary.....4	46	15.6
Town manager.....5	29	9.9
No one person in particular.....6	64	21.8
DK.....8	16	---
REF.....9	12	---

(N = 294)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/29	FREQATT	Q.66 HOW FREQUENTLY DO YOU ATTEND COUNCIL MEETINGS?		
		Less than 25%.....1	1	0.3
		25% to 50%.....2	3	0.9
		50% to 75%.....3	5	1.6
		75% to 100%.....4	309	97.2
		DK.....8	3	---
		REF.....9	1	---
			(N = 318)	
2/30	ROLEINI	Q.67 WITH REGARD TO POLICY MATTERS (SUCH AS, AMOUNT OF TAX, ROADS TO BE PAVED, ETC.) HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS YOUR PERSONAL ROLE IN:		
		1) Initiation (bringing the matter up for discussion)		
		Very significant.....1	124	42.0
		Significant.....2	155	52.5
		Not very significant.3	15	5.1
		Of no importance.....4	1	0.3
		DK.....8	14	---
		REF.....9	13	---
			(N = 295)	
2/31	ROLEALT	Q.67a 2) Suggesting alternatives (such as a new tax or paving only a portion of a road, etc.)		
		Very significant.....1	109	38.7
		Significant.....2	154	54.6
		Not very significant.3	19	6.7
		Of no importance.....4	---	---
		DK.....8	15	---
		REF.....9	25	---
			(N = 282)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/32	ROLEDEC	Q.67b 3) Actual taking of the decision (your personal influence in convincing other council members to your point of view)		
		Very significant.....1	101	36.3
		Significant.....2	152	54.7
		Not very significant.3	20	7.2
		Of no importance.....4	5	1.8
		DK.....8	19	---
		REF.....9	25	---
			(N = 278)	
2/33	ROLEIMP	Q.67c 4) Making sure the policy is carried out.		
		Very significant.....1	118	41.3
		Significant.....2	137	47.9
		Not very significant.3	30	10.5
		Of no importance.....4	1	0.3
		DK.....8	17	---
		REF.....9	19	---
			(N = 286)	
2/34	CROLEINI	Q.68 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE INFLUENCE OF THE CLERK (OR SECRETARY IF NO CLERK) IN POLICY MATTERS?		
		1) Initiation (bringing the matter up for discussion)		
		Very significant.....1	94	33.8
		Significant.....2	96	34.5
		Not very significant.3	62	22.3
		Of no importance.....4	26	9.4
		DK.....8	18	---
		REF.....9	18	---
		NA.....0	8	---
			(N = 278)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/35	CROLEALT	Q.68a 2) Suggesting alternatives.	.	
		Very significant.....1	70	25.7
		Significant.....2	98	36.0
		Not very significant.3	72	26.5
		Of no importance.....4	32	11.2
		DK.....8	19	---
		REF.....9	23	---
		NA.....0	8	---
			(N = 272)	
2/36	CROLEDEC	Q.68b 3) Actual taking of the decision.		
		Very significant.....1	58	21.5
		Significant.....2	86	31.9
		Not very significant.3	81	30.0
		Of no importance.....4	45	16.7
		DK.....8	19	---
		REF.....9	25	---
		NA.....0	8	---
			(N = 270)	
2/37	CROLEIMP	Q.68c 4) Making sure the policy is carried out.		
		Very significant.....1	107	39.1
		Significant.....2	95	34.7
		Not very significant.3	52	19.0
		Of no importance.....4	20	7.3
		DK.....8	18	---
		REF.....9	22	---
		NA.....0	8	---
			(N = 274)	
2/38	MROLEINI	Q.69 IF YOUR COMMUNITY HAS A TOWN MANAGER IN ADDITION TO THE CLERK (OR SECRETARY) HOW WOULD YOU RATE HIS INFLUENCE IN POLICY-MAKING?		
		1) Initiation (bringing the matter up for discussion)		
		Very significant.....1	39	49.4
		Significant.....2	32	40.5

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.69 (continued)		
		Not very significant.3	6	7.6
		Of no importance.....4	2	2.5
		DK.....8	6	---
		REF.....9	9	---
		NA.....0	228	---
				(N = 79)
2/39	MROLEALT	Q.69a 2) Suggesting alternatives.		
		Very significant.....1	38	47.5
		Significant.....2	32	40.0
		Not very significant.3	8	10.0
		Of no importance.....4	2	2.5
		DK.....8	7	---
		REF.....9	7	---
		NA.....0	228	---
				(N = 80)
2/40	MROLEDEC	Q.69b 3) Actual taking of the decision.		
		Very significant.....1	26	32.9
		Significant.....2	35	44.3
		Not very significant.3	14	17.7
		Of no importance.....4	4	5.1
		DK.....8	8	---
		REF.....9	7	---
		NA.....0	228	---
				(N = 79)
2/41	MROLEIMP	Q.69c 4) Making sure the policy is carried out.		
		Very significant.....1	48	59.3
		Significant.....2	24	29.6
		Not very significant.3	5	6.2
		Of no importance.....4	4	4.9
		DK.....8	5	---
		REF.....9	8	---
		NA.....0	228	---
				(N = 81)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/42	CINFL	Q.70 DO YOU THINK THE CLERK (OR SECRETARY) HAS TOO MUCH INFLUENCE OVER POLICY?		
		Too much.....1	8	3.1
		About right.....2	232	89.6
		Not enough.....3	19	7.3
		DK.....8	23	---
		REF.....9	32	---
		NA.....0	8	---
			(N = 259)	
2/43	MINFL	Q.71 HOW ABOUT THE MANAGER'S INFLUENCE OVER POLICY?		
		Too much.....1	10	13.0
		About right.....2	64	83.1
		Not enough.....3	3	3.9
		DK.....8	4	---
		REF.....9	7	---
		Not applicable (no manager).....0	234	---
			(N = 77)	
2/44	GRPSPRES	Q.72 DO ORGANIZED COMMUNITY GROUPS (SUCH AS THE LIONS CLUB, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS, ETC.) EVER MAKE PRESENTATIONS TO YOUR COUNCIL?		
		Yes, often (at least once a week.....1	10	3.6
		Sometimes (about once per month).....2	50	18.2
		Rarely (once or twice per year).....3	115	42.0
		Never.....4	99	36.1
		DK.....8	25	---
		REF.....9	17	---
		NA.....0	6	---
			(N = 274)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/45	YOUPRES	Q.73 HAVE YOU YOURSELF BEEN ASKED BY A MEMBER OF SUCH A COMMUNITY GROUP TO MAKE PRESENTATIONS ON THEIR BEHALF?		
		Yes, often (once per week).....1	10	3.4
		Sometimes (about once per month).....2	21	7.2
		Rarely (once or twice per year).....3	74	25.3
		Never.....4	187	64.0
		DK.....8	7	---
		REF.....9	17	---
		NA.....0	6	---
			(N = 292)	
2/46	COUNCDOM	Q.74 DO YOU FEEL THAT COUNCIL IS DOMINATED BY ONE OR TWO MEMBERS?		
		Yes.....1	36	11.8
		No.....2	269	88.2
		DK.....8	8	---
		REF.....9	9	---
			(N = 305)	
2/47	PROVINT	Q.75 DO YOU THINK THERE IS TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE FROM THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN LOCAL MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS?		
		Yes.....1	52	17.4
		No.....2	247	82.6
		DK.....8	19	---
		REF.....9	4	---
			(N = 299)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/48	BUDGET	Q.76 SHOULD THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HAVE THE FINAL SAY OVER THE BUDGET IN YOUR COMMUNITY?		
		Yes.....1	150	50.5
		No.....2	147	49.5
		DK.....8	15	---
		REF.....9	3	---
		NA.....0	7	---
			(N = 297)	
2/49	BYLAWS	Q.77 DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PRACTICE OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HAVING TO APPROVE YOUR BY-LAWS BEFORE THEY BECOME LEGALLY EFFECTIVE?		
		Yes.....1	220	73.8
		No.....2	78	26.2
		DK.....8	13	---
		REF.....9	4	---
		NA.....0	7	---
			(N = 298)	
2/50	FINHELP	Q.78 DO YOU THINK THAT THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROVIDE MORE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO YOUR COMMUNITY?		
		Yes.....1	292	95.4
		No.....2	14	4.6
		DK.....8	10	---
		REF.....9	6	---
			(N = 306)	
2/51	TREATMNT	Q.79 COMPARED TO OTHER COMMUNITIES YOUR SIZE WOULD YOU SAY YOUR TREATMENT BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IS?		
		About the same.....1	183	66.3
		Much better.....2	23	8.3
		Much worse.....3	70	25.4
		DK.....8	32	---

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
		Q.79 (continued)		
		REF.....9	3	---
		NA.....0	11	---
			(N = 276)	

2/52 REGGOV Q.80 THE WHALEN COMMISSION
RECOMMENDED THAT THE
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT
INSTITUTE A NUMBER OF
CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE
AND OPERATION OF MUNICIPAL
GOVERNMENTS IN NEWFOUND-
LAND. TWO OF THESE
RECOMMENDED CHANGES ARE
LISTED BELOW.

- 1) THAT A SERIES OF
REGIONAL MUNICIPAL
GOVERNMENTS BE SET UP
ACROSS THE PROVINCE TO
LOOK AFTER ASPECTS OF
LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT
GO BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES
OF MORE THAN ONE
MUNICIPALITY (FOR EXAMPLE,
WATER SUPPLY OR GARBAGE
DISPOSAL OR PLANNING).
DO YOU THINK SUCH
REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS
WOULD BE:

A good idea.....1	211	81.8
A bad idea.....2	47	18.2
DK.....8	55	---
REF.....9	9	---

(N = 258)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>4</u>
2/53-54 COMMENTS		Q.80a* ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS.		
		Negative comments:		
		Too much tribal jealousy.....1	2	2.6
		Already too much government.....2	5	6.5
		Will result in more bureaucracy.....3	5	6.5
		Less local autonomy....4	6	7.8
		Unnecessary.....5	2	2.6
		Too many economic- administrative diffi- culties.....6	11	14.3
		General reservations...7	4	5.2
		Positive comments:		
		Will allow sharing of resources and equip- ment.....10	13	16.9
		More local autonomy...11	1	1.3
		Generally in favour...12	9	11.7
		Only good for some areas.....13	9	11.7
		More influence for councils.....14	3	3.9
		Should also be amal- gamation.....15	1	1.3
		May help small munic- ipalities.....16	5	6.5
		Local situation will be better understood..17	1	1.3
		DK.....08	71	---
		REF.....09	174	---

(N = 77)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/55	NUISTAX	Q.80b 2) THAT "NUISANCE TAXES" SUCH AS THE FUEL TAX AND VEHICLE TAXES BE ABOLISHED, AND THAT ALL DEVELOPED MUNICIPALITIES (THOSE WITH WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES) ADOPT THE REAL PROPERTY TAX (ON THE ASSESSED VALUE OR LAND AND BUILDINGS).		
		a) Do you agree or disagree that "nuisance taxes" should be abolished?		
		Agree.....1	182	67.4
		Disagree.....2	88	32.6
		Don't know.....8	36	---
		Refused.....9	16	---
			(N = 270)	
2/56	TAXPROP	Q.80c b) Do You agree or disagree that real property taxes should be imposed?		
		Agree.....1	146	55.1
		Disagree.....2	119	37.0
		Don't know.....8	33	---
		Refused.....9	24	---
			(N = 265)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>S</u>
2/57-58	CHANGES	Q.81* BASED ON YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE, ARE THERE ANY OTHER CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND? IF SO, WOULD YOU PLEASE LIST THEM BELOW AND BRIEFLY STATE WHY YOU BELIEVE THEY WOULD IMPROVE LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN YOUR COMMUNITY.		
		Need more autonomy.....01	5	5.6
		Need more provincial help and cooperation....02	31	34.8
		Should pay councillors..04	4	4.5
		Need more powerful regional offices.....05	2	2.2
		Need training for new members of council.....06	2	2.2
		Increased partici- pation.....07	4	4.5
		Council-employee relations.....10	1	1.1
		Shorter term of office..11	1	1.1
		Eliminate tax exemptions.....13	2	2.3
		Implement Whalen Report.14	7	7.9
		Basement apartment regulations.....15	1	1.1
		Faster provincial approvals.....16	3	3.4
		Pay for clerks/ secretaries.....17	2	2.2
		Have suburbs pay way....18	1	1.1
		Elect mayor separately..19	1	1.1
		Revise tax structure....20	8	9.0
		Explain benefits of incorporation.....21	2	2.2
		Deduct taxes from pay..22	3	3.4
		Improve tax enforce- ment.....23	6	6.7
		Structural reform.....24	3	3.4
		DK.....08	72	---
		REF.....09	161	---

(N = 89)

COL. VARIABLE QUESTION

N

%

SECTION F: THE FOLLOWING ARE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS ABOUT LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BY COUNCILLORS, MAYORS, CLERKS, POLITICAL SCIENTISTS, AND THE PRESS. SOME OF THEM MAY APPEAR TO BE OVERSIMPLIFICATIONS OF RATHER COMPLEX MATTERS. SOME YOU WILL PROBABLY AGREE WITH, SOME YOU WILL NO DOUBT DISAGREE WITH, AND OTHERS YOU MAY BE SOMEWHAT UNCERTAIN ABOUT. THAT'S FINE: THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS, ONLY VIEWPOINTS. AFTER READING EACH STATEMENT WOULD YOU PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER INDICATING WHETHER YOU AGREE WITH IT; WHETHER YOU TEND TO AGREE WITH IT; WHETHER YOU ARE UNDECIDED (FOR EXAMPLE IF YOU AGREE WITH ONE PART BUT DISAGREE WITH ANOTHER PART); WHETHER YOU TEND TO DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT OR WHETHER YOU TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH IT.

2/59 ATT1

Q.82 THE JOB OF A COUNCILLOR ENTAILS BEING A SOUNDING BOARD FOR COMMUNITY OPINION AND THEN ACTING ON IT. I ALWAYS TRY TO FIND OUT WHAT MY FELLOW-CITIZENS FEEL AND MAKE MY DECISIONS ACCORDINGLY.

Agree.....1	141	44.6
Tend to agree.....2	120	38.0
Undecided.....3	23	7.3
Tend to disagree.....4	24	7.6
Disagree.....5	8	2.5
DK.....8	1	---
REF.....9	5	---

(N = 316)

2/60 ATT2

Q.83 THE MAIN JOB OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILS IS TO OBTAIN BENEFITS FOR THEIR CITIZENS FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

Agree.....1	99	31.3
Tend to agree.....2	95	30.1
Undecided.....3	21	6.6
Tend to disagree.....4	63	19.9
Disagree.....5	38	12.0
DK.....8	1	---
REF.....9	5	---

(N = 316)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/61	ATT3	Q.84 THIS COMMUNITY HAS GOOD LEADERSHIP IN DEALING WITH ITS PROBLEMS.		
		Agree.....1	180	56.8
		Tend to agree.....2	83	26.2
		Undecided.....3	26	8.2
		Tend to disagree.....4	13	4.1
		Disagree.....5	15	4.7
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 317)	
2/62	ATT4	Q.85 IMPORTANT COMMUNITY DECISIONS ARE BEST LEFT UP TO A FEW LEADING CITIZENS.		
		Agree.....1	36	11.4
		Tend to agree.....2	49	15.5
		Undecided.....3	24	7.6
		Tend to disagree.....4	83	26.2
		Disagree.....5	125	39.4
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 317)	
2/63	ATT5	Q.86 ORDINARY CITIZENS DON'T HAVE ENOUGH SAY IN COMMUNITY DECISIONS.		
		Agree.....1	115	36.3
		Tend to agree.....2	68	21.5
		Undecided.....3	32	10.1
		Tend to disagree.....4	46	14.5
		Disagree.....5	56	17.7
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 317)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/64	ATT6	Q.87 AROUND HERE, ONE MAN'S OPINION IS AS GOOD AS ANOTHER'S IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS.		
		Agree.....1	71	22.4
		Tend to agree.....2	33	10.4
		Undecided.....3	29	9.1
		Tend to disagree.....4	90	28.4
		Disagree.....5	94	29.7
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 317)	
2/65	ATT7	Q.88 MY FIRST DUTY IS TO MY FELLOW-CITIZENS. THEY ARE THE ONES WHO ELECTED ME.		
		Agree.....1	176	56.6
		Tend to agree.....2	84	27.0
		Undecided.....3	21	6.8
		Tend to disagree.....4	15	4.8
		Disagree.....5	15	4.8
		REF.....9	11	---
			(N = 311)	
2/66	ATT8	Q.89 LET'S FACE IT. INSOFAR AS PEOPLE CARE ABOUT COUNCIL, WHAT THEY CARE ABOUT IS WHAT YOU AS A COUNCILLOR CAN DO FOR THEM IN THE WAY OF SERVICES AND FAVOURS.		
		Agree.....1	143	45.0
		Tend to agree.....2	99	31.1
		Undecided.....3	19	6.0
		Tend to disagree.....4	35	11.0
		Disagree.....5	22	6.9
		REF.....9	4	---
			(N = 318)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/67	ATT9	Q.90 PUBLIC MEETINGS HERE GENERALLY STIR UP MORE TROUBLE THAN THEY ARE WORTH.		
		Agree.....1	59	18.6
		Tend to agree.....2	43	13.6
		Undecided.....3	33	10.4
		Tend to disagree.....4	71	22.4
		Disagree.....5	111	35.0
		REF.....9	5	---
			(N = 317)	
2/68	ATT10	Q.91 OUTSIDE OFFICIALS AND AGENCIES DON'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THE NEEDS OF THIS COMMUNITY.		
		Agree.....1	153	48.1
		Tend to agree.....2	81	25.5
		Undecided.....3	32	10.1
		Tend to disagree.....4	35	11.0
		Disagree.....5	17	5.3
		REF.....9	4	---
			(N = 318)	
2/69	ATT11	Q.92 I AM NOT AT ALL CERTAIN THAT DOING FAVOURS, RUNNING ERRANDS, OR SERVING YOUR CONSTITUENTS, CALL IT WHAT- EVER YOU WISH, REALLY HELPS GET YOU ELECTED. I AM CERTAIN THAT NOT DOING THESE THINGS WHEN ASKED WILL ASSURE THAT YOU DON'T GET ELECTED.		
		Agree.....1	83	26.6
		Tend to agree.....2	71	22.8
		Undecided.....3	72	23.1
		Tend to disagree.....4	47	15.1
		Disagree.....5	39	12.5
		REF.....9	10	---
			(N = 312)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/70	ATT12	Q.93 THE BUSINESSMEN IN THIS COMMUNITY HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENCE OVER HOW THINGS ARE RUN.		
		Agree.....1	31	9.7
		Tend to agree.....2	23	7.2
		Undecided.....3	23	7.2
		Tend to disagree.....4	82	25.7
		Disagree.....5	160	50.2
		REF.....9	3	---
			(N = 319)	
2/71	ATT13	Q.94 EVEN IF A COUNCILLOR WANTED TO FIND OUT WHAT HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS FELT ABOUT A MAJOR PUBLIC ISSUE, IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE. THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE DON'T KNOW. THEY DON'T HAVE ANY INFORMATION ON THESE THINGS. THE REST, OR MOST OF THE REST, SIMPLY DON'T CARE.		
		Agree.....1	69	22.0
		Tend to agree.....2	78	24.8
		Undecided.....3	34	10.8
		Tend to disagree.....4	80	25.5
		Disagree.....5	53	16.9
		REF.....9	7	---
			(N = 314)	
2/72	ATT14	Q.95 THE MAIN JOB OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL IS TO HELP THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDE SERVICES TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.		
		Agree.....1	142	45.1
		Tend to agree.....2	100	31.7
		Undecided.....3	19	6.0
		Tend to disagree.....4	31	9.8
		Disagree.....5	23	7.3
		REF.....9	6	---
		DK.....8	1	---
			(N = 315)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/73	ATT15	Q.96 A COUNCILLOR SELDOM HAS TO SOUND OUT HIS FELLOW- CITIZENS BECAUSE HE THINKS SO MUCH LIKE THEM THAT HE KNOWS HOW THEY WOULD REACT TO ALMOST ANY PROPOSAL,		
		Agree.....1	52	16.6
		Tend to agree.....2	66	21.0
		Undecided.....3	36	11.5
		Tend to disagree.....4	76	24.2
		Disagree.....5	84	26.8
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	7	---

(N = 314)

2/74	ATT16	Q.97 MY PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY AS A COUNCILLOR IS TO DO AS GOOD A JOB AS I CAN FOR THE COMMUNITY--TO ACT ACCORDING TO MY CONSCIENCE. THE ALTERNATIVE IS TO GIVE IN TO VOTERS.		
		Agree.....1	153	48.9
		Tend to agree.....2	61	19.5
		Undecided.....3	45	14.4
		Tend to disagree.....4	22	7.0
		Disagree.....5	32	10.2
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	8	---

(N = 313)

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/75	ATT17	Q.98 IF ANYONE TELLS YOU HE MAKES HIS DECISIONS IN COUNCIL ON THE BASIS OF WHAT HIS FELLOW-CITIZENS WANT, ASSUMING HE KNEW WHAT THEY WANT, HE IS EITHER KIDDING YOU OR HIMSELF.		
		Agree.....1	84	27.3
		Tend to agree.....2	66	21.4
		Undecided.....3	56	18.2
		Tend to disagree.....4	54	17.5
		Disagree.....5	48	15.6
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	13	---
			(N = 308)	
2/76	ATT18	Q.99 LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS IMPORTANT IN MAINTAINING DEMOCRACY IN NEWFOUNDLAND.		
		Agree.....1	224	72.3
		Tend to agree.....2	40	12.9
		Undecided.....3	30	9.7
		Tend to disagree.....4	9	2.9
		Disagree.....5	7	2.3
		DK.....8	1	---
		REF.....9	11	---
			(N = 310)	
2/77	ANYDIFF	Q.100 ONE LAST QUESTION: DO YOU NOW HAVE ANY DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT WHAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAN YOU HAD BEFORE FIRST JOINING THE COUNCIL?		
		Yes.....1	142	58.0
		No.....2	103	42.0
		DK.....8	7	---
		REF.....9	70	---
			(N = 245)	

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/78-79	REG	REGIONS IN WHICH PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED. BASED ON THE PRIMARY SAMPLE AREAS OF THE 1973 STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN NEW- FOUNDLAND CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR MARK GRAESSER FOR THE WHALEN COMMISSION.		
		Gander.....01	2	2.5
		Stephenville.....02	6	7.6
		Bay Roberts.....03	2	2.5
		Marystown.....04	4	5.1
		Bishop's Falls.....05	1	1.3
		Stephenville Crossing.....06	0	0.0
		Badger's Quay - Valleyfield -		
		Pool's Island.....07	6	7.6
		Cupids.....10	2	2.5
		Elliston Area.....11	11	13.9
		Southwest coast.....12	3	3.8
		Eastport area.....13	11	13.9
		Dark Cove - Gambo - Middle		
		Brook.....14	6	7.6
		St. Barbe South.....15	7	8.9
		Pasadena to Humber Arm.....16	6	7.6
		Southern Shore.....17	6	7.6
		Placentia Bay West.....18	4	5.1
		Bonavista Peninsula.....19	2	2.5
			(N = 79)	

IN ADDITION, PERSONAL INTERVIEWS
WERE CONDUCTED IN THE FOLLOWING
AREAS WHICH WERE EXCLUDED FROM
THE 1973 STUDY. FOR TECHNICAL
REASONS THESE RESPONSES HAVE NOT
BEEN INCLUDED IN THE CALCULATIONS
OF PERCENTAGE FOR THIS VARIABLE.

Corner Brook.....20	6	---
St. John's.....21	7	---

<u>COL.</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
2/80	AREA	AREAS INTO WHICH THE PROVINCE WAS DIVIDED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE A BASIS FOR ASSESSING THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.		
		Avalon.....1	68	21.1
		East.....2	72	22.4
		Central.....3	68	21.1
		Burin.....4	31	9.6
		Northwest.....5	42	13.0
		Southwest.....6	41	12.7

(N = 322)

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PARTICIPATING MUNICIPALITIES

The following is a list of municipalities from which replies were received from one or more councillors. In order to protect the confidentiality of the respondent, the code numbers for each municipality are not listed. An asterisk (*) indicates that the designated municipality was part of the First phase of the study and most responses were obtained by personal interview.

<u>NAME OF MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Appleton	LID	1
Arnold's Cove	T	1
Avondale	T	1
Badger	T	1
*Badger's Quay-Valleyfield-Pool's Island	RD	6
Baie Verte	T	2
*Bay Roberts	T	2
Berry Head	LGC	1
Port au Port East		
Bide Arm	LGC	3
Bird Cove	LGC	1
Bishop's Falls	T	1
Branch	LGC	1
Brigus	T	1
Buchans	T	1
Burin	T	4
Cape St. George-Petit Jardin-Grand Jardin-De Grau-Marches Point-Loretta- Sheaves Cove	LGC	1
Carbonear	T	3
Catalina	T	1
Chance Cove	T	3
Change Islands	T	4

<u>NAME OF MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Chapel Arm	T	1
Clarke's Beach	T	1
*Corner Brook	CITY	6
Cottles Island-Lukes Arm	LID	4
*Cow Head	T	3
*Cupids	T	2
*Dark Cove-Middle Brook-Gambo	RD	1
Dover	T	1
Durrell	T	5
*Eastport	T	1
*Elliston	T	7
Embree	T	1
Englee	T	4
English Harbour East	LGC	4
*Fermeuse	LGC	3
Flower's Cove	LID	2
Forteau	LGC	1
Fortune	T	1
Fox Cove-Mortier	RD	1
Frenchman's Cove	LGC	1
Freshwater	T	1
*Gander	T	2
Garnish	T	2
Gaultois	T	1
Glenwood	T	2
Glovertown	T	1
Goulds	T	1
Grand Bank	T	2
Grand Falls	T	3
Halfway Point-Benoit's Cove-John's Beach-		
Frenchman's Cove	RD	2
Hampden	LGC	1

<u>NAME OF MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Hant's Harbour	LID	1
Happy Valley-Goose Bay	T	2
Harbour Breton	T	1
Harbour Grace	T	1
Hare Bay	T	2
Heart's Delight-Islington	RD	4
Heart's Desire	LID	2
Hughes Brook	LGC	2
Indian Bay (Parson Point)	LGC	3
*Isle Aux Morts	LID	2
Jacques Fontaine	LGC	1
Joe Batt's Arm-Barr'd Islands	RD	3
Keels	LGC	2
*King's Cove	LGC	2
Kippens	LID	2
Labrador City	LID	1
L'Anse au Clair	LGC	1
L'Anse Au Loup	LGC	1
Lark Harbour	LGC	3
Lawn	T	1
Leading Tickles West	LGC	4
Lewin's Cove	LGC	1
Lewisporte	T	1
Little Burnt Bay	T	1
Lourdes	LGC	2
Lumsden	T	4
Lushes Bight-Beaumont-Beaumont North	LGC	2
Makkovik	LGC	4
Mary's Harbour	LGC	2
*Marystown	T	4
McIvers	LGC	1
*Meadows	LGC	2
*Melrose	LGC	4

<u>NAME OF MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Miles Cove	LGC	2
Ming's Bight	LGC	1
Mount Moriah	LID	2
Mount Pearl	T	4
Musgrave Harbour	T	2
Musgravetown	T	5
Nain	LGC	2
Norris Point	LGC	1
Northern Arm, Exploits	LID	1
Northwest River	T	3
Pacquet	LGC	1
Paradise	T	1
*Parkers Cove	LGC	4
*Parson's Pond	LGC	4
Pasadena	T	1
Peterview	LID	4
Pilley's Island	LGC	2
Placentia	T	1
Point Lance	LGC	1
Point May	LGC	2
Point of Bay	LGC	1
Pool's Cove	LGC	1
Port Anson	LGC	2
Port aux Choix	T	1
Port Blandford	LID	2
Port Saunders	T	1
Port Union	T	1
Ramea	T	1
Red Bay	LGC	1
Rencontre East	LGC	1
*Renews-Cappahayden	LGC	3

<u>NAME OF MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Roberts Arm	T	3
Rocky Harbour	LGC	1
Roddickton	T	1
*Rose Blanche-Harbour Le Cou	LID	1
St. Alban's	T	2
St. Anthony	T	1
*St. John's	CITY	7
St. Lawrence	T	2
St. Lunaire-Griquet	LGC	1
Salmon Cove	T	1
*Salvage	LID	5
Sandy Cove	LGC	2
Seal Cove, F.B.	LGC	2
Seldom-Little Seldom	RD	2
Small Point-Broad Cove-Blackhead- Adams Cove	RD	2
South Brook, Hall's Bay	T	1
*South Brook, Humber Valley	LGC	3
Southern Harbour	T	1
South River	T	2
Spaniard's Bay	T	2
*Steady Brook	LGC	1
*Stephenville	T	6
Summerford	T	1
*Terra Nova	LGC	1
Terrenceville	T	1
Torbay	T	5
*Traytown	LGC	4
Trepassey	T	4
*Trinity, B.B.	LID	5
Trinity, T.B.	LGC	2
Twillingate	T	1

4 4

OF / DE

<u>NAME OF MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Victoria	T	2
Wabana	T	2
Whiteway	LGC	1
Wild Bight	LGC	2
Windsor	T	1
Winterton	T	2
Woodstock	LGC	1
Woody Point	LGC	1
York Harbour	LGC	2

Total number of municipalities in study 154

Total number of individual responses 322

APPENDIX L

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONS
OF ATTSCALE INDEX AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES

BACKGROUND VARIABLE	CORRELATIONS			
	Q88	Q96	Q97	ATTSCALE
SIZE OF COMMUNITY				
-no significant relationship	-.00 (G)		-.07 (G)	-.03 (G)
-trustee style related to higher population		.25 (G)		
COMPETITIVENESS				
-no significant relationship to method of selection, but tendency for those appointed to tend toward trustee style	.12 (G)	.07 (G)	.04 (G)	.10 (G)
-no significant relationship to ward system	.04 (G)	.09 (G)	-.04 (G)	.04 (G)
COMPLEXITY				
-no relationship to size of budget	.00 (G)		.10 (G)	.01 (G)
-no relationship to type of council	.05 (G)		.02 (G)	.05 (G)
-trustee style related to higher budget		.35 (G)		
-delegate style related to more complex type		.24 (G)		
AGE				
-older councillors tend to trustee style				.24 (G)
-delegate style related less to middle-aged councillors.	-.10 (G)	-.14 (G)	-.29	
EDUCATION				
-higher education weakly related to delegate style				-.13 (G)
-higher education weakly related to trustee style	.06 (G)	.29 (G)		
-no significant relationship			.03 (G)	
OCCUPATION				
-no significant relationship	.02 (G)		.08 (G)	.00 (G)
-higher status weakly related to trustee style		.11 (G)		
LENGTH OF SERVICE				
-no significant relationship	-.01 (G)	-.01 (G)	-.03 (G)	-.03 (G)

	Q88	Q96	Q97	Q98
LEADERSHIP				
-no significant relationship	-.04 (G)	.07 (G)	.02 (G)	.00
PRIOR POLITICAL EXPERIENCE				
-no significant relationship	-.01 (tau C)	.05 (tau C)	.05 (tau C)	-.03 (tau C)
SOCIALIZATION				
-no significant relationship	.012 (tau b)	.083 (tau b)	.008 (tau b)	.046 (tau b)
POLITICAL PARTY/IDEOLOGY				
-no significant relationship	.00 (G)		.03 (G)	.03 (G)
-independents tend toward trustee style		.18 (G)		
FAITH IN PEOPLE				
-those with less faith more likely to be trustees		.175 (tau b)	.083 (tau b)	-.102 (tau b)
-no significant relationship	.007 (tau b)			
SEX				
-females tend less to trustee style	-.044 (tau C)			-.095 (tau C)
-females tend more to trustee style		.079 (tau C)	.038 (tau C)	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achen, Christopher H. "Measuring Representation." American Journal of Political Science 22, 3 (August 1978): 475-510.
- Banton, Michael. Roles: An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Bell, Charles G. and Price, Charles. "Prelegislative Sources of Representational Roles." Midwest Journal of Political Science 13 (May 1969): 254-70.
- Best, James. "Influence in the Washington House of Representatives." Midwest Journal of Political Science 15 (August 1971): 547-62.
- Biddle, Bruce J., and Thomas, Edwin J., eds. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Birch, A. H. Representation London: Pall Mall, 1971.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. Social Statistics. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Blondel, Jean and Hall, Robin. "Conflict, Decision-Making, and the Perceptions of Local Councillors." Political Studies 15 (October 1967): 322-350.
- Boswell, Peter G. "Attitudes and Role Perceptions of Local Government Officials in Newfoundland: A Pilot Study." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Fredericton, N. B., June, 1977.
- . "Legislative Reform in Newfoundland: The case of Municipal Government." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Political Studies Association, Halifax, N. S., October, 1977.
- . "Regional Government for St. John's?" Urban Focus 7, 3 (January-February, 1979): 1-2.
- . "Municipal Councillors in Newfoundland and Labrador." Newfoundland Quarterly 76, 1 (Spring 1980): 19-23.
- . "The Utility of Representational Role Style Analysis at the Local Level of Government: A Case Study in Newfoundland." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Montreal, June 2, 1980.
- Campbell, Angus; Converse, Philip E.; Miller, Warren E.; and Stokes, Donald E. Elections and the Political Order. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Campbell, Colin and Clarke, Harold D. "Editors' Introduction: The Contemporary Canadian Legislative System." Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November 1978): 529-535.
- Caputo, David A. and Cole, Richard L. "City Officials and Mailed Questionnaires: An Investigation of the Response Bias Assumption." Political Methodology 4, 3 (1977): 271-287.
- Clarke, Harold D. and Price, Richard G. "A Note on the Pre-Nomination Role Socialization of Freshmen Members of Parliament." Canadian Journal of Political Science 10, 2 (June 1977): 391-406.
- Clarke, Harold D. "Determinants of Provincial Constituency Behaviour: A Multivariate Analysis." Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November, 1978): 601-628.
- and Price, Richard G.; and Krause, Robert. "Constituency Service Among Canadian Provincial Legislators: Basic Findings and a Test of Three Hypotheses." Canadian Journal of Political Science 8 (December 1975): 520-542.
- Cohen, Anthony P. The Management of Myths: The Politics of Legitimation in a Newfoundland Community. Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies, no. 14. St. John's, Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1975.

- Conniff, James. "Burke, Bristol, and the Concept of Representation." Western Political Quarterly (September 1977): 329-341.
- Cramer, Jack S. "Parliamentary Experience and Legislative Behaviour." In Foundations of Political Culture: Political Socialization in Canada, pp. 195-210. Edited by Jon H. Pammett and Michael S. Whittington. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976.
- Crane, Wilder W. "Do Representatives Represent?" Journal of Politics 22 (May 1960): 295-99.
- Crosbie, J. C. "Local Government in Newfoundland." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science 22 (August, 1956): 332-346.
- Davidson, Roger H. The Role of the Congressman. New York: Pegasus, 1969.
- ; Kovenock, David M.; and O'Leary, Michael K. Congress in Crisis: Politics and Congressional Reform. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966.
- Dearlove, John. "Councillors and Interest Groups in Kensington and Chelsea." British Journal of Political Science 1, (1971): 129-153.
- Dye, Thomas R. "A Comparison of Constituency Influence in the Upper and Lower Chambers of a State Legislature." Western Political Quarterly 14 (1964): 473-480.
- Erikson, Robert S. "Constituency Opinion and Congressional Behaviour: Reexamination of the Miller-Stokes Representation Data." American Journal of Political Science 22, 2 (August 1978): 511-535.
- Eulau, Heinz; Wahlke, John C.; Buchanan, William; and Ferguson, Leroy C. "The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Representation of Edmund Burke." American Political Science Review, 53 (September 1959): 742-756.
- and Karps, Paul D. "The Puzzle of Representation: Specifying Components of Responsiveness." Legislative Studies Quarterly: 2 (August, 1977): 233-254.
- and Prewitt, K. Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and Policies in Urban Politics. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.
- Fiorina, Morris P. Representatives, Roll Calls, and Constituencies. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1970.
- Fletcher, Frederick J., and Goddard, Arthur M. "Government and Opposition: Structural Influences on Provincial Legislators." Legislative Studies Quarterly 3, 4 (November 1978): 647-669.
- Francis, Wayne. "The Role Concept in Legislatures: A Probability Model and a Note on Cognitive Structure." Journal of Politics 27 (1965): 567-585.
- Friedman, Robert S. and Stokes, Sybil L. "The Role of Constitution-Maker as Representative." Midwest Journal of Political Science 9 (1965): 148-156.
- Graesser, Mark W. "1973 Survey of Attitudes Toward Local Government." Study prepared for the Royal Commission of Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador. St. John's: 1973.
- Gross, David A. "Representative Styles and Legislative Behaviour." Western Political Quarterly 31 (September 1978): 359-371.
- Gunlicks, Arthur B. "Representative Role Perceptions Among Councillors in Western Germany." Journal of Politics 31 (May 1969): 443-464.
- Hadley, David J. "Legislative Role Orientations and Support for Party and Chief Executive in the Indiana House." Legislative Studies Quarterly 2 (1977): 309-335.

- Hampton, William H. Democracy and Community. London: Oxford, 1970.
- Hedlund, Ronald D. "Legislative Socialization and Role Orientations." Mimeograph, Laboratory for Political Research, University of Iowa, 1967.
- and Friesema, H. Paul. "Representatives' Perceptions of Constituency Opinion." In Public Opinion and Public Policy, pp. 396-412. Edited by Norman R. Luttbeg. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1974.
- Hoffman, David and Ward, Norman. Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the Canadian House of Commons. Documents of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Vol. 3 Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970.
- Hrebennar, Ronald J. "The Utility of Role in Budgetary Decision-Making." Western Political Quarterly 29 (December 1976): 575-588.
- Huckshorn, Robert L. "Decision-Making Stimuli in the State Legislative Process." Western Political Quarterly 18 (March 1965): 164-85.
- Jackson, John A., ed. Role. Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Jewell, Malcolm E. "Attitudinal Determinants of Legislative Behaviour: The Utility of Role Analysis." In Legislatures in Developmental Perspective, pp. 460-500. Edited by Allan Kornberg and Lloyd Musolf. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1970.
- "A Reappraisal of 'The Legislative System.'" Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1970.
- "Legislative Studies in Western Democracies: A Comparative Perspective." Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November, 1978): 537-554.
- and Patterson, Samuel C. The Legislative Process in the United States 2nd ed. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Jones, Bryan D. "Competitiveness, Role Orientations and Legislative Responsiveness." Journal of Politics 35 (1973): 924-47.
- Jones, Charles O. "Representative in Congress: The case of the House Agriculture Committee." American Political Science Review 55 (June 1961): 358-67.
- Jöreskog, Karl G. and Sörbom, Dag. Advances in Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Models. Cambridge: ABT Books, 1979.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioural Research 2nd. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Kim, Jae-On and Mueller, Charles W. Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and How to do it. Sage University Papers, Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, no. 13. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.
- and — Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues. Sage University Papers, Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, no. 14. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.
- Kim, Young C. "Role Orientations and Behaviour: The Case of Japanese Prefectural Assemblymen in Chiba and Kanagawa." Western Political Quarterly 22 (1969): 390-410.
- Kornberg, Allan. "Perception and Constituency Influence on Legislative Behaviour." Western Political Quarterly 16 (June 1966): 291-2.
- Canadian Legislative Behaviour: A Study of the 25th Parliament. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- and Campbell, Colin. "Parliament in Canada: A Decade of Published Research." Legislative Studies Quarterly 3 (November, 1978): 555-580.

- _____ and Mishler, William. Influence in Parliament: Canada. Durham: Duke University Press, 1976.
- _____ and Musolf, Lloyd, eds., Legislatures in Developmental Perspective. Durham: Duke University Press, 1970.
- Kuklinski, James H. "Representativeness and Elections: A Policy Analysis." American Political Science Review 72, 1 (March, 1978): 165-177.
- _____ and Elling, R.C. "Representational Role, Constituency Opinion, and Legislative Roll-Call Behaviour." American Journal of Political Science 21 (February 1977): 135-47.
- Landes, Ronald G. "The Use of Role Theory in Political Socialization Research." In Foundations of Political Culture: Political Socialization in Canada, pp. 59-74. Edited by Jon H. Pammett and Michael S. Whittington. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976.
- LeDuc, Lawrence Jr., and White, Walter L. "The Role of Opposition in a One-Party Dominant System: The Case of Ontario." Canadian Journal of Political Science 7 (March, 1974): 86-100.
- McCrone, Donald J., and Kuklinski, James H. "The Delegate Theory of Representation." American Journal of Political Science 23 (May, 1979): 278-300.
- McMurray, Carl D. and Parsons, Malcolm B. "Public Attitudes Toward the Representational Roles of Legislators and Judges." Midwest Journal of Political Science 9 (1965): 167-185.
- Mayhew, David R. Congress: The Electoral Connection. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Meller, Norman. "Representational Role Types: A Research Note." American Political Science Review 61 (June 1967): 474-77.
- Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. 3rd. ed. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1977.
- Miller, Warren E. and Stokes, Donald E. "Constituency Influence in Congress." In Elections and the Political Order, pp. 351-372. Edited by A. Campbell et al. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Munroe, Ronald. "The Member of Parliament as Representative: The View From the Constituency." Political Studies 25, 4 (1977): 577-587.
- Nachmias, David and Nachmias, Chava. Research Methods in the Social Sciences. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.
- Newfoundland and Labrador, Province of. Royal Commission on Municipal Government in Newfoundland and Labrador (Whalen Report). St. John's: Queen's Printer, 1974.
- _____. Municipal Directory. Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. St. John's: Queen's Printer, 1977.
- Newton, Kenneth. "The Roles of Elected Representatives in Local Politics." Unpublished discussion paper, 1972.
- _____. "Links Between Elite and Non-Elite in a Local Political System." Unpublished discussion paper, 1972.
- _____. Second City Politics: Democratic Processes and Decision-Making in Birmingham. London: Oxford, 1976.
- Noel, S. J. R. Politics in Newfoundland. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

- Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950; reprint ed., New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1966.
- Patterson, Samuel C.; Hedlund, Ronald.; and Boynton, G. Robert. Representatives and Represented. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.
- Pitkin, Hanna F. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley: University of California, 1972.
- Plamenatz, John. Ideology. London: MacMillan, 1971; Papermac.
- Powell, C. W. "Problems Arising From the Lack of Organized Municipalities in Newfoundland." Proceedings of the Institute of Public Administration in Canada, 1949.
- Prewitt, Kenneth and Eulau, Heinz. "Political Matrix and Political Representation: Prolegomenon to a New Departure From an Old Problem." American Political Science Review 63 (1969): 427-441.
- _____ and _____; and Zisk, Betty H. "Political Socialization and Political Roles." Public Opinion Quarterly 30 (Winter 1966-67): 569-582.
- Price, Richard G.; Clarke, Harold D.; and Krausse, Robert M. "The Socialization of Freshman Legislators: The Case of Canadian M.P.'s." In Foundations of Political Culture: Political Socialization in Canada, pp. 211-238. Edited by Jon H. Pammett and Michael S. Whittington. Toronto: MacMillan, 1976.
- Price, Trevor and Krausse, Robert. "Representational Styles in Local Government: A Case Study of Hamilton-Wentworth." Paper presented at the Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, May 1979.
- Putnam, Robert D. The Comparative Study of Political Elites. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Riemer, Neal. The Representative: Trustee? Delegate? Partisan? Politico? Boston: Heath, 1967.
- Ruddock, Ralph. Roles and Relationships. Library of Social Work. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Selltiz, Claire; Wrightsman, Lawrence S.; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Simon, Julian L. Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Smith, Barbara Leigh; Johnson, Karl F.; Paulsen, David Warren; and Shocket, Frances. Political Research Methods: Foundations and Techniques. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.
- Smith, David. "The Recruitment, Role Perception and Political Attitudes of Saskatchewan M. L. A.'s." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, 1970.
- Sorauf, Frank J. Party and Representation: Legislative Politics in Pennsylvania. New York: Atherton, 1963.
- Sudman, Seymour and Bradburn, Norman M. Response Effects in Surveys: A Review and Synthesis. National Opinion Research Center, Monographs in Social Research, no. 16. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1974.
- Sullivan, John L. and Uslaner, Eric M. "Congressional Behaviour and Electoral Marginality." American Journal of Political Science 22, 3 (August 1978): 536-553.

Szwed, John. Private Cultures and Public Imagery: Interpersonal Relations in a Newfoundland Peasant Society. Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies, No.2. St. John's, Nfld: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1966.

Wahlke, John C.; Eulau, Heinz; Buchanan, William.; and Ferguson, Leroy C. The Legislative System. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Zisk, Betty. Local Interest Politics: A One-Way Street. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.

_____, Eulau, Heinz; and Prewitt, Kenneth. "City Councilmen and the Group Struggle: A Typology of Role Orientations." Journal of Politics. 27 (August, 1965): 614-648.

END

105409484

FIN